

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
Tuesday, 3 August 2021
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chair:

Mr P.A. Treloar

Members:

Hon. A. Koutsantonis

Hon. S.C. Mullighan

Mr S.J. Duluk

Dr R.M. Harvey

Ms P.M. Luethen

Mr T.J. Whetstone

The committee met at 09:00

Estimates Vote

DEPARTMENT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT, \$1,071,420,000
ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND
TRANSPORT, \$4,045,000

Minister:

Hon. C.L. Wingard, Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr T. Braxton-Smith, Chief Executive, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr W. Buckerfield, Executive Director, Transport, Planning and Program Development, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Ms J. Formston, Executive Director, People and Corporate Services, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Ms S. Fueyo, Executive Director, North-South Corridor Program Delivery Office, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr J. Whelan, Executive Director, Transport Project Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr L. Pineda, Manager, Budgeting and Reporting, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

The CHAIR: Welcome back to the final session of Estimates Committee A. The estimates committees are a relatively informal procedure and, as such, there is no need to stand to ask or answer questions. I understand that the minister and the lead speaker for the opposition have agreed an approximate time for the consideration of proposed payments. Can the minister and lead speaker for the opposition confirm that the timetable for today's proceedings is accurate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir—well, no, I will not, but I know there is nothing I can do about it. I wrote to the government asking for more time. There are, I think, five programs that relate to this morning's session, and there is half an hour for transport and transport planning and then roads and marine and around an hour for public transport. There is a bit of confusion about how the programs are allocated within the processes, but that is a question for another time. I just thought I would inform the committee.

The CHAIR: It is, indeed. You have written to the government and requested it but, on my agenda at least, we have infrastructure planning and management for the first half-hour.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I do note that timetable and note it is the same timetable that the Labor Party had when they were in government.

The CHAIR: Changes to committee membership will be notified as they occur. If the minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be submitted to the Clerk Assistant via the Answers to Questions mailbox no later than Friday 24 September 2021.

I propose to allow the minister and the lead speaker for the opposition to make opening statements of about 10 minutes, should they wish. There will be a flexible approach to giving the call for asking questions. A member who is not on the committee may also ask a question at the discretion of the Chair.

All questions are to be directed to the minister, not the minister's advisers. The minister may refer questions to advisers for a response. Questions must be based on lines of expenditure in the budget papers and must be identifiable or referenced. Members unable to complete their questions during the proceedings may submit them as questions on notice for inclusion in the assembly *Notice Paper*. Ministers and members may not table documents before the committee; however, documents can be supplied to the Chair for distribution.

The committee's examinations will be broadcast in the same manner as sittings of the house, via the IPTV network, the parliament website and video-on-demand service. I ask that members wear their masks unless, of course, they are asking or answering questions.

I now proceed to open the following lines for examination. The portfolio is the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and various programs. The minister appearing is the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. I declare the proposed payments reopened for further examination for each program. I call on the minister to introduce his advisers. I assume there will be a rotation as we go through the day. Minister, do you wish to make an opening statement?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No opening statement but, yes, I would like to introduce the people sitting with me today. To my direct left is Tony Braxton-Smith, Chief Executive of the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. Behind me is Jude Formston, the Executive Director of People and Corporate Services. Directly behind me is Wayne Buckerfield, Transport, Planning and Program Development. In the third row is Luis Pineda, Manager, Budgeting and Reporting, and Susana Fueyo, Executive Director, North-South Corridor Program Delivery Office. Elevated to the back seats is Mr Jon Whelan, Executive Director, Transport Project Delivery.

The CHAIR: The action is always up the back, minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If I can refer you to Budget Paper 3, the Budget Statement, page 33 states:

The state and Commonwealth governments have decided not to proceed with the Brighton Road Hove Level Crossing Upgrade project due to the significant cost increase of design options for the crossing identified in the project planning study.

There is table 2.16, and my questions all relate to that and the Treasurer's budget speech.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, what page is that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Page 33 of Budget Paper 3.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Which line?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The paragraph above table 2.16.

The CHAIR: It is the middle paragraph on page 33, Budget Paper 3.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Budget Statement, not the Agency Statement. While you are finding it, I note that the federal budget was delivered on 11 May. I also note that the budget papers say that the commonwealth government and the state government both decided not to proceed with the Hove crossing, but on 11 May there was no reference by the Treasurer, the federal infrastructure minister or any other relevant minister about that decision. Then, on 22 June, the government claims both governments decided not to proceed. My question to the minister is: how and when was that decision taken by both governments?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I cannot speak on behalf of the federal government. I do not have that time and detail in front of me. I am happy to get it and come back to the member.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You will take it on notice? Thank you very much. Was the cancellation initiated by the state government or by the commonwealth government?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I have said that I will happily get the time line back for that, but this was a conversation that was going on throughout the process. You rightly pointed out that the project was originally budgeted at \$171 million. If we go back a little bit further, note that this project was put forward I think back in 2018 by the then Labor Party ahead of the election.

When we came into government, we had a look at the project and at the planning work to see how much had been done. It was no great surprise that no planning work had been done, so we went away, had a look at what the options were and did the geotech work and the work surrounding to actually get a truer costing of the project. That geotech work was done and community consultation.

We looked at the four options—rail over, rail under, road over, road under. The costings were far over and above the original costings that were negotiated before my time in this position between the minister and the federal government. Again, \$171 million I think was the figure that was put to the project. The other options were far greater and above that. Those conversations were always ongoing with the federal government as to what the best solution would be, all factors being taken into consideration.

Ultimately, the decision was taken not to go ahead with the project. The cost was significantly higher. I think it was reported on numerous occasions and said publicly that it was between \$400 million and \$450 million for the rail under project to go ahead, which is quite excessively above the \$171 million that was talked about. A number of homes had to be acquired. From memory, anywhere between 26 and 45 homes would have needed to be acquired for that solution.

The rail under project was still sitting around the \$290 million to \$300 million mark, from memory. I know that is on the public record. Slightly fewer homes needed to be acquired for the rail over project but, again in concert with the federal government, it was decided for that project not to go ahead. Pertaining to your first question, I do know that the timing of that is on the public record. Again, I am happy to go and get it for you if you cannot google it and find it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There are a number of answers on the public record—there is one from the Premier, one from the Treasurer and one from you—and they are all different. I would like if you could please give me either the average of all three or the actual date. I also note that in last year's budget papers there was an actual result in 2019-20 being spent on the Brighton Road, Hove, level crossing of \$2.6 million—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, which page and which budget line are you referring to now?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am referring to last year's budget. Last year's budget showed an actual spend in 2019-20 of \$2.618 million on the Brighton Road, Hove, level crossing. Last financial year you budgeted to spend \$15 million. What is the actual result? In the Agency Statement and in the Budget Statement there is no acquittal for any money spent on Hove. Could you tell the committee how much you actually spent in the last financial year, as an actual result?

The CHAIR: The 2020-21 financial year, member for West Torrens?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. In the Agency Statement, there is no acquittal for what was spent on Hove, even though last year's papers and the Mid-Year Budget Review both show a budgeted figure for this financial year. For some reason, the department has not acquitted that in the budget papers.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In response to that, what I can tell the committee is that the \$2.6 million was spent in the first year. The ledgers have not been closed on what has been spent in the second year. Again, I refer back to things like—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How can that be possible? In formulating the budget, the department would have been asked by Treasury to acquit all its expenditure on every program by line. I do not accept that answer, and I do not think it is accurate. Could you please take on notice for the committee how much was spent. In the Mid-Year Budget Review and in last year's budget, we have \$15 million allocated for the 2020-21 financial year. You cannot possibly say that you have not acquitted that for budget purposes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If you are finished, I will continue. As I said, I have been informed that the ledgers have not been closed; that is being finalised now. I am happy to make available the final figure when it is done. It is being calculated now. Some \$2.6 million was spent in the first year, and I am informed that it is a similar figure in the second year. Again, this was money spent on geotech work. I stress the point, and I stress it very hard, because planning is so important when you are doing these projects and you are guesstimating a figure, as we had to do, because the planning work was not done when we came into government.

That figure, you are just going on best estimates of projects nearby, like the Oaklands project. When that geotech work was done—and this is again where that investment is very worthwhile because it gives you a clearer understanding of the conditions you are working in—we found with the Hove crossing, as opposed to the Oaklands crossing that is just down the road, that the watertable was a significantly different factor in this project. I am told the watertable is at around six metres, six to seven metres. This made it a heck of a lot different when actually engineering the project, and that is where a lot of the costs came from when you compare the two projects.

I am not an engineer, but a lot of people out there would look at these two projects and say, 'Hove and Oaklands: why is there such a disparity between the costs?' That is a very fair question to ask, and I asked it of the engineers as well. When this geotech work was done—again, the costing for that is being finalised in the last financial year, as I have pointed out—it was found that that watertable in particular, along with a number of utilities that run down Brighton Road and north-south, had a big impact on the actual cost of that project.

Once we did that work, we had more insight and more understanding of what the true cost of the project was. That is why planning works are important. We are getting on with doing a considerable amount of planning works, which I am happy to talk to the member about in more detail. Again, this is a great example of how we do that and how we make sure we get the planning work to get the cost estimate right so that when we are negotiating with the federal government we are giving them a fair, real and true understanding of what that figure is we are looking to partner them on. So that was the wash-up there. When those ledgers are closed, I am happy to bring the detail back to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So what you are telling the committee is that the department did not submit an acquittal of all expenditure on the Hove crossing to the Department of Treasury and Finance for the formulating of this year's budget—which, quite frankly, I think is a stunning admission by you. If we can move on, how many homes, land or businesses were compulsorily acquired during the life of the Hove crossing project?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In answer to the first part of your question regarding the \$171 million that was allocated in partnership with the federal government, I am informed by the officials—just to educate you as to how it was explained to me how this works—that money is put there; the money has not gone back to Treasury. It has not gone back to the federal government. We are still in negotiations with them about that. I am told it is very standard that that money then is acquitted against that \$171 million because that money is still sitting there in contingency, so to speak. It is perfectly normal practice for that to happen.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is perfectly normal practice to have it in the investing expenditure summary in last year's Agency Statements—to have Brighton Road, Hove, for a projected cost in the next budget and in the next financial year, and in the subsequent financial year, when you publish the budget papers, not to have an acquittal in the Agency Statements. That is not accurate, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have just outlined to you in my previous response—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, but anyway, if you can answer my question about how many businesses or houses were compulsorily acquired during the process.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can just finish the answer from the previous question the minister asked and then jumped—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Shadow minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —shadow minister, you are very right—and interrupted me on: I have outlined the answer to that very clearly, and I have given you the information that had been given to me by the department.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Great. How many houses were compulsorily acquired? You do not know?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Zero.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many properties were acquired that contained businesses? None?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Zero.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many public housing tenants were evicted?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: None were evicted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have they been returned?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: None.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: None?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: None.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No-one has been evicted? No-one has left? Everyone is back where they started?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, some people have chosen to go to other properties and—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So they were not evicted?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry?

The CHAIR: I am just going to interrupt. I know the member for West Torrens is keen to get as many questions as he can into this half-hour. After you have asked the question, member for West Torrens, we will give the minister an opportunity to answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In answer to that question, and again this is a question for Housing SA, what I can tell you is that to my knowledge some people were moved. Those who were moved have all been offered to go back. From my understanding, none of them at this stage have chosen to go back. In fact, they have preferred their newer accommodation, from my understanding, but they have been offered to go back and that has been very much made public as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, I refer you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 115, ministerial office resources. Do you have that?

The CHAIR: At the very top of page 115, minister, ministerial office resources.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many complaints have been lodged regarding inappropriate conduct or behaviour from you or your office in the last financial year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: None that I am aware of.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many this financial year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: None that I am aware of.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There were no complaints?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not that I am aware of, no.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many investigations into allegations of bullying or intimidation have been received regarding contact from you or any member of your ministerial office, in particular you and your Chief of Staff?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If you are referring to the allegations by Sport SA, you would be well aware that there is an investigation going on. I have made myself available to the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, as has my Chief of Staff. I am happy to meet with them at any time. We have reached out and done that. You would also be aware that a former Labor MP, I think a mate of yours, Michael Wright, who is the president of Sport SA, is going to be a part of that investigation, along with the CE, and I welcome that investigation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have you been told by the private investigator you just referenced that he will not be needed to interview you?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When you conducted meetings regarding the Hove crossing consultation, they were conducted by you personally. Who from your office participated?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If you are asking me a question now as a local member—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, as a minister as part of the consultation of the Hove project.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The consultation I had as minister as part of the Hove crossing was run by the department and I went along to four. I think there were six sessions. The fifth and sixth ones were held on parliamentary sitting days. I did not think it was appropriate that I not attend parliament, but I did get to four of those and they were engaging. The department did an outstanding job. There were a number of people there.

Again, it was an open dialogue with the community to discuss the fact that we had gone away and done the work—the work that was not done previously. People often ask me about that. They say, 'Well, Labor committed to this, but what were they going to do?' It was a very fair and real question and one that I do not think you have answered yet. But we had that discussion with the community.

I know there was a group out there that started a campaign from the get-go, which they are more than entitled to do. There was a Say No to Hove Crossing campaign. I think you were a part of that campaign. From the outset, they did not want the project to go ahead, and again that is their prerogative. But what was clear and what we really had to do was to make sure that we put on the table all the options for the community to look at. There was \$171 million on the table to try to find a solution for this problem.

We looked at all those options, and I make no apologies for putting them all out there to the community to discuss and hear what they had to say. We did that. Again, some people very passionately were against the project, and when I was asked whether I would just be shutting it down, I said, 'No, we want to explore this to its fullest extent. We want to have a look at all the options. I want to put them all on the table for the entire community, and the state for that matter, to take into consideration.'

So we did that and we welcomed everyone having their say. Some people were louder and more persistent in their views and their thoughts, and I respect that. Others were a lot quieter in what

they wanted to say. Some people wanted to be in a big forum where they could have their say in front of a lot of people and make a lot of noise. Different people have that persona about them and you would be well aware of that. Other people wanted to have a quieter say, and the department did an outstanding job.

As well as these direct community sessions that I am talking about, there were one-on-one meetings with people, with the department sitting down and talking people through it in a bit more detail, and then there were countless surveys. I can find out the exact number of online surveys where people could have a say in that as well.

This project was in my local community too, so I did a lot of work in my community talking to people. Anyone who requested a meeting with me was offered a meeting. Not all meetings were taken up, but I was happy to talk to anyone and talk them through the process as it pertained to them. In fact, I went to one person's house and sat at the kitchen bench and talked through it. That was the community consultation we had. I put out surveys, I asked people to email me and we submitted a lot of dialogue around this project. The consultation was extensive.

I think the department did an outstanding job. What you have to do when you are doing a project like this is make sure you do the consultation. Not everyone will always like what you have to say. People will have their mindset that, for example, they do not want the project to go ahead, and when you say, 'No, we are going to continue to explore it,' they may not like that, but that is my job. That is what I have to do, and we continued to do that respectfully right across the board, looking at all four options, and we landed at a position where at the end of the day the cost of the project did not stack up. The federal government was not willing to partner us with the extra funding needed and the project is not going ahead.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I heard you say in your response then, minister, that you were not prepared to have a large meeting because there are some people who wanted to have—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I did not say that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —their say. I understand—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I did not say that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that you and your office insisted on one-on-one meetings with people who were part of the Hove residents action group rather than a larger meeting. Is that because it is easier for you to intimidate them and bully them in private rather than in front of a large group? Is that how you prefer to behave?

If you read the quotes from people who were involved in that consultation, there was a 71-year-old woman who said this about you, minister. She says you were not respectful, that you were very dismissive when she encountered you. She says, 'He is extremely arrogant, bombastic, opinionated, overbearing. I think he is intimidating.' That is a 71-year-old woman, minister. Then another constituent of yours, who is 65 years old, said she attended a community meeting at a local football club to hear from you about the project. She said, 'He doesn't give you a chance to speak. He makes you feel uncomfortable and he is quite a bully really.' How does it make you feel when your own constituents—

The CHAIR: Sorry, member for West Torrens, you are asking the minister now to respond to comments that appeared in the media.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir.

The CHAIR: You are, yes. It relates to ministerial office resources?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir, as part of the consultation, and the minister himself just referenced it now in his remarks when he is trying to chew up the clock.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So that is two people who have had the courage to go on the record about your behaviour. What do you say to a 71-year-old grandmother in Hove and Robyn Patterson, who is 65, in Brighton about them thinking you are a bully?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I have just outlined the response to that and you referred—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You do not care?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can, please.

The CHAIR: No, the minister is answering.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, answer it.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have just outlined the response to that, in that there were a number of community meetings, a number of conversations—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are they lying?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can finish, please.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I feel like you are talking over me here.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What are you going to do? Are you going to stand over me?

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you going to bully me?

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Come on, tough guy.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is okay to push around a 71-year-old woman?

The CHAIR: Order! The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Why don't you try that with me?

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Come on, tough guy.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, that is what I thought. You are under investigation—

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are pretty cocky for someone under investigation.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A 71-year-old woman!

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens! This house is in committee and it will be conducted in an orderly way. How it happens is that members ask ministers questions. Ministers are entitled to answer those questions as they see fit.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You look like you are standing, sir.

The CHAIR: Sorry?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are standing, sir.

The CHAIR: I am standing because I could not get your attention.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am sorry, sir. I could not see you.

The CHAIR: I am not finished yet. Member for West Torrens, you have been really well behaved thus far this week—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir.

The CHAIR: —and I expect that to continue.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It will, sir.

The CHAIR: I am sure it will. You will not be talking over the minister while he is answering.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, sir. With all that grandstanding from the member for West Torrens, I am surprised he did not drop the c-bomb because I know he is famous for that. But could he please repeat the question.

Mr DULUK: Mr Chair, can I ask—

The CHAIR: Yes. I am going to go the member for Waite, who has been waiting patiently.

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Mr Chair. Minister, my question is on Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 138, dot point 4 in regard to level crossings. When will the Glenalta, Blackwood and Hawthorn level crossing planning studies be undertaken as part of the project improvement strategy and the high-level—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am having trouble hearing. Could you repeat that, sorry?

Mr DULUK: In regard to the Glenalta, Blackwood and Hawthorn level crossings—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What page are we on, sorry?

Mr DULUK: Page 138, dot point 4. When will those three level crossing planning studies be undertaken for the grade separation as part of the new level crossing safety improvement strategy?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Budget Paper 3, you said?

Mr DULUK: Budget Paper 4, Volume 3.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Page 138?

Mr DULUK: Page 138, dot point number 5, Infrastructure Australia's infrastructure priority list including level crossing congestion and safety.

The CHAIR: While the minister is seeking advice on that, I draw members' attention to standing order 127, which you would all be well familiar with, and that is in relation to digression and making a personal reflection on a member.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What about the Ministerial Code of Conduct?

The CHAIR: No, I am talking about the committee here, member for West Torrens. Some of the inference you made towards the minister I felt was making a personal reflection, and I have warned you against that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You are referring in dot point 4 to the IPL list, which I do appreciate now. This comes back a little bit to the answer I gave to the member for West Torrens before around the planning works and getting the planning works right. When we went ahead with Ovingham and Hove crossings, I mentioned again, with Hove in particular, that that planning work was not done, so we have gone away and done that and again came back with quite a different figure from the \$171 million figure that was formulated on the back of the works on Oaklands crossing.

It is really great that this has gone on the Infrastructure Australia priority list because it means we can move ahead and do that planning work. We have identified 31 level crossings across the Adelaide rail network and, instead of just plucking them willy-nilly out of a hat as the previous government potentially did, what we are doing is actually doing that planning work to identify—

Mr DULUK: I do not disagree, minister, but the question was: has that planning work for Glenalta, Blackwood and Hawthorn been done yet?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can complete my answer, what we are doing is identifying the five priority ones that we will be addressing and attacking out of that 31. We are looking at a matrix to work out the cost, the benefit to travel, the benefit to community and, once we land on those five or thereabouts, we will then be able to put them to the federal government and look for support for funding for that. So, no, the five have not been identified.

We are doing that work to work out which ones. You imagine across the network where there are 31 level crossings, like the previous government did before the last election; they just randomly picked a couple. When we went to unpack that and work out, 'Why did you pick this crossing over that crossing?' that planning work had not been done to justify it. We will have a look at things like the cost, the impact on the road network, the impact on the community, the benefit to productivity—those types of factors that will value the project—to get the best ones so that when we do invest taxpayer money we are getting the best bang for buck for South Australia.

The CHAIR: According to my agenda, we move now to public transport. Minister, does that require a change of advisers?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, it does.

Membership:

Ms Stinson substituted for Mr Brown.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr T. Braxton-Smith, Chief Executive, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Ms J. Formston, Executive Director, People and Corporate Services, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr J. Whelan, Executive Director, Transport Project Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr L. Pineda, Manager, Budgeting and Reporting, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Ms T. Crimes, Parliament and Cabinet Officer, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

The CHAIR: Member for Badcoe, I have just been informed by Hansard that the microphones are not working in the third row. If you wish to ask a question, you will need to come down to the first or second row. Minister, would you introduce your advisers, please.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: For public transport, we have shuffled the chairs. I still have alongside me Tony Braxton-Smith, the Chief Executive of the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, as well as Jude Formston, Executive Director, People and Corporate Services; Luis Pineda, Manager, Budgeting and Reporting; Jon Whelan, Executive Director, Transport Project Delivery, has been brought down from the bleachers; and Trina Crimes is with us as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 123, objectives, which highlight an efficient, safe and accessible public transport service in metropolitan Adelaide. Can the minister explain to the committee why the free City Connector is currently unavailable?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, what dot point were you referring to?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I was referring to the objective/description. The question is: why is the free City Connector currently unavailable?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for his question. I am told that was on public health advice. There are a couple of services that SA Health advised best not be restarted at the lockdown to prevent the spread of COVID-19.

You would be aware that COVID has had its impact on our state, on our city, on the nation and on the world. Here in South Australia, we have done an outstanding job as a state and as a people. Our communities have been sensational. Public transport, I think, has played a really pivotal role throughout COVID-19, and I want to thank everyone in the public transport space who has done a wonderful job through this time keeping people safe and keeping our essential workers working as well. The role they have played has been exceptional.

I am informed that there was some SA Health advice at the lockdown for a couple of public transport operations not to continue, and this was one of those. We have taken that public health advice throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. I think that the work of the Transition Committee, the government, Nicola Spurrier and Grant Stevens working together means that we have had some outstanding outcomes to keep people safe and secure.

As I said, that is the information that I have: it was on the advice of SA Health, and we have done very well following that advice and we will continue to do so.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer now Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 124, program summary. In the program summary, under Income you have fees, fines and penalties of a budget of \$12.395 million. Does that include revenue from the passenger levy and point-to-point journeys?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am led to believe it is, is the advice I have been given, but I am happy to take that on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you either answer now or take on notice: what is the total raised each year from that point-to-point levy, and could you give me the budgeted number for across the forward estimates as well?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify again, I am not sure if you were Treasurer when this came in. You were; you were the Treasurer who brought it in, so you may or may not know the figure. I am happy to take that on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you break it down by Uber and taxis. Could you do that for me as well? Is that possible? Or break it down by rideshare and taxi. If it is not possible, I understand.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, I was just checking to see if it was possible. I am not sure it is, but I will take it on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On this same line of inquiry, on behalf of the South Australian Taxi Association the department used to publish an annual figure of transactions of plates. That has ceased. I was wondering if you could give the committee last year's actual result for the number of taxi plates that changed hands, and the value they sold for, and if you are prepared to continue publish those figures annually for the benefit of the association.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am happy to take that question on notice and point out that I am not 100 per cent sure if that detail is kept or to what level it is kept.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: For?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: A reasonable time. Yes, I will take that on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 123, dot point 5, under highlights, 'Transitioned to new contracts and service providers for Adelaide—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, did you say?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, the Agency Statement, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 125?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Page 123, under highlights.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think you have got the wrong paper, that's all.

The CHAIR: Volume 3.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: So it is not Volume 2?

The CHAIR: Volume 3, page 123.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Agency Statements that refer to your—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I accept your apology.

The CHAIR: Volume 3, page 123, highlights.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Out of respect for this being your last estimate, sir, I will contain myself.

The CHAIR: I appreciate your respect.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Which dot point, sorry?

The CHAIR: Except, of course, member for West Torrens, you have identified your budget line; it is for the minister now to speak to that.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Which dot point was it, sorry?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Dot point 5, minister. Are you that frightened of scrutiny that you just want to waste time? How many drivers have Keolis Downer been able to recruit and train and are now operational?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If you are referring to 'made available' drivers, at the moment I am led to believe there are 91 drivers being made available to Keolis Downer (KD). As they train those up, that number obviously will reduce. They are in the process of doing that. I do not have the figure of how many drivers they have at the minute, but that is the 'made available' number. Those numbers are working with Keolis Downer now, providing a service, as I outlined a little earlier, to the people of South Australia and doing a great job. We look forward to them continuing.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer you back to page 124 of Volume 3 of the Agency Statements and sales of goods and services in the table under the program summary. Could you give me a breakdown of the fare revenue that the department estimates over the forward estimates for bus, train and trams?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that in a non-COVID year it is between \$95 million and \$100 million. Of course, I have spoken about COVID on a number of occasions here and the impact it has on our state right across the board. Obviously, it has a significant impact on public transport as well. An answer to that question prior to the lockdown we had just recently would have been very different.

The incongruous thing about dealing with COVID and dealing with the sectors I deal with—infrastructure and transport, and then sport, rec and racing as well—is everyone is looking, planning and doing an outstanding job to move ahead with the variables that are thrown at us all the time. Most recently, of course, we have seen the Delta variant, which no-one would have thought of, planned for or been able to put contingencies in place for because it is quite different from the original COVID-19 strain.

That figure is actually quite hard to calculate. As I said, \$95 million to \$100 million would be in a normal COVID year. Heaven forbid we have another strain or another variant. We want to keep things moving on in the direction that they are heading, so we are recalibrating that on the back of what happened with the Delta variant, but we also have one eye on the fact that we do not know what is coming as we move forward. We will still continue to be as nimble as possible and again keep providing a service in a safe manner, as we have done all the way through.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not trying to hold you to account on that number; I would just like the department's best estimate. If you could take that on notice, I would appreciate it.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, the answer to that question, and as I think I outlined before, is that the best estimate in a normal year is \$95 million to \$100 million. Estimating that figure in a COVID year is quite difficult because of those variants I talked about and the variables I talked about, most notably being the lockdown we have had and any other restrictions around that.

Public transport has served us well through this time. We will be doing what we can to get people back onto public transport. We did actually announce just the other day the tap-and-pay program that we are rolling out now and that we trialled on the trams. We think that is going to be a really great thing, especially with COVID at the back of people's minds going forward. That touchless pay capability is really good and it has worked incredibly well on trams.

We are rolling it out now on the O-Bahn as well. The new smart validators will come into place from I think October this year and they will be switched on in the middle of next year, in July or so. We will then continue to look to roll them out across the whole entire network. It is things like that, investments we are making in public transport, that will help bring people back. Of course, the extra services we have put on with Flinders Link as well have been a great success in getting people up to Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University.

It is these sorts of things, along with the electrification of the Gawler rail line, that will bring people back to public transport. They have been crying out for this for a long period of time, as you would be well aware. It was ignored by the previous government, and we are getting on and delivering this project. We understand that it is creating some inconvenience for people, but they know that at the end of the day they are going to have a far better service. We are doing everything we can to deliver that service as quickly as possible for the people of the north because we know they deserve it. They have been teased for a long time with that project. It was not delivered, and we will continue to deliver that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Will you take the question on notice, minister?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Do you mean the actual cost figure, if we can get it for you?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The actual revenue projections.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I will take that on notice. If we can get it for you, I will do that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much. If I can I refer you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 124 and your program summary, under supplies and services there is a cost of \$407 million. I assume that is for the contracts for buses, trams and trains.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, what dot point are you referring to?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I am referring to the table under program summary. In Agency Statement, Volume 3, under supplies and services, \$407 million is the budget for this year.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I assume that is for the trains, trams and bus contracts. While you are there with your advisers, minister, could you ask to have it broken down by mode—train, tram and bus?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In answer to the first part of your question, I am told that, yes, it is, along with the running of the ticketing system as well, and external supplies and general expenses are all encapsulated in that. The running of the ticketing system, which I have just outlined, as we move towards the tap-and-pay system, is all part of that. These are the extra add-ons that we are putting into our public transport system, as far as investment is concerned, to get more people to use public transport. My apologies, I think you were raising another question while I had my back turned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you break it down by bus, train and tram?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will take that on notice. I am told there are some elements of that that could be commercial-in-confidence, so I will forewarn you on that front. I will take that question on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have Keolis Downer asked for any variations in the contract they have signed with the South Australian government, since the contract was signed?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not that I am aware of.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Has the South Australian government asked for any variations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not to my knowledge.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 123, program 1, under targets:

Complete the transition to electrified train services on the Gawler Line, optimise timetables to reduce travel times, and provide more options for integrated end-to-end journeys at key interchanges.

Minister, as the Gawler line is being upgraded to an electric service, were two subcontractors earlier this year removed from the project after they tested positive under a drug and alcohol test for meth in their system?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That would be a matter for the contractor. As I am informed, regular drug testing takes place at a lot of workplaces, and if someone tests positive they are removed from site.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, is 8 November the date you plan to restart train services on the Gawler line?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not sure if you read today's paper or not, but what we have always said with the Gawler electrification project—and I think it was outlined in the paper today as well—is that it would be completed by the end of the year. That was our intent. As is outlined in the paper today, I have talked about COVID and the impacts that it has had on our state across the board. I want to start by actually congratulating everyone involved in all our projects. We have \$17.9 billion of infrastructure rolling out over the next four years. Of that, \$8.8 billion is transport and road infrastructure.

The teams have been working incredibly hard to get these projects ahead of schedule, knowing and forecasting and understanding the environment we are living in whereby we can be hit with a halt at any turn. Other states that we are dealing with as well have been impacted profusely by COVID. Most of the other states, as South Australia would be aware, have been impacted far greater than we have. So that is something that we have been really focused on. The hard work of the project team and the contractors has minimised delays, but in this world a seven-day shutdown will always cause delays.

With the Gawler electrification project, we are always targeting the end of the year. That target is going to move back into the first part of next year now. Again, you would have seen that in the paper today. That is an unfortunate part of this project. We are doing everything we can to deliver it as quickly as possible. There are some technical elements of this project whereby some of the people and contractors working on it are from Victoria and some are from New Zealand and Queensland.

In the shutdown, they have returned to their home bases and it will take some time to get them back. Likewise with the trains that have been built out of Victoria, they are dealing with COVID over there as well. We were always shooting for the end of the year. The seven-day lockdown has moved that back, so it will now be the early part of next year. Again, the team is working incredibly hard to make sure that we can get all these projects out.

Since March last year, the department has put out more than \$1.8 billion of new transport infrastructure projects in the market, which is unbelievable. That includes \$100 million worth of stimulus work to keep people working. We know how important that is. You will have noticed in the latest lockdown that construction on a number of projects was stood up as quickly as possible, and that was through some great work with the sector. We will be doing everything we can to make sure that we keep these projects on track.

The Granite Island Causeway was another project that was slated for the end of the year that will now be early in the new year. That was a project that had a couple of those consequences also impacting it through the lockdown. The other ones, I can inform the house, include the Main North Road/McIntyre Road/Kings Road intersection. That was scheduled for July and it will now be August. The Dublin Saleyard project was scheduled for July, but that will now be August. The Golden Grove park-and-ride was scheduled for March and probably now will be April. So there has been a little bit of slippage.

I want to pay credit to the project teams and contractors who are working on these projects. They have worked incredibly hard to get projects ahead of schedule, with the view that some of these things may well present themselves. There are a number of projects, including Goodwood/Springbank/Daws, which got itself ahead of schedule, so there will be no material impacts there. The Joy Baluch Bridge was another one that got itself ahead of schedule, so they have done really well there. The Port Wakefield Road overpass as well, we said that would be open by Easter next year. They are ahead of schedule, so they have been able to absorb this setback.

With that amount of work, the dollar figure and the size of the projects we are delivering right across South Australia, the teams have done incredibly well. Unfortunately, through technical reasons and where we have been impacted by external sources, if you like—interstate operations and/or people heading back interstate where their states are in a hard lockdown and they are still going through a number of issues there—that has had a bit of a knock-on effect on us, but the teams are working hard every day to try to minimise that impact.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When were you first informed that there would be a delay to the Gawler electrification?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As you would understand, when the lockdown hit, of course we assessed all projects, and the team is keeping a really close watch and check on all the time lines. I cannot emphasise enough how hard the people out in the field are working on these projects—and I have been out in the field a number of times and spoken to them. Their pride and passion around these projects are exemplary.

Throughout that lockdown, not knowing how long it was going to be, we were watching and monitoring. When we were able to come out of that lockdown, we were able to reassess and have a look at where we were situated, and that was when I was informed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What day will the electrified rail line be operational?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are still finalising that. It will be early next year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You do not have a date yet?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have a date yet, no. There are still things happening interstate, and we are still monitoring them by the minute. I am happy to stand corrected by the experts. I am not the expert; I have to profess that. I am not an engineer; I am not at that level obviously. In the negotiations and the conversations we are having, that project more than any has those external factors we cannot control, such as what happens in Victoria and, for example, India, with the supply chain for the trains. A number of countries overseas, not just one or two, have to be a part of that supply chain to build the trains and put that together, so that whole project has more external factors than any other project we have.

We have local people working on the ones that are local to South Australia. There are contractors who are out in the field—our road projects, for example—right across the board. I should point to them because these people have done such a great job. We are talking about out in the regions too. I mentioned the Port Wakefield overpass, but there are also the Eyre Highway, the Sturt Highway, the Barrier Highway and the Horrocks Highway. All these projects have people working out in the field. They are a little bit easier to control, as you would understand, as opposed to the ones that have interstate and overseas connections.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Will electric trains be operating when the line opens?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, that is absolutely the intent.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know it is the intent, but will they be?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Well, I have outlined to you quite extensively as far as—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You cannot give me a date.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, if I can finish, please. You have tried to bully me all morning.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am just following your lead.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can finish, please?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What do you usually do—bully and intimidate?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can finish, please.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, the minister had only just begun his answer to your question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I asked two simple questions, sir, and I cannot get an answer.

The CHAIR: Well, he had only just begun, so let's see where it goes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair, and I appreciate you preventing the member from speaking over the top of me. As I have outlined—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just pretend I am a 71-year-old woman.

The CHAIR: No, member for West Torrens, you are out of order again.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Or a sports organisation.

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens will cease.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I did outline before that this is all in the paper today. I am not sure if the member has read that, but there was an article in there outlining this. As I said, early next year is when the Gawler line will open up with its electric trains. The electric trains will roll out after that. We are still working through what that is going to look like given the impacts of COVID, as I said. We have gone out and made it public where we sit at the minute.

Will there be another COVID variant? What will happen over the next six to eight months? Who knows? We will keep working with that. The teams are doing an outstanding job with these unknown impediments that jump in front of everyone at the minute now that we are dealing with COVID-19. Everyone is doing an outstanding job. We will continue to tackle whatever is put before us. But again, early next year as opposed to the end of this year is the shift in that date.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Will you run diesel trains initially on the Gawler line before you run the electric trains, or will you wait for the electric trains to arrive before you open the line?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, as soon as the line is available we will open the line.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: With diesel trains?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And we will roll out the electric trains as they come into service.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The electric trains will not be rolled out until late next year or early next year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What is your best estimate about when electric trains will be rolled out?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: When the line opens, we will be rolling out the electric trains with that. That is the intent, as I said, not foreshadowing what might come. I know what could potentially happen is you will say, 'You said this,' and then there will be another variant of COVID, etc.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sure.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: So, please, if I can put that as a caveat. Yes, we will keep rolling out the electric trains as the line opens up. That is our intention. We will have a program of them rolling out. They, like the Gawler line itself, have been impacted more than anything by COVID because of, as I explained, the external variants that come into play with delivering this project and also delivering the trains as well.

The CHAIR: I will go to the member for Waite.

Mr DULUK: Minister, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 123, program 1 in terms of targets, dot point 3, the Station Refresh program. Except for the Goodwood station, which train stations on the Belair line will be upgraded in the next 12 months as part of the Station Refresh program?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you for that question. I know you have asked similar questions in question time and I appreciate that. This is a really important project, this Station Refresh, because dare I say it, under the previous government a lot of the stations were left to go to rack and ruin, so I can understand why you ask that. But what we are doing here—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Silence in the benches! The minister is answering and I cannot hear what he is saying.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We have \$10 million for improvements on the Ovingham railway station to be undertaken as part of the Torrens grade separation; \$5 million in improvements for the Goodwood station, as you pointed out, to be delivered as part of the Mike Turtur overpass—which again was just left swinging in the breeze when we picked that up—the Ethelton railway station as well on the Outer Harbor line, which the member will be—

Mr DULUK: Minister, my question was about the Belair line.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I know.

Mr DULUK: My constituents do not care much about the Ethelton line.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is not very nice. That is not very nice at all. Five million dollars has been allocated to Ethelton, as I said.

The CHAIR: Minister, just a moment. The member for Waite has asked a question. The minister, as I understand it, is providing some background information. I appreciate that you are asking a question as a local member, but the background is being provided and we will get to your question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, I was just outlining the Ethelton station as well. The other ones that are priorities on the Gawler rail line—because that line is being electrified, as we have just been outlining—are Salisbury, Smithfield, Gawler Central, Tambelin, Islington, Womma, Dudley Park, Greenfields, Kilburn, Nurlutta, Dry Creek, Gawler Oval, Kudla and North Adelaide. That will be done over the next 12 months or so, then the roughly \$100 million that is in that will be rolled out over the coming years, so other stations will be assessed along that way.

I know you will advocate for your stations in your local electorate, and I admire that advocacy. I will keep considering them all on merit and work out which ones are done according to need. Again, we are in the unfortunate situation where, when we came into government, they were all needing upgrades. We do not have money to do all of them, but the state they were left in by the previous government probably pertains to the fact that lots of stations would like to see upgrades.

There is roughly \$100 million on the table there for that project. We think that is a really good investment and, again, a further investment in public transport. I have talked about the upgraded ticketing, and this project will continue to roll out to make these amenities better as we try to bring people back to public transport as we work our way out of COVID-19.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Perhaps the minister could bring back to the committee the number and names of the stations that were upgraded between March 2014 and March 2018 and those that were upgraded between March 2018 and March 2022.

The CHAIR: Are you happy to take that on notice? I have a sneaking suspicion the member for Lee might know the answer to that anyway.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The rest of the committee does not, sir.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think the point the member for Lee is making is there were a large number of stations that needed upgrading; the previous government never got them all done. They needed work and they needed upgrades. We are investing \$100 million into doing that, as well as electrifying the Gawler rail line. I do want to go back to that project because the member for Lee, sadly, was part of a government—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for Badcoe! I have been pretty pleased with the way this estimates committee has been running today. The member for Lee has a specific question that he has asked the minister. Is the minister able to answer that here or at least get back to us on that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am, sir. What I will do is go away and put together all the money we have invested into the public transport system, including the \$715 million we have put into the Gawler rail electrification project because that was one that the previous government had on again, off again, on again, off again more times than I care to remember. I think our investment in public transport is exceptional, in particular for the people of the north.

This is a tough project and it is an intricate project, but it will ultimately give them electric trains like the people of the south have had for a long period of time. They will have that quality piece of infrastructure. We are very pleased and proud to be investing in that piece of infrastructure after the people of the north were overlooked by the previous Labor government when it comes to this project. We are really pleased and proud to be delivering that. As I have said, we are also putting \$100 million into upgrading stations—

The CHAIR: There is a point of order, minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: sir, this is debate.

The CHAIR: I think the minister has had ample opportunity to answer a very specific question. To be quite honest, committee, I am not sure if he has answered it or not.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, he has not. It is just verbal diarrhoea, sir.

The CHAIR: The question was about how many stations have been upgraded between 2014 and 2018 and then between 2018 and now; is that correct, member for Lee?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is correct.

The CHAIR: Minister, either answer the question or take it on notice.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. As I was saying, I will come back to the house with the details and I will also outline how much we have invested in the Gawler electrification project. When you look at that, I am significantly proud of the money we have put into public transport since coming to government.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 123, program 1, SA Public Transport Authority and targets 2021-22:

Complete implementation of a new contract management framework and performance reporting performance system to improve the management of service delivery partners.

Given the number of rail operation staff who remain undeployed, how many remain in the retraining hub as of 30 June this year? How many this financial year are in the hub, and how many have gained full-time employment? Minister, I am happy for you to take that on notice, if you like, and get back to us.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have been searching for the information to avail the committee of some detail to that question. I thank the member for the question. The number that I have as of 30 June is 111. None of those are unemployed, I might stress, but they are doing some very important work.

In fact, to be more clear, six of those remain in the hub or are on short-term leave. A number of them are doing COVID mobilisation. They have been very important in this role. They have been retasked to do that work. Others are doing roles such as fruit fly inspections with PIRSA, which is a very important role as well. Some are doing work at the Torrens Parade Ground. Some are working on the bus stop refresh program as well. A number are working on compliance within point to point. A number have gone across to work on the Gawler rail electrification project. Some are doing digitisation and archiving, as well as road inspections, level crossing work and some in-vehicle inspections.

They have actually been very valuable and done some good work in that area working through those projects that I have just outlined. In particular, the COVID mobilisation has been very important work through this time. The answer to your question is: six.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Those people you mentioned who are off doing important work on other government projects, were they compelled to do so, or was it all voluntary? Was it a condition of their employment?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to be clear, these people have asked to have other jobs in government, and that is exactly what we are doing. I am told their skills are assessed. They are required to do work. As far as I am informed, their enterprise agreement requires the government to provide them with meaningful work, and that is what is done. It is done against their skills assessment, and these are the tasks they are allocated. They have been doing some very good work, as I stressed, especially in the COVID climate that we are in right now.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If I can take you back to Agency Statement, Volume 3, pages 125 and 126, the table of performance indicators for the South Australian Public Transport Authority. On how many occasions last financial year did any bus, tram or train—if you could break it down by those three modes—skip stations to maintain a timetable?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, I did not hear. Were there two parts to that question? Maybe just do it one at a time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There were three parts.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Okay, just go one at a time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If you can, break down for us on how many occasions a bus, a tram or a train skipped stops to maintain a timetable within the performance indicators.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can tell you is that skipped stops have been an operational response used on a very rare number of occasions for decades across the Adelaide network, and other rail networks worldwide in fact, to catch up time after a service is delayed by an incident on the network. I am also informed that, when operated by government, a skipped stop occurred on 0.3 per cent of occasions. Keolis Downer's performance is very similar and, in some instances, marginally better than that previous performance.

I will just explain the skipped stop and what has been explained to me by people within this transport space. As far as I am aware (and this practice occurs around the world), if something happens halfway through a journey, be it an incident at a station or someone has trouble getting on and off if they are in a wheelchair, or something along those lines, and there were to be a delay on a train and the train behind it was catching up to it—of course, it would not be a good thing if a train catches up to the back of another train—I am informed that the train in front will then go over the last few stops.

They may say, 'Well, I won't do that last stop because there's a train right behind me that can pick up those people. I will get the people that are on my train to their destination closer to their on-time running.' That is how that works. I am also informed that the performance regime and the contract with Keolis Downer will result in them being abated and penalised if they skip stops excessively and their performance deteriorates.

There is no evidence of any systematic skip stop behaviour. Again, I am informed by people in the transport sector that this happens the world over. It happened, as I said, when the government

ran the trains to a figure of 0.3 per cent, and I am told Keolis Downer's figures are very similar and marginally better.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can you take that on notice and give me the actual numbers for the last financial year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In comparison to what they were under the previous government?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sure, if you like. In fact, you can give me the last four years of the last four budgets of what the skip stop ratio was per journey by tram, train and bus. Could you also outline to the committee, given you referenced penalties and the contract, what they are?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am being informed—I am not sure how well kept the records were historically under the previous government—that would have to be assessed. I am happy to have a look at that. Likewise, as far as the contract is concerned, elements of that would be commercial-in-confidence. I will have a look at that and take that into consideration.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, if you mention in the committee that there are penalties, the committee is entitled to ask what they are. If it is commercial-in-confidence, then you should not mention that there are penalties.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is not true. If it is commercial-in-confidence, I will not be able give you the detail—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You have just waived whatever confidentiality there is by talking about it here in the parliament. It is pretty common practice. If you talk about a clause in a contract in a committee like this, you should reveal what it is. If you do not want to, just say you do not want to, but do not pretend there is some sort of special clause that stops you. It is your contract and you can do whatever you like with it.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What is your question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is: will you take on notice what the penalties are?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I refer you to my previous answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Which was what?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I refer you to my previous answer. You can check the *Hansard*; it is there.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If we stay on performance indicators, the department set a target of 98 per cent of trains arriving within four minutes and 59 seconds. The actual result was 96 per cent. The new target is 98 per cent. The previous target involved, I suppose, a mixture of public-run trains in a privatised train system. Could you explain to the committee why the target has not changed with the new private operators?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, can you outline that again? I missed the start of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On pages 125 and 126, under the performance indicators for on-time running, the department set a target of 98 per cent of trains arriving within four minutes and 59 seconds in the last financial year. The actual result was 96 per cent. The new target for Keolis Downer is 98 per cent. The old target is the same as the new target. You talked about improvements in on-time running, so why have you not set a different target?

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, we are at the top of page 126, I understand. Are you suggesting there is no difference between 96 per cent and 98 per cent?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, that is the estimated result. I am talking about the two targets.

The CHAIR: I am with you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In response to that, what we have said is we will be delivering better services. That has been the key and that is the focus. That is what Keolis have done, as I have mentioned many times before in this place, in the tram network they run in Queensland, for example, under the Labor government that appointed them there and the services they run for the Victorian Labor government as well.

What we want to look at is savings in journey time and that is fundamentally looking to take some fat out of the schedule. Keolis are looking to do that. Perhaps a better example of that would be the extra services that we have put on the Flinders line, which of course takes people up to Flinders University and Flinders hospital, and extending the Tonsley line up there, which has been a really great outcome for the people in that region.

What we have also done with that is put on extra services of an evening and also of a weekend when they did not have those services. What we have been able to do with that is actually make journeys far more efficient. In fact, I was looking at the timetable on the weekend. On the weekend, when you go out of Adelaide, because there are those extra trains running on the Flinders line now and the Flinders line and the Seaford line cover the same stations for the first X number of stops, those stops can happen on the Flinders line so that those people get that service, but the people on the Seaford line get a quicker service because they will not be stopping at those stations and will be getting through their line far quicker. They are the sorts of examples whereby you can get a better service for the people who use it.

Likewise, going back the other way—again, I was looking at the timetable on the weekend—as you go into the city, because the trains are stopping at the appropriate stations, that service can be far quicker and you can have more express services and the like. That ability to put savings into journey time is a great example of the better service that we want to be delivering.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So you will not change your targets. If I can take you back to where we started with the free City Connector, you said that it was based on advice from SA Health. Have SA Health advised you when that service can resume?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to outline my response to that question, it was suspended, as I outlined, on the advice of the Minister for Health during lockdown and then for an additional seven days of restrictions to assist in the limit of incidental movement around the city. It will be reinstated from first service on Thursday, in line with the easing of restrictions.

The CHAIR: I will call for the committee to adjourn, but I remind members that these budget lines remain open until 11.45am.

Sitting suspended from 10:30 to 10:45.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr T. Braxton-Smith, Chief Executive, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Ms J. Formston, Executive Director, People and Corporate Services, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Ms E. Kokar, Executive Director, Road and Marine Services, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr L. Pineda, Manager, Budgeting and Reporting, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

The CHAIR: Welcome back to Estimates Committee A. We have the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport appearing. We move now to roads and marine. Minister, would like to introduce your advisers?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes. I would, sir. Still alongside me is the Chief Executive of the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, Tony Braxton-Smith. Jude Formston, Executive Director, People and Corporate Services, is still behind me and to my left. Emma Kokar, Executive Director, Road and Marine Services, is behind me, and then the other guests are in the back row.

The CHAIR: Do you have an opening statement in relation to this?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I do not, sir.

The CHAIR: We will go to questions, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 120, the investing expenditure summary, north-south corridor, River Torrens to Darlington. In that table, the total project cost is estimated to be \$9.9 billion, with a budget for this financial year of \$151 million. In italics underneath that it says, 'Estimated total project cost subject to final business case'. Has the final business case not been completed, and when will it be completed?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: This is a very exciting project, as you know. This is the finishing piece in the puzzle I suppose, or the hardest piece in the puzzle, of the north-south corridor. We had a good look at this when we came to government. I know that under your government they were looking at the open-cut design of this project, which would have been quite devastating in terms of the number of properties that were going to be acquired. We have managed to reduce that by some 480, I think, from the plan that was being considered in the first place, and we are very happy with that. We have gone with the hybrid+ model, which is the two tunnels.

We are doing the reference design, and there is a lot of work going into that and the final business case, which will be completed later this year. Regarding the reference design, what we have made public on a number of occasions is that, without certainty, we do not want to go out and alarm people that their property may or may not need to be acquired. We have outlined the southern laydown area at the southern end, the Darlington end, near Tonsley.

We have done the design work and gone out and consulted with the community. We have spoken to those people and outlined where we need to be. As we get surety in the reference design, we can then go to the community and talk to them about what is happening and what needs to happen. That is being worked through.

We submitted the full business case to Infrastructure South Australia and Infrastructure Australia in the second half of this year to undergo the assurance process. They are being done in unison, and the reference design is being done as well. As I outlined, as we have that information we will take it to the community first more specifically to make sure they are aware of what is going on.

It is a huge project; everyone knows that. It is going to be a game changer for South Australia. The tunnels put us in that big city league, if you like. I hear the excitement when I am out in the street talking to people about this project, be it about their ability to drive and utilise the tunnels or the opportunity to get involved in the construction of the tunnels, and industry is incredibly excited. Someone raised with me that there are potentially 15-year-old kids out there who are now at school who will finish school, get through university and work on the very tail end of this project and have it on their résumés. That is very exciting and we are continuing that work.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So the business case is not completed and it has been sent to Infrastructure South Australia and Infrastructure Australia so they can work concurrently on two business cases independently; is that what you just told the committee?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, I am not clear on your question there. It did not make sense.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did you just say then that the business case had been referred to Infrastructure South Australia and Infrastructure Australia?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They are working on it together or separately?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The final business case will be submitted to Infrastructure South Australia and Infrastructure Australia. They do work together—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So who is doing the business case?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —to undergo their assurance process in the second half of 2021. The department is putting that business case together, obviously, led by Susana Fueyo and her team, working with a number of consultants as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What consultants have been engaged to date?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will take that question on notice because I am told there are a number of tier 1 consultants who have been engaged in this. It is a significant project. You are talking about a \$9.9 billion project, so there are lots of people working on this project.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is a dedicated team within the department I think I heard you say?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is correct.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is headed up by whom?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Susana Fueyo.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What is the budget for the business case?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have that figure. I am told it is incorporated in the budget for other works.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Has there been any initial benefit-cost ratio calculated on the \$9.9 billion expenditure?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am told, yes, that work has been done and that will all be part of the business case.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What is the BCR?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It will all be finalised and assured through the business case.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, the budget has committed money to the construction of the north-south corridor.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is correct.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You have committed this financial year to spend \$151 million. I think a pretty reasonable question for the people of South Australia is: what is the benefit-cost ratio for this expenditure? Do you not know it, or are you just not releasing it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said, that is being calculated through the business case where it will be finalised and assured.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is it positive?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You can wait for the business case.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When will the business case be completed?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I said in the second half of this year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The second half of this year? Will you release it publicly?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We will take advice on what we release publicly as far as this is concerned. Obviously there will be commercial elements as well, but the references on the business case will be done in the second half of this year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So the commonwealth government and the state government have both committed to a \$9.9 billion piece of infrastructure without a completed business case and without a published BCR; is that correct?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I outlined before, this is the final piece in the puzzle of the north-south corridor. It is a project that is yet to be completed. Extensive work has been done and is being done. If you do not think this project should go ahead, you could say so. What we are doing is that work, as I have outlined, and the business case will be done in the second half of this year along with the further reference design, which is being worked through as we speak. As we have that detail,

we will be making that public to the community first and foremost that will be impacted by that and then more broadly.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Last year's budget for this project was \$30.5 million and the estimated result so far is \$41.5 million. Can you break down that expenditure for the committee, or you can take it on notice, if you like, and come back to us with it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have the full breakdown, so I will take that question on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many residential—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, which page and which reference number are we on?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, the investing expenditure summary on page 120, north-south corridor. How many residential properties have been identified for compulsory acquisition and how many properties housing businesses have been identified for acquisition?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To give some detailed response to that, I was outlining before the open-cut model that Labor had on the table for this section of the road, and this is again why we pivoted to the hybrid plus. Originally, I think it was a figure of around 888 or 890 properties that would need to be acquired. In doing the modelling for the hybrid+, we managed to save 480 properties, so the figure is around 390 or 400. I am pretty sure I have made that public, so you could google that as well. A significant number of properties will not need to be acquired because of the hybrid+ model that we are going for, as opposed to the open-cut model that was being looked at by the previous Labor government.

As to that detailed work, I go back to the business case work and also the reference design work, which is clearer. I do not have this figure in front of me, I apologise, but I have made it public. Around the southern laydown area, we get the definitive boundaries, these precincts that we need to operate on to launch the tunnel-boring machine and have it come out at the other end. We can give more detail on that.

We have announced the southern laydown area near Tonsley, which I was talking about before, where the tunnel-boring machine will be launched. I must say that these things are quite spectacular. I think people will be amazed as they learn more about them through school and through the community. As we get that definitive size and understanding of the areas we need, like the southern laydown area, we can have more detail. I am pretty sure I have made that public. If I have not made it public, I will certainly bring it back to this committee.

But once we have that plan and that design, we know the footprint that we need to operate in and, again, our consideration is very much around minimising the impact on the properties that need to be acquired and the people who need to be impacted. Again, that is why we went with the hybrid+ model of putting the tunnels underground, because we know things like Thebarton Theatre and the prominent church on South Road have been saved and are able to be saved because of the tunnel option we are going with.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So back to my original question, how many of those properties house businesses?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I do not have that breakdown and the only definitive area we have as we work through this is the southern laydown area. So if you are asking me from the southern laydown area what is the breakup of houses and businesses in that space, I am happy to take that on notice and get back to you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have all those properties that the department is estimating may need to be compulsorily acquired, especially the ones that house businesses, been contacted yet?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can tell the committee is that community and stakeholder engagement activities have been underway since November 2020, including this year's doorknocking focus in the southern section of this project that will see the first element of construction activity. The engagement was designed to inform local stakeholders about the project and give them

a point of contact should they have any further questions. Community and business reference groups have been formed to provide a forum for residents more broadly, community interest groups, businesses and individuals to provide input into various aspects of the project during the planning and design phase.

In June 2021, community engagement in the form of a public survey and a pop-up roadshow commenced. I must say one of these was at the Marion shopping centre near me and I did go over, and the engagement with the local community was fantastic. People had a real interest. To date, the survey responses have identified a 75 per cent positive community sentiment and feedback received and that will be provided as input into the reference designs. So ongoing engagement is occurring with other key stakeholders including councils and businesses.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, minister, have all the businesses that will be compulsorily acquired, or the properties that they are housed in to be compulsorily acquired, been contacted?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To my understanding, everyone has been reached out to and that community engagement is ongoing, understanding that there are landowners and then there are tenants of those businesses. Working our way through that process has been a key focus for the team, and that engagement will continue and continue right the way through this entire project, as I outlined in my previous answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay, so is your evidence to the committee that every owner of a property has been contacted but not necessarily the businesses that are tenants?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, what I said in my previous answer I thought was clear, but I am happy to repeat it. The team has made every endeavour to engage with every property owner and/or business—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Excellent.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and residents in that local area and they will continue to do this. This is not just a one-off lever, a note in the letterbox and walk away. Someone may not see that note or see that form of engagement, so it is an ongoing engagement process that we will continue with all those businesses and residents in that area.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have you met with any businesses personally?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I pause to think about that question because do I know someone who owns a property along the South Road corridor? I probably have over my journey. Have I met with someone specifically? I have left that specific engagement to the team, so not knowingly. Again, the engagement team and the team on this project have done a really great job in reaching out and taking people through.

I refer you to my previous answer with the details of what they have done and how they have reached out and engaged with everyone. Again, I know there was one example that was put to me of an owner who lived overseas and, despite a number of attempts and efforts to contact that person, if you send an email does the person get it? I mentioned before that you can drop something in someone's letterbox but do they get it? You try to reach out in a number of ways and means to try to engage with people, and that is what this team is doing.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you explain to the committee—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, what page? Are we still on the same—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The same budget reference. Could you explain to the committee how the South Eastern Freeway will ultimately connect freight to the north-south corridor?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Are you talking about the north-south corridor, or are you talking about the South Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am talking about the north-south corridor, which was—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Because the South Eastern Freeway stops at—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, just hang on a second. I will give you a little history lesson. The reason the north-south corridor was developed was to link up freight from the South Eastern Freeway to move it to port. The question I ask you is: how are you planning to link the South Eastern Freeway to the north-south corridor? What is the department's preferred route?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I appreciate the question and I think I maybe need to give some context and clarity to this. I have talked about this in the session before the little break, the importance of planning and putting these things in place to make sure we get the best system and network, if you like, for the entirety of the state, and the fact that when we came to government this work was not done.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is just not true, minister. That is just not true. You are just making it up.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is not even partially true; it is just a lie.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, before I was rudely interrupted, I was saying these planning works need to be done and these planning studies need to be put in place. It was mentioned before about Infrastructure Australia and the fact that they are working with us on the priority list to have a PBS level 4 road network to make sure that we are getting high-productivity vehicles transported and moving right across the state, so it is focus that we have had.

That is why in the budget you would have read that we have some \$200 million plus in there for the Truro bypass. This is some work that we are doing, plus some planning studies in there for the Greater Adelaide freight bypass. This is where we believe there could be great uplift for our state and for moving traffic. The idea is to get the heavy vehicles that are coming east to west across our state and/or coming from the north. What we have and what we know is that the heavy vehicles that come down the South Eastern Freeway are getting more and more.

How do we actually alleviate that? That is where we have looked at the Greater Adelaide freight bypass. Again, the Truro element of that freight bypass is the one I alluded to just a few moments ago whereby we are investing in actually improving that aspect of it, and that is another piece in the puzzle of getting these heavy vehicles—ideally these PBS level 4 heavy freight vehicles—off at Murray Bridge, around the back and onto the Sturt Highway.

That work is being done. As I said, a piece in that puzzle, the Truro bypass, is being done. We have actually already put I think \$12 million into upgrading that road around the back, and we have the planning studies as well looking at the Swanport Bridge fundamentally and what we can do there. We are also looking at other elements of that road corridor to get those heavy vehicles off.

That will mean those bigger trucks will be able to use that aspect of the freight bypass, and add value by having a higher productivity return, travel around the back of the city and then go down either the Northern Connector, out to the port and up to Port Augusta or across to the west.

Again, we are investing heavily in upgrading and doing planning works for that PBS level 4 road infrastructure going right across to the Western Australian border so that these bigger trucks can carry more freight and bypass the city. That said, heavy vehicles will still come down the South Eastern Freeway. That is never, ever going to stop and never going to end. Trucks still do need to get to the Bunnings on South Road and down south into my community to drop goods at Westfield, Marion, and supermarkets and all those sorts of things.

That is why we are investing in upgrading a number of road intersections along that corridor to make it safer for commuters. We have worked very closely with the community when doing a number of projects, and we look forward to rolling them out. Again, it is that bigger picture planning work. It is putting in place this Greater Adelaide freight bypass and doing the planning work for that, starting with the Truro bypass, which is a big piece in that puzzle.

We will continue to do that work, and they are the planning works that will happen. As I said, heavy vehicles will still use the South Eastern Freeway and the outer ring road we had as well as the inner ring road. Yes, they will, but by adding this Greater Adelaide freight bypass for high-productivity vehicles it will mean that we can get more freight onto that route and around bypassing the city.

That is the plan we have put in place. It may not have been the plan the previous government had, but that is what we are working on. We are partnering fantastically well with the federal government. It has seen the need for this, it has seen the value in this and it wants to work with us, which is why it has ended up on the Infrastructure Australia priority list and why the federal government has partnered with us to do these planning works as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Is your evidence to the committee that the congestion-busting intersection upgrades on Cross Road are to facilitate heavy freight to—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not at all.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So there will be no connection from Cross Road onto the north-south corridor?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. I am happy to repeat my answer because you might have been talking to the member for Lee, I am not sure. What I said was that we need a number of ways to move freight around our city. Freight will still have to come into the city and will still have to go to Marion. It will come through the Hills and go down south and into your electorate as well—to supermarkets and all those sorts of places that will need freight travel through the city.

There will be the Greater Adelaide freight bypass. Freight still will come down Cross Road because Cross Road is part of the outer ring route and has actually been a freight route within the city for a long period of time—the inner ring route and the outer ring route. This road is still needed and will still be used as it is today and as it was previously. That is how it was designed—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So could you—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, can I finish?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, but we are running out of time, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Those intersection upgrades are still very important to decongest and make them safer, and the one that you reference there—the Fullarton-Cross Road one—is a really important piece of infrastructure because that is a really tight squeeze-up for vehicles and for pedestrians. It is right alongside a school. Trucks still do use that. They take goods, as I said, to the supermarket. People need to get their food, their clothes and their supplies delivered and trucks do that.

We need to make that intersection as safe as possible, so that everyone can keep using it, and also decongest the road network so that people can get where they need to go as quickly and efficiently—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: So we have buses, we have trucks, we have cars—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, minister. Can we move on, sir?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Excuse me. I am still finishing the answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He is just rambling, sir.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We have buses, we have trucks, we have cars and we have pedestrians as well—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Come on!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —not to mention bicycles in that school area.

The CHAIR: Order! Minister, we probably have time for one more question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you please tell me how vehicles heading west on Cross Road will enter the north-south corridor?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The technical detail of that is still being finalised.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you considering an entry point into the tunnels from Cross Road.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, the design is still being finalised.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So you do not know, or you are waiting for the designs to be finalised?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I cannot be any clearer. The design is still being finalised. I outlined at the start of this—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When will that be completed?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said in the very first answer, and I am intrigued that you were not listening—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I doubt you could be intrigued.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said, the reference design is being finalised. Again, we have outlined that at the southern end of this project, the launch site for that, and as we go through each element we will be announcing that to the community and to the public. At the end of that, we will have the full reference signed, and that will outline how the project is going to work. That detail is still being finalised.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr T. Braxton-Smith, Chief Executive, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Ms J. Formston, Executive Director, People and Corporate Services, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Ms E. Kokar, Executive Director, Road and Marine Services, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr S. Smith, Director, Service SA, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

Mr L. Pineda, Manager, Budgeting and Reporting, Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

The CHAIR: We come now to Service SA, having completed roads and marine. Do you need to change advisers, minister?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I do not, just to introduce a couple of other people. It is the same team, fundamentally. I have alongside me the chief executive, Tony Braxton-Smith. Jude Formston, who is doing an outstanding job, is behind me, and she is the Executive Director, People and Corporate Services, along with Emma Kokar, directly behind me, the Executive Director, Road and Marine Services. In the very back row for this one is Luis Pineda, Manager, Budgeting and Reporting, and Shannon Smith, Director, Service SA.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 127, program 2, highlights, dot point 1. You opened a new Service SA centre in Mount Barker and Port Adelaide. How many other Service SA centres were downsized in 2021? Did the downsizing of Service SA centres result in any reduction in FTEs at those other centres?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify, none were downsized and no FTEs, as you allude to. What we have done is made our centres far more customer focused and outward facing. If you have been into the city one, which is probably the easiest one for you to get to and have a look at, the Mount Barker one and Port Adelaide follow suit, and I can talk more about others. Credit to Shannon and his team for the way they have done this. They have made it more customer focused.

I am not sure when you last went into one of these service centres, but you are greeted by someone at the door in this new format, and they take you to where you need to be. A lot of these transactions are now happening online. They have these service desks and the like, and people can take you there and point you through that and educate people on how that rolls out. I know they just opened one in Elizabeth recently. I think it had a record number of people on the very first day come through and access that self-service model and work through that.

Shannon told me a story. I do not know the gentleman's name, but I am led to believe he is in his late 80s or early 90s. You understand that for these people it is potentially hard to transfer from a service desk, an old bank teller type operation I suppose is the way you could describe it, into this new modern, online facility. Shannon pointed out that this person was exemplary in the way he picked it up; in fact, the exemplar to everyone was this gentleman in his senior years who just picked up the online aspects like a duck to water. As Shannon explained to me how well this guy handled it, I was feeling a little bit inferior with my computing skills and my knowledge in the area.

It is great that we have these people there providing customer service. Again, it is all about delivering a better service for people. Some people are taking it away and able to do a lot of this work online themselves, because that is the way the world is obviously heading, but if they do come into the store they can get that help, be talked through it and have someone give them that help, or if they do need to go to what I described as the old bank teller style transaction they can do that as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So your evidence to the committee so far is that there has been no downsizing of any Service SA centre?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, it is the reshaping, the rescoping and the outward-facing model. I think the best description, potentially, is what people of your generation and my generation—I am not meaning to make you older than you are; I think you and I are about the same age—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am 50 this year. How old are you this year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am 50 this year as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you '71? That's unfortunate.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: A grandparent as well, which is very delightful.

The CHAIR: Order! Back to the question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry. Thank you, sir. The point I was making was that people of our age and our demographic would remember going into these service centres. You can think of it as an old bank where you walked up to a teller and did your transaction. If you think about the new modern methodology, maybe walk yourself to a mobile phone centre now where you walk in and do a transaction and you get that customer service person greeting you at the door. That is the changing face, if you like, of these centres. They are still there, still providing that same service; they are just doing it in a slightly different and more modern manner, if you like.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Your other evidence was that there were no FTE reductions either.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, that is what I am informed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer you now to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 127, program 2, targets, dot point 4, in particular the Northpark Shopping Centre Service SA. That has been relocated, I understand. What is the difference in floor space between the old site and the new site?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To that question and the point that is raised there, or rather the point I was making before—this is a great example of clarifying this—the footprint we are looking at there is going from 300 square metres to 200 square metres, but with this new, more modern methodology—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Would you not call that downsizing?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —there are actually five more service points. Because we are bringing the back of house to the front, there is actually the same customer space but five more service points because of this move to the digital footprint. So, on floor space, absolutely; on service points, which is what people are after, there are actually more; if you are measuring us on service, yes, absolutely. There would be no point in having a massively big warehouse if you only needed to use a quarter of the space. It would be silly.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have you been there, minister?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I have not been to this one.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do you know that there are constantly lines out the front of the Service SA? There are queues.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Is that your question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What is the question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are moving a very busy Service SA to a smaller space. That very busy Service SA has queues out the front regularly and you are moving it to a smaller footprint. My question is: how are you improving service?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think you missed the point I am making, which is that there is the same amount of—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I get what you are trying to do.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, listen, please. There is the same amount of customer space in this Service SA. The customers are getting the same amount of space; in fact, they actually have more digital service points they can access. I thought I tried to explain it in my last answer, but I will have another crack at it to be clear.

It is the more modern way of doing things. You could build a big old teller space, which would take up more space and have people in offices behind, etc., or you could reverse space and reverse engineer them and have them actually out in a more modern sense, as I described in terms of Telstra stores, Optus stores and those sorts of things. What we are looking at is giving more service space.

I do note, too, that through COVID-19—and again I congratulate the Service SA team because it has been tough, and I know the people who are going in to use these facilities do find that—all spaces, areas and retail spaces have had restrictions put on them. We are living in very unusual times as we work our way through this. I think ultimately what people want, and this is the feedback we have had, is better service delivery. Having those five extra service points, those five extra digital spaces in the same customer space, is what is really important.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many FTEs were at the original site, compared with the number of FTEs at the new site?

The CHAIR: While the minister is taking advice on that, I will inform the committee that if the omnibus questions are read before the end of today it will be fine, given that it is the same minister all the way through.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised that there is no change.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many were there?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have that detail on hand, but there is no change.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can you take it on notice for me?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, but there is no change.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did you do any community consultation before you moved the Service SA site at Northpark?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is in the same shopping centre.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, but did you do any community consultation about the change?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: About moving it within that shopping centre?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Really, it moved a handful of metres.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who did you consult with about the change?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Moving it within the same shopping centre site—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —to a new, modern facility?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you trying to be ironic?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I am just trying to understand the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know it is difficult for you, so I will explain it to you again. Did you consult with anyone when you moved this facility and changed the service delivery model? Who did you consult with when you did it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, it is still in the same shopping centre.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When you moved it, who did you consult with?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, to be clear, it is still in the same shopping centre. We have just upgraded it and made it one of the new modern facilities. I cannot be any clearer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did the member for Adelaide, your cabinet colleague, raise any concerns with you about the plan to change the footprint of the Service SA centre in her electorate?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can tell the member in answer to that, and I have outlined it previously, is that when we came into government one of the things we were very focused on was delivering better services. The member for Adelaide, and all the members in fact, was adamant that we needed to provide better services for the people in our community. That is why we looked at how we could be more customer focused in the service we deliver, and it is not by delivering old-style, old-school, bank teller type services, as I described them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is not what I asked you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can finish.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I asked: did the member for Adelaide support the change or oppose it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, I just get distracted—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You should say sorry to your constituents you shout at, not me.

The CHAIR: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I get—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You get what? You get confused?

The CHAIR: Order, member for West Torrens! The minister is answering the question, and my feeling is that he is being quite specific with the answer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do get sidetracked when the member for West Torrens interrupts and speaks over the top of me. As I was outlining, we came to government committing to deliver better services. That has been the focus of our entire government and that is what everyone within our party has advocated very strongly for.

As I was explaining, better services come about by a more modern approach to how we deliver better services. I referred to the old bank teller style operation where you would walk in, line up and walk up to the bank teller. There is still some need for that, and that is built into the operations we have, but the outward-facing, digital way of thinking is the way of the future. You pointed out that you turned 50 recently. Happy birthday—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I have not turned 50 yet.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not yet, but it is coming. Happy birthday for your upcoming celebrations. I am of the same era, but when we think about our children and our grandchildren this

is the way they operate. They are far more online and far more digitally focused, so it is only right that we build and refurbish these centres to be more modern in the way they operate. Where we can do that and have the same customer space and deliver better services for the people of South Australia it is a positive. I think I can speak for everyone on our side when I say that delivering better services is what we want to achieve, and that is what we are doing.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have you issued a tender to find new premises for the Modbury Service SA centre yet?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: A little bit like the centre in Prospect, we did have a look to see if we could get a better facility, one that could be more beneficial for the people in that community, but there was not one available to our liking, so it is staying in the location that it is in.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What about the Mitcham Service SA—will that remain at its current location, or is it moving?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Likewise, we did have a look around for a facility that could be more modern and could fit the bill. We did explore that and decided that, no, we would keep it where it is.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Will the Modbury Service SA have a refit, or will it remain as is?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, say that again?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Will the Modbury Service SA centre have a refit?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are always looking to upgrade all our Service SA centres. So, yes, that will be having a refit as well—again, I emphasise the point—to make it a far more modern, digitally focused, better customer service experience.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given that at last year's estimates you informed us you were looking for new spaces at Modbury and Mitcham, and that has now been abandoned and you are staying where you are, how much have you spent looking for new premises? Did you hire any consultants, or did you hire any external advice to try to seek new premises, or was it all done internally?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that it is done by the internal property leasing team, so it was all done internally. I think what I did outline last year was that we would go away and look to see if we could find something that was of better value to taxpayers. That is exactly the role we should be taking and what we should be doing. We did that analysis work. When these leases come to an end, you have a look and determine whether or not there is a better opportunity out there. In the case of the Prospect centre, we did find that within the same centre. We have decided that the other two will stay in those locations to make sure we are delivering that service that those communities need.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Was there a savings target attached to moving or relocating the Mitcham and Modbury Service SAs?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed it was outlined in last year's budget paper that that was reversed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you planning on moving or relocating any other Service SA centre in South Australia?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Maybe I can give you a little bit more detail here. I know that the member for King and the member for Newland have been very passionate about this, as has the member for Adelaide. Maybe it's best I say that the Marshall government is committed to delivering better services, which I have outlined, by embracing the latest technologies and best practices in customer service to help them navigate government services faster and more efficiently. This commitment extends to the services provided by Service SA, where the state government is delivering a service transformation program that brings the style and standard of service provided to customers up to the latest standards.

The transformation that Service SA is offering is being achieved by modernising the digital platform and bricks-and-mortar experience. This will make it simpler, easier and more convenient for Service SA clients so they can get into a centre, get what they need, get it done and then get on with the rest of their day. The member for Newland has asked me a lot about the Modbury Service SA centre, and I am pleased to advise him and also the member for King that the government will be retaining the Service SA centre at this location.

I am pleased to advise that not only the Modbury Service SA centre will be retained but the Prospect and Mitcham centres as well. We will be retaining these, as we pointed out, in the Northpark Shopping Centre, but it will be a brand-new tenancy site that will incorporate the latest customer-centric digital principles. These three sites are staying—the one in Modbury, the Prospect one is staying in that same shopping centre and the Mitcham one is staying in its location. The Mitcham and Prospect centres will be refreshed with those formats.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And my question?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To add to that, I know the Port Adelaide one, which was not upgraded for a long period of time, now has new premises and the new customer-centric focused format. I mentioned before the records that the Elizabeth service centre had just the other day—152 customers completed their transaction using the assisted digital service that was introduced as part of their refresh program, so that was absolutely outstanding. There are a number of others that will be upgraded as well, but there is no intention to move any of the other Service SA centres.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So no other Service SA centres will be closed?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. What we did do was open the Mount Barker one as well, which has been a huge success. In fact, I was up there just before the opening. I know the two local members were there and the member for Hammond even came down because his community will access that. If you get a chance to go to Mount Barker up the freeway and go to the Service SA centre there, the—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given that you like Mount Barker so much, why did you not come to the public meeting?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —outward-facing aspect of that is absolutely outstanding and the service that it provides. It is not a massive footprint, but it has that customer focus and it feels so modern and so free and easy. It is a wonderful centre.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You mentioned before a transformation project for Service SA. What is the total budget for the transformation project and what is the forward estimates profile of that budget?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that is all coming out of annual programs funding.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So you have a transformation project that is being conducted out of existing resources?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, it is coming out of the existing funding. The Mount Barker one was the standalone. I am informed that there was potentially a little bit over \$2 million in last year's budget for this and the annual funding as well to deliver this refresh program.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So the transformation project was about three programs and not about all Service SA centres; is that right?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, can you repeat that, please?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The transformation project you mentioned was capital works funding for the upgrades of Port Adelaide, Mount Barker and Prospect; is that correct?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. I think I outlined that there was funding for the Mount Barker one. I am led to believe that there was just over \$2 million in last year's budget and then there is the annual budget as well. This is a program that the Service SA team has rolled out to upgrade the customer-centric focus around Service SA delivery.

The team has done a great job in formatting and formulating this and rolling out upgrades as they have come to hand to make sure that our service centres are focused on delivering better services. It is what we committed to do when we came into government. It is what we have this team doing through Service SA. They have had some extra funding, as I have just outlined, to help deliver this on a number of occasions.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What is the current savings target assigned to Service SA?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To be clear, there is no savings target assigned to Service SA, and to be even clearer on the transforming of services—I am not sure of the label you gave it—what we have been doing here is transforming the service within Service SA, making sure that they are delivering a more customer-focused service.

I am probably repeating myself a bit. I apologise if I am, but this is about delivering better services to the customer, changing that mindset as we refurbish these centres, making them more customer-focused and more modernised and improving the digital footprint and the digital aspect of them, as we outlined with the Prospect centre. The customer space is staying about the same, but we are increasing the digital terminals by five—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I did not ask about that. I asked about the savings target.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —so there is more interactive ability and that is what we are delivering.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many FTEs are assigned to Service SA as of this financial year? I have not asked you to explain blockchain. I am just asking how many FTEs are in Service SA.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to give a fulsome answer to that question, I am told that it is around about 290 FTEs, direct FTEs, along with the indirect employment as well through IT, for example, and also policy. So they are people who are indirectly working through this sector doing policy to generate more online accessibility to Service SA. Again, with a view to the way the world is moving and the way that the next generation is going, that is a really important part. That is more indirect but, in the direct FTEs, some 290 is the figure.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many positions are currently vacant? You do not know?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed there are about 10 to 12.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Twelve, thank you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: But those positions are currently being filled by contractors or backfilled by contractors.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Has the department conducted any investigation reviews, hired any consultants or engaged any work to look at outsourcing Service SA call centres?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The short answer is no. The team has been doing and continues to do work—and I think it has been outlined extensively—to look at ways it can provide better services for the people of South Australia. That digital aspect I think is where the real opportunities are, and we have talked about the people, the indirect employees, through Service SA who are working on the new online components that are coming in to Service SA and the policy work as well. I think it is a point I have stressed immensely that we have been focused on delivering better services for the people of South Australia.

With that FTE number I have outlined, there are people working behind the scenes within the department who are doing that indirect work, which is about creating more offerings. That is why these service centres we are building have that digital focus—so that people can come in and actually have those interactions and be helped through them at a digital station as well as the old-style bank teller operation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So your evidence is there is no plan to privatise Service SA call centres. Could you take on notice, because we are running out of time, how many FTEs are allocated to the call centre, and have you received any advice over the last 12 months to

consider reducing the operating hours of any Service SA centres or to change the operating hours of any Service SA centres?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will just ask about the call centres.

The CHAIR: After the minister has answered this question we will go to the member for Newland for an adjournment.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As far as the call centres are concerned, I am told that there are roughly 40 or so, maybe a few more, and they work flexibly between the counter and the call centre at various centres right around the Service SA operations.

Sitting suspended from 11:46 to 12:45.

Membership:

Ms Hildyard substituted for Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

Ms Wortley substituted for Ms Stinson.

Departmental Advisers:

Ms K. Taylor, Chief Executive, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Mr T. Nicholas, Director, Corporate Strategy and Investment, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Mr. A. Trottman, Director, Infrastructure and Planning, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

The CHAIR: Welcome back to the final hour of Estimates Committee A for 2021. I remind members that the proposed payments for the Department for Infrastructure and Transport remain open. Minister, would you like to introduce your advisers and make a short statement, if you wish.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No statement. With me is the Chief Executive of the Office Recreation, Sport and Racing, Kylie Taylor. On my immediate left, directly behind me, is Tim Nicholas, Director, Corporate Strategy and Investment, and behind me to my left is Mr Adam Trottman, Director, Infrastructure and Planning.

The CHAIR: Would the lead speaker for the opposition like to make a statement?

Ms HILDYARD: No, other than to say thank you to all the departmental staff who are here with us today.

The CHAIR: In that case, I invite questions, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 142. Specifically, this series of questions will relate to the expenses section of the Agency Statement on that page and specifically to the grants and subsidies on that line. I can advise when I move from there. In relation to the significant movements and how they are offset, your budget states that there has been a \$9.8 million decrease in grant expenditure due to a reprofiling of grants. From exactly which programs has this cut been made?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify, there are no cuts to the grants programs. What that means, so that I can be really clear, is that over the course of a project—for example, the tennis project, which is one of the significant ones and what a lot of this relates to, is a \$44 million project. That is not spent equally over the years. More of that is spent one year and therefore a bit less is spent the next year. The \$9.8 million decrease is because most of that tennis money, the one-off project, was spent in the first year; it was not spent in the second year. To be clear, there are no cuts to the normal grants programs: it is just the profiling of that money across the different years.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, why was around \$2 million of the \$2.3 million opening round of the new Partnerships Program awarded to applicants outside the sport and recreation sector?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will clarify that statement because unfortunately it is incorrect; I know it has been perpetrated out there a number of times. But what we have here is that, of that \$2.3 million, only \$9,700 (0.42 per cent) was allocated to private providers. So \$2.293 million was allocated to not-for-profit sport and recreation organisations, councils or universities for the Game On stream of the program.

For the Performance Pathways program, there was another \$586,000, and that went to state sporting organisations. The important point to make here is that this money has gone to the sector and the industry, and that is what we always wanted it to do to achieve outcomes that will get more people more active. We know that in South Australia we need to get more people more active. If we can get them doing 150 minutes of exercise per week we know that it can bring down the cost to the health budget significantly.

With respect to the national physical activity guidelines, when we came into government sadly we were in a situation where just 26 per cent of the children aged five to 12 met those activity levels and only 14 per cent of young people aged 13 to 17 met those physical activity levels. We wanted to partner with the sporting sector and the sporting industry to make sure that we could get better outcomes there.

With regard to that \$2.3 million, as I say, there has been some misconception out in the community that that money was not going to the sporting industry sector and people involved in sporting outcomes. I am happy to give you a breakdown of that money: state sporting associations got 30.7 per cent, industry sporting organisations got 17 per cent, industry representative bodies got 12.8 per cent (bodies like Sport SA), councils got 11 per cent (councils provide a lot of our sporting programs), sports clubs got 8.9 per cent, education institutions got 8.8 per cent, community organisations got 5.1 per cent, recreation organisations got 4.5 per cent and a for-profit organisation got 0.4 per cent.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, did you use your ministerial discretion or any influence whatsoever to approve any of the 19 successful applicants in the opening round of the Partnerships Program?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing went through the process, if you like, and assessed all the applications. All the applications were outstanding. We did get more applicants than we had funding for, which happens regularly in this sector and in this space. The 19 projects and programs that went through the grassroots focus area were outstanding projects and programs.

In fact, I can detail some of them to you with the benefits and the upside. One of them, which I think was reported, was a partnership, and that is what we look for with this program. We wanted to see sporting organisations partner together to deliver better outcomes.

Ms HILDYARD: Standing order 98, Mr Chair.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Surf Life Saving South Australia—

Ms HILDYARD: Standing order 98, I have a point of order.

The CHAIR: Do you have a point of order?

Ms HILDYARD: I have a point of order: debate, Mr Chair. I had the answer to the question in the first word, and we are now talking about other issues entirely.

The CHAIR: You believe you have achieved the answer you are looking for?

Ms HILDYARD: Yes, thank you.

The CHAIR: The minister can still conclude his answer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: With respect, Chair, the question was furnished around the Partnerships Program, and I think it is important to outline what they are.

Ms HILDYARD: It was about your ministerial discretion or influence.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The reason I did not—

The CHAIR: Order, for a moment, minister. Member for Reynell, I have explained a number of times now that in the committee session the member gets to ask a question and the minister gets to answer. We will not have interruptions by either over the top of the other. The minister will conclude his response to the question from the member for Reynell.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, sir. The reason there was no ministerial discretion was that these projects and programs were exceptionally good. If I can just point to a couple of them, one was the partnership between Surf Life Saving SA and the SACA. What we are looking to do with that project, which I think is outstanding, is to get people from multicultural communities who have a background in cricket but perhaps do not have an understanding of water safety. The partners in this are the SACA, Surf Life Saving SA, City of Holdfast Bay, the Adelaide Nepalese Cricket Association and the Muslim Australian Connection of South Australia.

This project has brought these young children together. They come down to the beach to play cricket and engage in something they know. They are getting physically active doing that but, at the same time, it is integrated with water safety and water education, which I think is really important. It is a great example of getting more people more active and making sure that the younger generation are getting involved. It is introducing a new group of people—and that is the real stress here, a new group of people—to new sporting activities. I went down and met some of those kids and it is a great program.

Another such program that I think is great is Athletics SA partnering with Novita and Paralympics Australia. Again, this will get more people involved in lifelong physical activity and oversee the development and expansion of the previous youth athletics para winter program to greater advance the involvement of that—

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. I think we will conclude there.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —for participation in events for people with a disability. Working with that disability sector is important.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, can you guarantee that neither you nor anyone in your office or at the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing encouraged specific organisations to apply for the Partnerships Program?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I am not quite sure what you are alluding to with this question, other than the process. People were invited to apply. It all went up online. If people need help, generally with grant applications they can contact the office and they can talk them through and guide them through that process.

I know the Office for Rec and Sport had a number of stakeholder meetings to engage with the sector to talk about what it is we are looking for and work out ways that we could actually partner people and projects together to make sure that we helped anyone get a good outcome in this process. That was what it was all about. It is really important to make sure that all stakeholders—I think I emphasised that point before.

This project you are talking about, the \$2 million of the some \$390 million that we have invested in sport since coming into government, was about collaboration and getting groups and organisations to work together. I did just outline a couple, but I would really like to outline a couple more, because the examples I can give you about the collaboration and the way these projects are working together—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What are you afraid of? Are you afraid of questions?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —is really beneficial—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are talking over people again.

The CHAIR: As are you, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Because he just will not stop, sir. He is just trying to waste time because he is afraid of scrutiny.

The CHAIR: No, I do not agree.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have never met a minister who is more terrified of questions than you.

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens is called to order. We are only—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What are you frightened of?

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, order! You will cease interjecting. Minister, you were giving a couple more examples.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, sir. I will not waste any more time. I can give more examples because these projects—I was asked whether or not these projects were fair and reasonable projects and I hope the inference is not that the Office for Rec and Sport—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That was not the question.

Ms HILDYARD: That was not my question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —favoured anyone over anyone in this process.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, have you? Not the Office for Rec and Sport.

The CHAIR: No, member for West Torrens. Minister, I do not believe the inference was that at all.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, did you instruct the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing chief executive to tell the Sport SA chief executive not to attend an online COVID-19 related meeting of stakeholders shortly after the CEO made a complaint about your and your Chief of Staff's behaviour?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Chair, as you would be aware, there is an investigation ongoing. I do not want to make any comments.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What's wrong? Are you going to hide behind—

The CHAIR: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Tough guy, come on.

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens is called to order. I cannot throw you out, member for West Torrens, you know that, but you are impeding or eating into the committee's time. Minister, there is an investigation ongoing and you are not prepared to comment any further than that. Is that the gist of it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The answer to the question is no.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, have you ever asked your department to deal with complaints against you and your staff?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, could you rephrase the question. I am not—

Ms HILDYARD: Have you ever asked your department to deal with complaints against you and/or your staff?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Ms HILDYARD: Who in your office decided that the CEO of Sport SA should be discouraged from attending an online COVID-19 related meeting of stakeholders?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I made this statement earlier today, and I am happy to repeat it for the member for Reynell. There is an investigation underway led by the public sector commissioner, which I welcome. I have made myself available, as has my Chief of Staff, for that investigation, and I am on record as saying that. I am led to believe that former Labor MP Michael Wright, who was in that meeting, along with the CE of Sport SA, will also be interviewed.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you have made an assertion in that question that a particular person was discouraged from attending a meeting. Do we know that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, that is why there is an investigation.

Ms HILDYARD: I can rephrase the question if you prefer.

The CHAIR: No, that is fine. We are just making assertions.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, when will you be interviewed as part of the investigation into the complaint?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not carrying out the investigation. That would be a question for the person carrying out the investigation.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, minister. Have you been contacted by the investigator?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I outlined my position a few moments ago. I am happy to repeat the answer. There is an investigation underway. I have made myself available to the public sector commissioner. The investigation is taking place. I have said I am standing by ready to speak and as soon as the investigator is ready to speak to me, and I am sure they will. But, again, that question would be better put to the investigator.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, do you deny the allegations made by Sport SA about your conduct in a meeting?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What is the allegation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The allegation that you were bullying and intimidating?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You deny it? They are lying?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They are lying?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I am saying it did not happen.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are saying it did not happen.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, are you receiving legal or any other advice about this investigation?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I need to be really clear about this. The investigation is underway. The public sector commissioner is leading that investigation. I am led to believe that there is an investigator who will be interviewing the people involved. I have outlined that one of those is the former Labor MP Michael Wright, who I think you both or all know well, and the CE of the Office for Rec and Sport. I am standing by to speak to that investigator, as they request, but I have said I am available and I am ready to speak at any occasion.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, minister, I understand that. The question was: are you receiving legal or any other advice about that investigation?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I cannot make any comment about the investigation and if you want to refer to which line in the budget paper that pertains to, I would be really keen to know.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, has the Partnership Program replaced the Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program in entirety?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Ms HILDYARD: Will consultancies, universities and other non-sport and recreation entities be eligible and encouraged to apply for the \$3.5 million 2022 round of the Partnership Program?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I think there is perhaps some old ground that you are going over, but that is fine. I am happy to repeat that. What we have said—and I just want to clarify because some information in the public sector is not on the money—is that this program was always

open to the sports sector and the sport industry. I have outlined again, and I am happy to as a way of example because I do not know what applications will come in the next round, that it is an application-based project. No-one is guaranteed any money. If the best applications come forward, they will be assessed and referred to me and then awarded the grant as such.

Maybe to frame it, so we can understand and be a bit clear with that question, in the last round, as an example—and I will do it as a percentage because the percentage may vary because it really depends on the applications—state sporting associations got 30.7 per cent of the budget. Industry sport organisations, like Play Australia and Volunteering SA&NT got just 17 per cent of the allocation. There are industry representative bodies, like Sport SA. Sport SA got \$295,000, which is 12.8 per cent of the budget.

Councils, who do a lot of work in the sport and recreation sector and are key stakeholders, got 11 per cent of the budget. Sporting clubs got 8.9 per cent of the budget. Education institutions, which again are a key player and a key stakeholder in this, got 8.8 per cent of the budget. Community organisations got 5.1 and recreation organisations got 4.5.

This is where the misnomer is. The only organisation that had a really good application and is a for-profit organisation partnering with a number of other organisations got 0.4 per cent. I cannot stress that enough. It is \$9,700 of that pool funding. The misnomer of how much has gone outside the sporting industry and sporting sector is just not right. They are all not-for-profits, except for the profit organisation, which got 0.4 per cent or \$9,700 of that funding.

So with the next round going forward, depending on the grant applications, the Office for Rec and Sport will keep working with industry to help them collaborate and put together better applications. A number of these sporting organisations did put good applications forward and were successful—Athletics SA, the SACA, Surf Life Saving SA, Australian Sailing, Hockey SA, Target Rifle SA, Volleyball SA, Diving SA, Swimming SA, AusCycling and Basketball SA.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, how do you think Reclink participants feel about the outcome of the partnership grants program? How do you think they feel about it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not sure if they put in an application, so I do not know. But on the grading and the scaling, clearly—and I have outlined the projects that were successful and it is all online—if they did put in an application, and I do not know if they did, and they were not successful, I invite them to engage with the Office for Rec and Sport and work with them around the parameters for this grants program to help them with their applications in future.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, under the new funding guidelines, is there anything preventing any type of private business applying for a Partnerships Program grant?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: All those details are outlined on the website. What I want to stress is that this is about our Partnerships Program and getting outcomes—outcomes that have benefits. If you want the detail, please go to the website. You can avail yourself of all that there. What we are getting here is organisations that are coming together, partnering together, to deliver outcomes for the sporting sector. We open it to the sporting industry and the sporting clubs. Maybe I do need to outline a couple more of these projects so you can get an understanding and a feel for what they are.

Ms HILDYARD: I understand.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: But the question I am asking is: do you know what the projects are? For example—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You do not get to ask the questions. If you are going to be in government, it cannot ask a question of itself.

Ms HILDYARD: I understand the concepts, Mr Chair.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The question is about whether or not people should get grants, and I think it is important to understand perhaps the projects that were successful—

Ms HILDYARD: That was not the question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —because you can measure them against the people who maybe were not successful.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: standing order 98. The minister is attempting to debate an answer to waste time. Can we just go to the member for Newland to ask his question, please?

The CHAIR: The member for Newland has indicated to me that he would like to ask a question. I do not believe the minister is, on this occasion, debating the answer. He is simply furnishing examples in relation to the question asked by the member for Reynell, but I will ask the minister—

Ms HILDYARD: The question was whether any private business can apply.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, do not backchat me.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is our job.

The CHAIR: It is my job to say it will not get you anywhere.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Chair, maybe to clarify, if I can just give one and that is around the for-profit organisation that, as I said, received some \$9,700 or 0.4 per cent of the funding. The reason they got it was that the partners that they partnered with, which is the point I am trying to make here and what we are trying to bring together, were not-for-profit organisations.

They led this proposal. Their partners were the Copper Coast Council, the Harvest Christian school, the Kadina Memorial School and the Belgravia health and leisure foundation. This program is to run youth and school projects and programs to engage students who experience high levels of stress and anxiety, to get them involved in sport because we know the benefits, especially through COVID, of sport and recreation on mental health.

That was a great project whereby the profit organisation, again to the tune of \$9,700, partnered with four—I think it was four that I mentioned—not-for-profit organisations. So you can see what we are doing. That is a key part of it. We want to see those groups come together and, if a for-profit group can help bring four not-for-profit groups together to get a great outcome and deliver and get more people more active, then that potentially will be one that is funded. But they will all be assessed on their individual merits, and we look forward to having more applications in the next round.

The CHAIR: Minister, I believe your answer was particular relevant to the question because you were explaining how for-profit organisations can be involved in a program.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, sir.

Dr HARVEY: My question relates to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 141. Can the minister please update the house on sports infrastructure, specifically the West Adelaide Hellas football club?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, and I thank the member for his question. The Marshall government recognised the importance of making sure hardworking taxpayers get value for money in the delivery of government projects, especially when it comes to infrastructure. After all, we are delivering a record \$17.9 billion in new and improved infrastructure in South Australia over the next four years, which is more than any other four-year period in South Australia, and a significant amount of that, of course, is going into sport.

We have invested some \$390 million plus into sport since coming to government, more than the sector has ever seen, especially at a grassroots level. The former Labor government simply cannot match our record when it comes to delivering infrastructure projects, including sports infrastructure. We have been undertaking the biggest ever investment in grassroots sports in the state's history, with our projects funded to date delivering more than \$57 million in project value across 39 different sports and many recreational activities.

We are not stopping there because the Marshall government has made a further \$20.6 million in funding available to sports and recreation through the infrastructure projects 2021-22 grants program. The Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program for the upcoming

year is \$5.6 million. The grassroots facilities program, round 2, is \$10 million. The Regional and Districts Facilities Program, round 2, is \$5 million.

Unfortunately, though, the former government's record of delivering sports infrastructure projects is not so rosy. The member for Newland has made reference to the West Adelaide Hellas football club. I am advised that an audit of the club has found a litany of compliance and dangerous and safety defects on site. This has prompted the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing to take urgent action to keep the public safe which has meant a ban on community use of the main pitch.

The recent safety audit highlighted the dire state the facility is in and forced the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing to give the club 48 hours to fix immediate safety concerns including installing safety barriers, adequately fencing off the site, and removing trip and fall hazards. The sorry state of the facility is despite more than \$4.8 million in state government funding being spent on the project dating back to 2014. This includes funding from the former Treasurer the member for West Torrens who I note has been a club patron.

I also understand that funding received by the club included \$300,000 just prior to the 2018 election. The \$4.8 million was provided in full to West Adelaide Hellas football club and Football South Australia, but the West Adelaide Hellas football club has advised that all the money has been spent and the project is not complete.

An external forensic financial analysis looked at the accuracy of the acquittal of the grants fund paid to both West Adelaide Hellas football club and Football South Australia and assessment of the building works required to get the site to a usable state. While the audit found no evidence of misappropriation, it did highlight the fact that the club had exhausted all funds. The audit found that the estimated cost to complete stage 1 is around \$3.6 million more, noting this would only complete the ground floor level. The first floor level would be left as a shell. Stage 2, which is required to officially complete the project, will cost another \$2.5 million on top of the \$3.6 million.

I am sure that the community will be very disappointed to know that after seven years, and millions of dollars later, this facility is still in this shocking state. While I note that the club was able to rectify those immediate concerns and now has until 18 August to provide a detailed defect management plan and the proof that it has the financial means to implement it, the public should be assured that the Marshall government is about backing worthy projects that are shovel ready that will benefit the community, not handing out obscene amounts of cash to clubs where mates work or where they were patrons.

That is because the Marshall government is investing in sport infrastructure that helps South Australians get their game on, gets them moving and gets more people more active, enjoying the many social, health and lifestyle benefits that sport and recreation can provide.

The CHAIR: Minister, it seems to me you may well have invited a question from the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have. That was the most appalling display I have ever seen in this parliament. This is a volunteer club that is not for profit, and to have the minister attack in the way he just did—

Mr WHETSTONE: How much money did you give them?

The CHAIR: Order, member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know exactly how Triathlon SA feel when you were bullying and intimidating the head of Sport SA, you thug. You are a thug. That is all you are, and you are attacking a club, a volunteer-based club—

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, you are called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —in the parliament under privilege.

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens will cease.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You really are a disgrace.

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens will cease.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To attack a bunch of volunteers, mums and dads who work tirelessly—

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, I am on my feet.

Mr WHETSTONE: Shut up.

The CHAIR: Order, member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not embezzle money like you, mate—embezzler.

The CHAIR: Order! All of this—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sit down.

The CHAIR: No, I can feel a point of order coming from the member for Chaffey. I will resume my seat now, but please be aware that when the Speaker or the Chairman rises all other conversations will cease. Member for West Torrens, I remind you, as I already have today, of standing order 127, point 3, which refers to making a personal reflection on any other member. You have in the last minute referred to the minister as a bully and a thug.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The CHAIR: I am not sure if the minister has taken offence to that or not, but I am going to deem them a personal reflection and I ask you to withdraw.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I withdraw, sir.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE: I ask the member for West Torrens to withdraw and apologise for those incorrect comments he made about me.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How much did you pay back?

The CHAIR: No, member for West Torrens, this is not helping at all. The member for Chaffey has taken offence to the assertion you have made about him—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I withdraw, sir.

The CHAIR: And you will withdraw—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do, sir.

Mr WHETSTONE: And apologise.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I will not apologise. I have withdrawn, sir.

The CHAIR: You withdraw?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I withdraw, but I will not apologise.

The CHAIR: Why won't you apologise?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sir, I do take offence as well to the comments the member made before about me and ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have withdrawn.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And apologise. Sir, I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens has withdrawn on both counts.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And I ask him to apologise.

The CHAIR: The minister and the member for Chaffey have asked the member for West Torrens to apologise as well. I cannot force you—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, you cannot, sir, and I will not.

The CHAIR: —as Chair to apologise.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And I won't.

The CHAIR: You have withdrawn, but we are on thin ice. As reluctant as I would be to do this, I am not able to throw any member out of this committee but, should the sitting of this committee deteriorate to such a state where I do not believe it can be managed, we will simply take some time out, which will eat into your time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That question was asked by the member for Newland at I think 10 past one. I have requests from the media about the West Adelaide Soccer Club and its work orders from an earlier time frame. I am assuming that the minister's office has leaked this to the media to try to get a story. This is a volunteer club run by mums and dads who just want to see their kids play soccer, and the minister is using his ministerial resources to leak documents to try to embarrass volunteers. This is exactly what Sport SA were complaining about: your conduct, minister, in that meeting.

The CHAIR: Once again, member for West Torrens, you are making assertions.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But, sir, he is under investigation for it by the Premier. It is not an assertion.

The CHAIR: You are making assertions—and they have been well publicised, I understand that, in the media—but you have gone a step further and made a further assertion. Your question is?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is: when did you tell the media that the West Adelaide Soccer Club had these work orders on it, and have you done it for any other organisation like, I don't know, the consortium building the Gawler rail line that is now delayed until next year sometime? You are talking about a club, based on volunteers, and their delays. Meanwhile, today you announced a whole litany of delays in infrastructure programs, yet you brush them off and blame someone else, and here you are attacking a bunch of volunteers. Do you have no shame at all?

The CHAIR: There is argument in that. What is the question, member for West Torrens?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When did you leak it to the media?

The CHAIR: There is an assertion in that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did you give this information to the media before the member for Newland asked his question?

The CHAIR: That question now is much better framed, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If the member can refer to the budget paper and the budget line.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sure, okay: it is Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 142, grants and subsidies. Did you leak to the media in advance of the member for Newland's question that there were work orders at the site at Kilburn aimed at the West Adelaide Soccer Club?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Let's be clear: I think these work orders have been in place for—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who told the media? Did your office tell the media?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not know who told the media. That would be a question for the media. My point with this is this is about accountability. This is significant money that has gone to a soccer club that you do know well, as the patron of the soccer club, and it was before we were in government. We have tried to rectify it and remedy this. We have actually gone—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: By attacking them in the media twice now?

The CHAIR: The minister is simply—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A bully.

The CHAIR: Okay, here we go again.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, they are a volunteer club.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, I am going to ask you to withdraw again—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I withdraw.

The CHAIR: —under standing order 127.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay, I withdraw.

The CHAIR: Thank you, and we will stop there.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I cannot imagine a club being attacked—

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens is called to order. The minister was answering a question posed to him by the member for Newland in the committee of this house, which he has done.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do say to those mums and dads—

The CHAIR: Nothing to do with the media.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —they deserve, after \$4.8 million is spent on it, to be in a safe environment. Those mums and dads of those children playing soccer out there deserve to be in a safe environment, and \$4.8 million was enough to get that project done and completed. It has not been completed. I outlined how much the shortcomings are and the defects in that project. It is in the vicinity of more than \$3 million to have stage 1 complete and more than \$2½ million to have stage 2 complete, so a lot more money is needed for that project. It has not come forth. We have put a time line on it for the group to come and do that.

Those mums and dads who have children playing at the facility, for the money that was spent under the previous government—I think there were grants that came from you as Treasurer—deserve to have that facility up to spec. To make people accountable for the money they spend, the taxpayer funding that they are spending, I think is the right thing to do.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, what do you think will be the impact of your decision to reduce core funding for state sporting and peak bodies from \$100,000 to \$50,000?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for that question. I will just give clarity around what we have done going forward through the grants review. What came of that was the need for more investment in infrastructure, and that is where we have put together our infrastructure projects—and I have outlined this—through the grassroots project, the community rec and sport facilities project and also the regional and districts fund. We started with the football, cricket, netball grassroots program and turned \$15 million into nearly \$60 million worth of projects, again partnering with councils and those key stakeholders, clubs and sporting associations to deliver those really good outcomes. That was one of the findings of the grant review.

The other part was actually getting outcomes against the money we are investing. State sports sectors will now have a maximum of \$50,000. Again, sporting bodies with a turnover of more than \$5 million will not be getting that state sector support. We think that they have enough money, but they can apply for more of these partnership programs whereby they work with other sports as well.

What we also think it gives a great ability to do is for those bigger sports to actually partner with smaller sports. For example, if someone wants to do a multicultural program, instead of having lacrosse, hockey, football, tennis, etc., all doing a multicultural program, if they all come together and work together—because the fundamentals are the same; it is just applied differently through different sports—we think that we will be able to get far better projects and programs in place, and there is the ability for some of those bigger sports to lead this.

That state sector support is there. What we are doing, though, is making that funding that they get going forward more accountable. Again, this is taxpayer money we are spending. We are putting it against projects and programs that are going to deliver outcomes. It is not just a matter of handing money over and having it untied: it will actually have outcomes that we want to achieve.

I have outlined a few of those projects in the first round. I am happy to talk about more of them, because I think they are genuinely exciting, and we will be doing more of that going forward.

They do have 12 months. We have given them more than 18 months to transition into this new arrangement.

I think that ultimately it will give far better bang for buck, and it will be focused on outcomes to deliver a better quality of service and a better outcome as far as getting people more healthy, more active and driving towards sport. If we can get people off the couch and get them active, that will lead them towards engaging in a sport.

What we also know is that with these projects and programs and them being more accountable, as I said, we are finding now that more groups are looking not just to sport and recreation. Let's look at the Olympics now. We have skateboarding, we have BMX, we have—

The CHAIR: Minister, I appreciate all of that—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think they are really important, sir, because—

The CHAIR: I understand that.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —the sector support that is being talked about—

Ms HILDYARD: It is not about the question. We are moving away from the question.

The CHAIR: Minister, I am going to ask you to bring that one to a close. We are down to less than 20 minutes. We have 18 minutes left in this session. I am sure that the member for Reynell has questions to ask which you will be more than capable to answer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can just finish that—

The CHAIR: No, I have asked you to finish, minister.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, can you guarantee that there will not be any job losses as a result of that reduction from \$100,000 to \$50,000?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, what we say with these grant fundings—

Ms HILDYARD: Yes or no.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What we want people to do with this grant funding is not to be relying on the grant funding structure for their business or their organisation. There is sector support available, but we want them to use taxpayer-funded money not to prop up their operations but to deliver projects and programs that will get the outcomes we want, which will get more people more active so that we can get them doing those 150 minutes of exercise per week because we know that there is a benefit for the community.

Again, it is not going to be a case of us just handing over untied funding to organisations. What we are going to do is to drive these projects and drive these programs so that we will get outcomes that we need and want. Again, we want to work with the sector, and if they partner up and they come up with these projects and programs they will be able to get funding and deliver that, and there will be benefits for everybody.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, given the serious Northern Territory ICAC findings of improper conduct against Racing SA deputy chair, Brett Dixon, in relation to a \$12 million government racing grant, is it proper that Mr Dixon continues to have oversight of South Australian taxpayer money through his board position?

The CHAIR: I will allow the minister to answer that as he sees fit.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: For clarity in referring to Mr Dixon, I know that there is an ongoing investigation there, and that is before ICAC. He has stepped down from his position both here and—

The CHAIR: I am going to interrupt here, because—

Ms HILDYARD: Is there an ongoing ICAC investigation?

The CHAIR: No, member for Reynell, just listen. The minister just referred to an ongoing investigation, whereas the member for Reynell referred to a finding.

Ms HILDYARD: A Northern Territory ICAC investigation.

The CHAIR: I am not sure whether we are on the same page here.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To be clear, there was an ICAC investigation and it is now in the hands of police, so the investigation is continuing. No charges have been laid, as far as I am aware. The point that I would like to make is that Mr Dixon has stepped down while this case is sorted out. It is before the police, so it is being investigated. That is where the matter stands. He is not making any decisions because he has stepped away from his position on the board.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, do you stand by your 2019 statement that, 'Frankly, the TRSA needs people like Brett Dixon on board and I stand by his appointment'?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to be clear, to the point that was made, we have put funding into racing. Under the previous government, they sort of gave them a very hefty tax. Since coming to government, we have put some \$24 million—plus another \$5 million, I think—back into the racing industry. In doing that, again, we are not giving out money that is not accounted for.

We said, 'Here is this money and what you need to do is to get your house in order. You need to have the right governance regimes in place. To do that selection process for the board process and to have good governance, you need good independent directors on that board.' We said that, in line with the funding that we were giving to the industry, they needed to do a governance review in line with the Australian Institute of Company Directors (AICD) recommendations to make sure that everything was in the best form it could be.

In doing that, for the directors for racing and for the harness racing, as well, a selection panel was put in place. We put three independent people onto that—independence coming to the board. Country racing had a person on that panel and so did metropolitan racing. They would go away, interview the applicants, come back and make recommendations to me. Those recommendations came, I endorsed those recommendations and people were put onto the board.

In the case of Mr Dixon, as you have outlined, there has been an ICAC investigation. It is now with police. I do note that there have been a number of ICAC investigations in South Australia that, when all was said and done, did not actually eventuate, so I think it is best we do not convict someone before they have had their day in court.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, have you or any of your staff spoken to Mr Dixon since the Northern Territory ICAC handed down its adverse findings against him?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I have not, and I am not aware that my staff have either.

Ms HILDYARD: Have any other Racing SA board members contacted your office to raise concerns about Mr Dixon and/or his continued presence on the board?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Ms HILDYARD: Which directors have recently resigned from the Racing SA board?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The Racing SA board?

Ms HILDYARD: There is an advertisement out for two Racing SA directors.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not aware of anyone resigning. I think it might be part of their term renewal, but I am happy to find out for the member.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you. Minister, have you read the Northern Territory ICAC report into the \$12 million Fannie Bay racetrack grandstand deal, which may lead to your hand-picked appointee, Brett Dixon, being referred to the DPP for consideration of criminal charges?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Ms HILDYARD: You have not read the report?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Ms HILDYARD: Will you remove Mr Dixon if the NT DPP does recommend criminal charges?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is not a position for me to remove a person; it is a position for the board and the members of that board under their constitution. That would be a matter for them.

Ms HILDYARD: Is Mr Dixon still able to access Racing SA resources and information, including his emails, board minutes and/or financial statements, whilst on leave?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That would be a question for Racing SA.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, do you personally regret the appointment and your endorsement of Mr Dixon to the board of Racing SA?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. I did go through the process before and I am happy to go through it again. Racing is independent of government. It runs its own race. What we did say in a stipulation we put in place as a government in giving them money—the previous government had imposed a very hefty tax on the industry. We know the industry does create jobs and is a growing sector that employs a wide variety of people, so we were happy to support them.

One of the big focuses we had on any investments that we made in the racing industry was on investing in infrastructure and building the infrastructure that would grow the industry and generate jobs for people in South Australia. They have done that, and done that very successfully. The Racing SA board has changed their name very much from TRSA to Racing SA and become far more engaging. They have put in an equine officer and welfare has been put in place for the animals. They have put in a number of other projects as well. Goodness, you are leading me to talk about Jamie Kah and the apprenticeship program that they run here out of South Australia—

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Chair—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —which has been incredibly successful. So, no, I think the board has done a great job. As far as Mr Dixon is concerned, I have made that point over and over again, and I am happy to make it again. There is an investigation happening up in the Northern Territory, he has stepped away from his position, but it is the board of Racing SA that makes the ultimate decision. I do not have any legislative power to do so.

What we did do for the grant funding was put in place a few stipulations that they had to meet, and they were happy to meet those. That was to have a look at their governance and have a governance review, which they put in place. Also, when there is a selection panel I put in place three independent people to make recommendations to me along with someone from Country Racing SA and the SAJC. Those recommendations come to me, I endorse them and the process moves from there.

The CHAIR: Before I go to the member for Reynell, just one thing: we have not had omnibus questions yet today.

Ms HILDYARD: The member for Torrens is going to do them in about five minutes.

The CHAIR: That is fine. I am just reminding you.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Chair, I appreciate it. Minister, what advice, if any, did you receive from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing prior to appointing Mr Dixon?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to go through the process there, the selection panel was put in place as agreed by TRSA as it was then, Racing SA as they are known now. I recommended three people to that panel, with one from Country Racing SA, one from the SAJC. They went through all the applications, did all the necessary interviews. That was a matter for them. They gave me the recommendations. I endorse those recommendations and then it goes to the TRSA, or the Racing SA board as it is now known. That is the process.

Ms HILDYARD: Just to clarify, did you not receive any information whatsoever from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing about Mr Dixon prior to his appointment?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. Again, to outline the process, there is no legislative hold from a government over racing here in South Australia. They are an independent body and they run their own organisation and operation. What we did put in place was a stipulation around the grant funding that we were giving to the racing industry to ensure that taxpayers' money was spent diligently and that the right checks and balances were put in place. We wanted to ensure that they

had good governance on their board. We were not just giving money to mates, and so on. We wanted to make sure there was the right governance put in place.

So we got them to do a governance review in line with Australian Institute of Company Directors' criteria, and then they went about doing the interviews. There were three independent people—someone from Country Racing, someone from SAJC—the recommendations were made to me and then I endorsed those people.

Ms HILDYARD: Given you have just said that you received no advice or information about Mr Dixon prior to his appointment, why did you say in your 2019 statement about his appointment, 'Frankly, the TRSA needs people like Brett Dixon on board, and I stand by his appointment'?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will go back over old ground, but I can repeat that point. These people were interviewed by the independent panel—three independent people plus the Country Racing and SAJC people. They made recommendations to me. I looked at those recommendations.

I could see Brett's pedigree in those recommendations, and I was happy to endorse him. He had a heavy involvement with racing up in the Northern Territory where they had had a lot of success. He and a couple of others who were in that same wave of people, if you like, who went onto the board were very impressive and, to be frank, the industry has only said glowing things about Brett Dixon to me. Again, there is an investigation going on and we await the outcome of that. That is the process that takes place as far as the appointment is concerned.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, have you had any concerns raised with you in the past 12 months about the viability of the harness racing industry?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Twelve months is probably too short. Harness racing has been dealing with a lot of issues, most notably through the club and the relationship between harness racing, the association and the premier club at Globe Derby. I know that a lot of that is being looked at through Consumer and Business Services (CBS) as far as licensing is concerned.

As to getting the harness racing industry on track and up and running, we have been working closely with them. They have been putting projects to us and we are working through the funding in a similar operation. When they do selections for their board, that governance element is something we want to see put in place around the Australian Institute of Company Directors guidelines, if you like, so we have asked them to do a similar thing if they are going to receive any grant funding for projects going forward.

We are working with them on those projects, making sure that the delivery of that funding and the projects that are delivered actually deliver benefits to the state, most importantly creating jobs and growing the industry to make it sustainable into the longer term.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, were you provided with a copy of the independent review into harness racing commissioned by Mr Fiacchi prior to his resignation?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not sure which review you are referring to.

Ms HILDYARD: I will ask a different question, minister. Do you agree with Mr Fiacchi's comments to *The Advertiser* on 25 June that 'it has become obvious that major reform is required', in relation to the harness racing industry, 'and we continue to face a reluctance to change'?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If that is what George said to the media, I can appreciate and understand that. As I have made really clear, and I will try to be clearer again, the racing industry itself is not aligned to government. We have no control over the industry. The industry runs itself and George, as the former chair, is free to make those comments, and that would be something for industry to answer.

We have offered help and support. They were hit with the heavy tax Labor imposed on them around the POC tax. We put money back into the industry to help them be sustainable going forward. The key focus for us was around that taxpayer money that is spent in the industry. We want to see it invested in projects and programs that return a good outcome for the people of South Australia and help generate jobs. That question is probably better directed to the actual harness racing board.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, who currently owns Globe Derby racetrack?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not me.

Ms HILDYARD: Who currently owns Globe Derby racetrack?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not me. I am not sure which part of the budget you are referring to. You keep asking these questions every estimates. I am happy to ask harness racing or happy to ask Globe Derby the state body. I think it is pretty obvious that they own it, but if you are asking me about their finances that has nothing to do with state government whatsoever. It is almost like asking who owns your house. It is a bizarre question.

Ms WORTLEY: I will read the omnibus questions.

1. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:

- What is the actual FTE count at 30 June 2021 and the projected actual FTE count for each year of the forward estimates;
- What is the total employment cost for each year of the forward estimates;
- What is the notional FTE job reduction target that has been agreed with Treasury for each year of the forward estimates;
- Does the agency or department expect to meet the target in each year of the forward estimates; and
- How many TVSPs are estimated to be required to meet FTE reductions over the forward estimates?

2. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:

- How much is budgeted to be spent on goods and services for 2021-22, and for each of the years of the forward estimates period;
- The top 10 providers of goods and services by value to each agency reporting to the minister for 2020-21;
- A description of the goods and/or services provided by each of these top 10 providers, and the cost to the agency for these goods and/or services; and
- The value of the goods and services that was supplied to the agency by South Australian suppliers?

3. Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, will the minister list the job title and total employment cost of each position with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more which has (1) been abolished and (2) which has been created?

4. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors above \$10,000 between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing:

- the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier;
- cost;
- work undertaken;
- reason for engaging the contractor; and
- method of appointment?

5. For each department and agency for which the minister has responsibility:

- How many FTEs were employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2020-21 and what was their employment expense;

- How many FTEs are budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities in 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25 and what is their estimated employment expense;
 - The total cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2020-21 and budgeted cost for 2021-22?
6. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, please provide a full itemised breakdown of attraction and retention allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021.
7. What is the title and total employment cost of each individual staff member in the minister's office as at 30 June 2021, including all departmental employees seconded to ministerial offices?
8. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, could you detail:
- How much was spent on targeted voluntary separation packages in 2020-21;
 - What department funded these TVSPs (except for DTF estimates);
 - What number of TVSPs were funded;
 - What is the budget for targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates (by year), and how are these packages funded; and
 - What is the breakdown per agency/branch of targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates (by year) by FTEs?
9. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, how many executive terminations have occurred since 1 July 2020 and what is the value of executive termination payments made?
10. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what new executive appointments have been made since 1 July 2020, what is the annual salary and total employment cost for each position?
11. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, how many employees have been declared excess, how long has each employee been declared excess and what is the salary of each excess employee since 1 July 2020?
12. In the 2020-21 financial year, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on operating programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2021-22?
13. In the 2020-21 financial year, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on investing or capital projects or programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2021-22? How was much sought and how much was approved?
14. For each grant program or fund the minister is responsible for please provide the following information for 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25 financial years:
- Name of the program or fund;
 - The purpose of the program or fund;
 - Balance of the grant program or fund;
 - Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund;
 - Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund;
 - Carryovers into or from the program or fund; and

- Details, including the value and beneficiary, of any commitments already made to be funded from the program or fund.

15. For the period of 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021, provide a breakdown of all grants paid by the department/agency that report to the minister, including when the payment was made to the recipient and when the grant agreement was signed by both parties.

16. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budgeted expenditure across the 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25 financial years for each individual investing expenditure project administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

17. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budget for each individual program administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

18. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what savings targets have been set for each year of the forward estimates? What measures are you implementing to meet your savings target and what is the estimated FTE impact of these measures?

19. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what initiatives or programs have been approved and funded as at 1 July 2021 but not publicly announced or disclosed in the budget papers?

20. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, how many complaints have been made regarding bullying, harassment, sexual harassment or any other form of discrimination or assault to human resources, the Commissioner for Public Employment or any other government agency or statutory office?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will just make a parting comment, along with congratulating the member for Torrens on getting it out so quickly—well done. I thank all the departmental staff who have been here working with us throughout this, all my personal staff and all the parliamentary staff as well, in particular Hansard for deciphering what just came out then and how quickly it came out.

I also thank you, sir, for your wonderful chairmanship of this committee over a long period of time. You have been a pleasure to work with. I know it is the last time that I will be sitting here with you, and I thank you very much for your guidance and the way you carry yourself and handle this committee, especially with some of the colourful characters who are no longer with us at this time. You do an outstanding job and it has been a pleasure to work with you in this space. I know you are not leaving here yet, but you have been outstanding and I value your friendship. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister, for those kind words and thank you to your advisers today. Thank you to committee members. Having reached the allotted time and there being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Department for Infrastructure and Transport to be complete. I lay before the committee a draft report for Estimates Committee A.

Dr HARVEY: I move:

That the draft report be the report of the committee.

Motion carried.

At 13:50 the committee concluded.