

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

Questions on Notice

Budget Estimates 2017-18

Monday 22 and Tuesday 23 May 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development Portfolio

| QoN No. | PDR No. | Division | Senator | Broad topic | Question | Proof Hansard page and hearing date or Written | Comments |
|-------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|--|---|--|----------|
| Corporate Services (5) | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 000169 | CORP | ROBERTS | SECRETARY REMUNERATION | <p>Senator ROBERTS: ... Mr Mrdak, what is your remuneration per year? Australians would like to know that.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, my remuneration is set by the Remuneration Tribunal. It is \$620,000 per annum.</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: That is all-inclusive—all entitlements?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I can get you the details of it—I think that is my pay remuneration. On top of that, there would be superannuation.</p> <p>Senator ROBERTS: If you could get me the total then, please.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly. It is published by the Remuneration Tribunal. It is publicly available, Senator. I am at a certain band in the secretary's level, but my remuneration is of that order.</p> | 41 22/05/17 | |
| 2 | 000170 | CORP | McCARTHY | NORTHERN AUSTRALIA ROADS PROGRAM – INDIGENOUS EMPLOYMENT | <p>Senator Nash: It is certainly there. If I can add: as you would well know, the Indigenous Procurement Policy is now at 708 businesses with \$407 million in government contracts. That is a significant increase. Back in 2012 it was about \$6.2 million, so that has been a significant achievement in terms of how much we have done.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Sure. Of the 708 businesses, how many of them are in the Northern Territory as part of these projects?</p> <p>Senator Nash: I do not have that information, but I can find that out for you.</p> | 78 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------|----------|-------------|---|---|--|
| 3 | 000171 | CORP | STERLE | LABOUR HIRE | <p>Senator STERLE: I will put it to you, Mr Mrdak, but also to the officers here: do you use labour hire? Do you employ labour hire firms anywhere throughout the department?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, we do.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Tremendous. What I would like to know, then, is would you like to give me a breakdown on each agency: how many are employed, what are the companies—I do not want to know the names of the people; that is not my business—and the number of those on a permanent basis or a part-time basis or whatever. What is the easy way, Mr Mrdak? Do want me to ask each agency and you?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No, I am happy, on behalf of all of the portfolio agencies, to take on notice to give you the firms of contractors we utilise and the numbers of contractors, perhaps over the last 12 months.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Yes, please, at least, and particularly where they are and what they are doing—that sort of stuff. We are here all day tomorrow. Can you have that available through your office?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Why don't we do that, Mr Mrdak? I raised the question about the use of labour hire through the department and all the agencies. How did you go with some info coming back to me on that?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am hopeful to get, by the close of the committee, the department's use of hire. We will have the agencies, but I probably will not have the agencies for you before the hearing concludes tonight. I will take that on notice.</p> | <p>95 22/05/17</p> <p>59 23/05/17</p> | |
| 4 | 000172 | CORP | MCCARTHY | PLUTUS | <p>Senator McCARTHY: No. I was just curious to see if you might have had anything extra on that. Mr Mrdak. I have a got a list here that I want to put to you. You may want to take this on notice or you may want to answer.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am happy to take it on notice. I will try and answer—we are trying to develop those lists that Senator Sterle asked for.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: I have just got a list as well. Do any of these labour hire companies use Plutus? I can read through them, if you would like.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Has the department undertaken its own investigation into the use of Plutus by labour hire companies? When did the department become aware that there was a problem with Plutus in connection with the department? When was the minister advised? What steps have been taken to avoid a repeat, and are there other payroll companies operating as agents of IT and other contractors? How much Commonwealth money is being directed through payroll companies?</p> | <p>125 23/05/17</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------|---------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Mr Mrdak: I will take those on notice. I think, like most people, we became aware of the issue with the media coverage of the Australian Federal Police actions last week. Since that time, we have not had a chance to review those companies that may be involved and the implications. But, in the light of your questions, I will undertake that and come back to you with answers.</p> | | |
| 5 | 000279 | CORP | FARRELL | EXPENDITURE ON MARKET RESEARCH | <p>For the 2016-17 financial year, what was the total amount spent by the Department on market research (either as a whole contract or as part of a contract)?</p> <p>For each contract for market research in 2016/2017, can you please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject of the market research; • The supplier; • Whether the supplier has been engaged previously and if so, for which contracts; • The total value of the contract; • The term of the contract (time); • The date that the decision was taken to seek market research on the topic; • The date the contract was opened to tender or selection process; • The date the supplier was engaged; • Whether the contract was subject to a tender process, including whether there was a full, partial or closed tender process; • Does the supplier exist on a pre-approved supplier list, if so, when were they added to that list; • Whether the Minister, or the Minister's Office, requested that the research be conducted; • Whether the Minister approved the decision to conduct market research; • Whether the Minister approved the contract with the supplier; • Whether the Minister or the Minister's office was consulted on questions asked; • Whether the Minister or the Minister's office received a copy of the market research; • If the decision to conduct research was initiated by the department or agency, was the Minister or their office consulted before the decision was taken to conduct research, if so – in what form did that consultation take (written, verbal other); • If the decision to conduct research was initiated by the department or | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>agency, did Minister or their office make any amendments or changes to the Department's proposal for market research to be conducted, if so, what changes and to what aspects were they made;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At any stage in the life of the proposal to conduct market research were other departments or agencies consulted? • At any stage in the life of the proposal to conduct market research were other Ministers, or the Prime Minister consulted? • At any stage in the life of the proposal to conduct market research did the expected cost change, if so how? • At any stage in the life of the proposal to conduct market research did the scope, questions or supplier of the research change? • Have any topics or questions of market research been conducted and subsequently conducted again by the same or different supplier? | | |
| Australian Rail Track Corporation (8) | | | | | | | |
| 166 | 000346 | ARTC | GALLACHER | AUSTRALIAN MADE STEEL AT ARRIUM | <p>Senator GALLACHER: Well, I can probably assure you there will be a unity ticket from South Australia between all members of parliament in respect of securing the 132,000 tons of Australian made steel at Arrium. I would be very pleased if on notice you could actually provide where they fit in the business in terms of the productivity of this job. Are the indirect job benefits quantified, managed and explained? Or is it just left to you, Mr Fullerton, to make a decision at the end of the day?</p> | 39 22/05/17 | |
| 6 | 000173 | ATRC | RICE | INLAND RAIL | <p>Senator RICE: Going back to the tricky bit of the project, from Toowoomba, and the tunnelling that is going to be required, do you have an estimate of what the cost per kilometre for the tunnelling will be?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: There were estimates in the business case. We are happy to provide that on notice.</p> | 46-47 22/05/17 | |
| 7 | 000174 | ATRC | GALLACHER | INLAND RAIL | <p>Senator GALLACHER: There are 600 kilometres that you have identified as greenfields. How many properties do you expect to have to interact with there?</p> <p>Mr Fullerton: I would have to take that on notice in terms of what the estimate would be. Virtually all of it is farming property or state-owned land in terms of forests.</p> | 51 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------|--------|-------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| 8 | 000175 | ARTC | KETTER | FEASABILITY STUDY | <p>Senator KETTER: I am referring to an announcement that was made on April 2017 by Senator Canavan and a local member of parliament. What is your department's connection with this announcement?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Wood: It is a study that has been put out to be undertaken currently by AECOM, a major global consultancy house. They are in the late stages of completing that work. We are expecting a draft in the near future.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Is it expected that the feasibility study report will be handed down in the middle of this year?</p> <p>Mr Wood: That is our expectation. Before the end of this financial year, it will come to the department as a draft, and we will obviously need to work through the draft with the consultants for it to be finalised and then provided to the minister.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: In the thinking behind the election commitment—you may not be in a position to answer this question—was there a business case put together to justify going ahead with the feasibility study?</p> <p>Mr Wood: The feasibility study is a very preliminary study so that would inform decisions about how to better take it forward. There has been no substantive work previously on an extension of Inland Rail to Gladstone. This would be the first step in considering that.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Can you tell me what is the expected final cost of the feasibility study?</p> <p>Mr Wood: I would have to take on notice the cost of the consultancy but it is within the election commitment of \$250,000.</p> | 52-53 22/05/17 | |
| 9 | 000176 | ATRC | RICE | INLAND RAIL | <p>Senator RICE: Do you expect that once the \$100 million has been spent we will have passenger trains that will be able to travel at 160 kilometres an hour on the Victorian part of the network?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I cannot give you an indication of what the performance requirements will be until such time as I have had the discussions with Victoria and the ARTC.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Will the development of that performance criteria be a public process that the public can have input into?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to take that on notice. I do not think we are enough advanced to give you any assurances, in relation to that.</p> | 57 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|------|----------|---|--|----------------|--|
| 10 | 000177 | ATRC | RICE | VICTORIA – NORTHEAST LINE EXPENDITURE | <p>Senator RICE: Mr Fullerton, I have some questions that you might need to take on notice about the amount of expenditure on the northeast line over the last 12 months. How much has been spent by the ARTC on the northeast line over the last year?</p> <p>Mr Fullerton: I could provide that on notice, if you like, because it is a combination of recurrent expenditure and capital works.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you could take that on notice and itemise it according to maintenance, repairs and capital works, and whether that is in line with what you budgeted over that 12-month period or what the difference is. Finally, there have been 20 cancellations on the northeast line reported in the last month, so could you provide advice as to the causes of all of those cancellations?</p> <p>Mr Fullerton: I can do that. The bulk of those cancellations were operator cancellations.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Please itemise why those 20 cancellations have occurred.</p> <p>Mr Fullerton: I will seek to get that information from V/Line.</p> | 58 22/05/17 | |
| 11 | 000178 | ARTC | XENOPHON | CPRS | <p>Senator XENOPHON: Just very quickly—I do not need long—in general terms, the new Commonwealth Procurement Rules go to issues of Australian standards, employment, environmental issues, occupational health and safety laws and the potential economic effects of a procurement decision, which are all new provisions that were not there previously. Has there been a shift in the way that the department undertakes Commonwealth procurement projects as a result of these new rules?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: It is my understanding—I do not know if this will assist your officers—that a government business enterprise, as I think the ARTC is, is subject to the CPRs, the Commonwealth Procurement Rules.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will confirm that.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Is that a shake of the head or a nod?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will confirm that on notice, but I think Mr Fullerton's evidence to this committee at the last two hearings is a very strong support for Australian suppliers.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: When the Commonwealth provides funding to the states for an infrastructure program, there is no requirement on the states to comply with the Commonwealth rules or can you make that a condition of that funding?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice. Most states also have their own procurement requirements.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: The New South Wales government, I think, a year or so ago</p> | 96 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|------|--------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | famously used 100 kilometres of Spanish rail lines for a project. Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice and check that. | | |
| 12 | 000297 | ARTC | STERLE | ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVALS FOR INLAND RAIL | Isn't it true that the ARTC haven't even identified a preferred alignment between the NSW border and Toowoomba, let alone gained the environmental approvals for the hundreds of kilometres of the project proposed for Queensland? ○ How long do you think it will take to obtain those approvals? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 13 | 000298 | ARTC | STERLE | INLAND RAIL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it true that you have recently changed the project to include a section between Kagaru and Bromelton? Apart from just adding it to your webpage, can you detail the public consultation you've undertaken recently on this change? When was this decision made and who made it? How was that decision made? Was the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads informed of your decision at the time it was made? Is it true that it was on Friday, 19 May that the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads first learnt that you had decided to change the project in this way? Is it true that senior officials from the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads were frustrated and disappointed at the shambolic situation whereby the first time they see such an important development is via your website? Can you see how the Queensland Government might be very concerned about your ability to consult and engage their communities on this project when you can't even ensure that proposed project changes are communicated to them in a respectful, timely manner? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| Infrastructure Australia (10) | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|--------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| 14 | 000180 | IA | STERLE | EAST WEST LINK AND WESTCONNEX | <p>Senator STERLE: Okay, so what came first, East West Link or WestConnex?</p> <p>Mr Davies: East West Link, I believe, Senator.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Sure.</p> <p>Mr Davies: Might have to take that on notice until later on.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Yes, I think I know the answer to that. That is fine.</p> | 6 22/05/2017 | |
| 15 | 000181 | IA | STERLE | VALUE CAPTURE | <p>Senator STERLE: Okay. Has Infrastructure Australia asked a state to rework a business case for a road to incorporate value capture? Have you ever done that?</p> <p>Mr Davies: I am not aware of an example off the top of my head. I would have to check that.</p> | 6 22/05/2017 | |
| 16 | 000182 | IA | STERLE | VALUE CAPTURE | <p>Senator STERLE: Okay. So you can tell me if you have assessed it on these certain road projects.</p> <p>Mr Dwyer: We would be able to tell you that certain business cases have business capture as a component of the business case, but we would have taken it on notice, as we do not have that information to hand.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: In that case, in WestConnex there was no value capture as part of your assessment?</p> <p>Mr Dwyer: We would have taken that on notice, and have a look at the business case on the day.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: All right, take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Dwyer: It was not part of our assessment, but whether or not there was value capture included in the business case we could take on notice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: So you could not tell me how it was evaluated at all? You just do not evaluate it?</p> <p>Mr Dwyer: We look at it. It does not form part of the economic or strategic case.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: I get that. So what about the M80 upgrade in Melbourne? Did you get it there? Did you have the value capture evaluated?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: I think the answer for the M80 is the same as for WestConnex. It may be that value capture was included as a potential source of funding. We would have to check and take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Okay. So while you are taking that on notice, can you tell me about NorthConnex now you are here?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: Yes. I am not aware that value capture was considered for that. That one is some years old. However, we could check and take that on notice as well.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: And the Brisbane Gateway?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: The same.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Okay, and the Perth Freight Link?</p> | 7-8 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|--|--|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Mr Parkinson: Again, we would have to check and take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator STERLE: You have made that very clear. What about the Western Sydney Airport? Have you done any value capture or assessed any value capture, or evaluated any?</p> <p>Mr Davies: For Western Sydney Airport, our role was to assess the economic business case, which we did. That was something we did in November last year.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Was there value capture included in your assessment for that?</p> <p>Mr Davies: I am not aware that value capture was included, but we would have to double check that. It did not form part of the assessment.</p> | | |
| 17 | 000183 | IA | STERLE | VALUE CAPTURE | <p>Senator STERLE: From all the projects that have received federal funding since 2013, including in this year's budget, fully accounted, could you tell us if there are any that have been fully accounted for value capture opportunities in their business cases?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: Some of the business cases that we have evaluated have included value capture as a source of funding. It is not included in the economic analysis, for the reasons that Mr Davies has explained.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Yes, I have that very clearly. Could you give me a list of those cases that have had value capture included?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: One that is on the top of my head is Melbourne Metro. We could certainly check whether there are others.</p> | 8 22/05/17 | |
| 18 | 000184 | IA | STERLE | VALUE CAPTURE | <p>Senator STERLE: How is value captured by the ARTC in the Inland Rail business case, which was subsequently assessed by Infrastructure Australia?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: As with the other evaluations, value capture can be included in a business case as a potential source of funding. I am not aware right now whether there is any value capture included as a source of funding in that particular business case. We could certainly check that and take it on notice.</p> | 8-9 22/05/2017 | |
| 19 | 000185 | IA | McCARTHY | TANAMI ROAD – MAY 2017 MEETING ATTENDANCE | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Mr Parkinson, what is the latest with the Tanami Road?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: I was pleased to be able to meet with the Northern Territory government and the Shire of Halls Creek in Darwin earlier this month to talk about the progress on the business case for the Tanami Road. That was a very productive meeting. I am pleased to say that the proponents are very keen to address some of the issues with that business case, to pull together a revised economic analysis, which they are working on at the moment, and to make a submission back to us later in the year.</p> | 13 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|-----------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Are you able to identify who actually was in that meeting?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: I could give you details, but probably not here and now.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Could you take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: We can certainly take that on notice. It was with the relevant departments of the Northern Territory government and also the Shire of Halls Creek.</p> | | |
| 20 | 000186 | IA | McCARTHY | TANAMI ROAD – INDIGENOUS EMPLOYMENT | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Are there Indigenous employees currently involved with this discussion?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: The proponents are at the early stage of the economic evaluation of the business case. I do not have visibility over who is working with the proponents on that.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Can you find out?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: I could certainly ask the question.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: When we talk about Indigenous employment, it is not just about being out on the roads; it is actually about understanding processes like this one that you come back to the Senate estimates and explain. Who are the Indigenous people that are employed in understanding how this all works and who are part of the process from the beginning? It would be really good to know if there are Indigenous employers involved even at this point.</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: Yes. I can assure you that the Shire of Halls Creek indicated to me that most of their workforce is Indigenous and they are certainly looking to map out a future work plan to keep that workforce on.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: So you can easily get those numbers then?</p> <p>Mr Parkinson: I can certainly ask.</p> | 14 22/05/17 | |
| 21 | 000187 | IA | GALLACHER | OAKLANDS CROSSING – SOUTH AUSTRALIA | <p>Senator GALLACHER: What I wanted you to take on notice is: has the analysis conducted by your department and IA concluded that this project will have a positive cost-benefit? I am happy for you to take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Mirdak: I will take that on notice.</p> | 17 22/05/17 | |
| 22 | 000301 | IA | STERLE | “OLD NOWRA” BRIDGE | <p>Has Infrastructure Australia been asked to assess any proposal to build a third crossing of the Shoalhaven River at Nowra?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If yes, who submitted the proposal and how long will it take you to conclude your assessment of it? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|----|--------|--|--|--------------------|--|
| 23 | 000302 | IA | STERLE | NORTHERN AUSTRALIA INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITY | <p>I refer to the Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility Mandate Decision 2016 in which it states that “Where an Investment Decision is greater than \$100 million, the Facility must consult Infrastructure Australia.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To date, has the NAIF Board sought the views of Infrastructure Australia on the merits of any investment proposal currently before them? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, can you list the projects, or least indicate how many? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| Infrastructure Investment (59) | | | | | | | |
| 167 | 000345 | II | LUDLAM | MURDOCH DRIVE EXTENSION | <p>Senator LUDLAM: Could you describe for us whether or not that Murdoch Drive extension would hit that \$100 million threshold?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will ask Ms Garbin to give you information, in relation to that project.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Much appreciated.</p> <p>Ms Garbin: Yes, the Murdoch Activity Centre access roads will reach the threshold of \$100 million Australian government contribution.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: If you have a document there, and maybe just to save the committee time because we are about to break, are you able to table either the document you are reading from or something that is appropriate for the committee to see of each of the components of that omnibus funding request that would hit that \$100 million threshold? I guess that tells us a bit about how much back-end work your team will need to do.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice, if you do not mind—</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: Yes, if you can.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: but I will see what we can provide through the course of the morning.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM: I would be interested to know which are above and which are below that threshold.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly. The WA government has provided indicative estimates around each of those projects but with work yet to happen on a large number of them. I will take it on notice and come back to you as quickly as I can.</p> | 23-24 22/05/17 | |
| 24 | 000190 | II | BACK | MELBOURNE CITY LINK – CONCESSION DEED | <p>ACTING CHAIR: Mr Thomann, my questions are somewhat general, but they go to the issues associated with Transurban and the concession deed. Am I right to get underway in this situation, Secretary?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes.</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: Good. As I understand it, the concession deed provides that the state may terminate the deed on prescribed dates prior to the 34½-year</p> | 58-59 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>anniversary from completion in 2000 if Transurban has achieved a 17½ per cent real after-tax equity return at different anniversaries. Are we with each other at the moment?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We are not a party to the deed, so I can only give you general advice. Is this in relation to Melbourne CityLink?</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: It is, but I understand it could also extend beyond CityLink. The questions that I want to ask relate to what base was used to calculate a return and, obviously, what would be the decision-making. If these are questions that you believe are more general in nature, it might be better for me to give them to you on notice, perhaps, for example.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: If you would not mind, Senator. Then I can seek advice from the Victorian government. The Commonwealth is not a party to that deed.</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: It is not?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No, it is not.</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: In that case, I will cease these questions and put them on notice. You might be able to assist us where you can.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly. I will seek advice from the Victorian government.</p> | | |
| 25 | 000191 | II | ROBERTS | RAIL – MOUNT ISA TO TENNANT CREEK | <p>Senator ROBERTS: What would be the cost? It would be roughly comparable with the Gold Coast tram and the Canberra tram, wouldn't it? But we would get a much longer railway line.</p> <p>Mr Collett: I would have to take that on notice. I do not have a figure for the costs at the moment.</p> | 60 22/05/17 | |
| 26 | 000192 | II | GALLACHER | NATIONAL RAIL PROGRAM | <p>Senator GALLACHER: Can I put this question to you on notice: can you tell me the detail of the complete spend in the fiscal years from the start of this proposal to 2026? I would like the information you have on commitments and spending, on notice. You have given us some global figures.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Then I would like to understand the rationale of how you get a piece of that action. If there are X number of dollars allocated in the forward planning for infrastructure for rail or whatever, how does a state or territory actually get in and get a proposal up?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will give you a breakdown on notice of the profile as per category out to 2026-27, and also the categories of expenditure against those.</p> | 65 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|-----------|--|--|-------------------|--|
| 168 | 000347 | II | GALLACHER | \$1.6 BILLION UNDERSPEND | <p>Senator GALLACHER: How much of the \$1.6 billion would be attributable to New South Wales and Perth?</p> <p>Mr Thomann: The amount that was moved out of 2016-17 for The Northern Road, as part of the Western Sydney Infrastructure Plan, was \$214 million. For the Perth Freight Link it was \$217 million, which had been estimated for 2016-17. It has to be moved to later years, because that is when the estimated expenditure will now occur in relation to the reallocated projects.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: That leaves quite a substantial—</p> <p>Mr Thomann: There are a number of other projects, some bigger than others—for instance, with the Tullamarine Freeway widening there was a movement of \$31.7 million. We can take it on notice and go through a list.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: We would like to know what the \$1.6 billion of underspend is attributable to.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Yes.</p> | 66 22/05/17 | |
| 27 | 000193 | II | RHIANNON | ALLENS- LINKLATERS ADVICE ON WESTCONNEX CONCESSIONAL LOAN | <p>Senator RHIANNON: You have a lot of experience in doing that, and that is why I was wondering that, considering Allens-Linklaters, the company selected to provide advice on the terms of the \$2 billion loan, promoted the deal as 'a new model for public-private partnerships in Australia' and as one that would 'support private sector debt co-funding and provide a platform for future private sector equity investment'. It sounds like the \$2 billion of public funds were being used to entice private lenders into funding the construction of a WestConnex, as it had been difficult for the government to raise finance the project. To start, do we all agree that the government knew they were going to have trouble raising finance for the project? Then we can go back to why Allens-Linklaters, considering they were so involved with this project and then you get them in to apparently give independent advice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: I am particularly keen to understand why that company was chosen, considering it was just so involved with the project. That is what has always seemed extraordinary about this.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: I might defer to Mr Pittar to go through the details, if we have them with us. Otherwise we will need to take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Pittar: Thank you, Mr Thomann. As I think Mr Thomann said earlier, we have a panel of providers, and we draw on the panel of providers depending on the expertise that we need from the private sector. That can go to issues around financing, issues around legal aspects and issues around engineering and technical aspects. I do not have the details as to specifically why that firm was chosen</p> | 67-68 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|--|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | | compared to other panel providers that we may have had on our panel of providers at the time, so we may need to take that on notice. | | |
| 28 | 000194 | II | RHIANNON | ADVICE ON WESTCONNEX CONCESSIONAL LOAN | <p>Senator RHIANNON: Let us move on to AECOM. They were brought in to assess the financial risk for the proposed loan, I understand. That is correct?</p> <p>Mr Pittar: I would need to check. I would have thought AECOM—</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: I thought they were your choice. I thought you were the ones who chose AECOM.</p> <p>Mr Pittar: Again, it is a couple of years ago now. I would need to check on those details. But there is absolutely nothing unusual with us selecting providers based on their technical expertise. Companies are also able to structure arrangements around any potential conflicts of interest that they may be perceived to have, if they are advising on other parts of the equation. But that would certainly be something that we would be very keen to avoid in engaging a company where there may be perceived conflicts of interest.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Thomann: We could come back, on notice, on the exact nature of the advice that we sought from each firm and the process we went through to engage each firm.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: I would appreciate if you could take it on notice.</p> | 68 22/05/17 | |
| 29 | 000195 | II | RHIANNON | ALLEGATIONS ABOUT LEIGHTON – WESTCONNEX CONTRACTOR | <p>Senator RHIANNON: Mr Mrdak, I have only got a couple of minutes. Coming back to some of the issues about the companies that are involved, are you aware that Leighton, a major contractor with WestConnex, is still under investigation at a domestic and international level for bribery, and that these investigations have been ongoing for four years since 2013?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am aware of the allegations—yes.</p> <p>Senator RHIANNON: How do you handle that when you have a major project? You are making a decision to take on a company to basically run and deliver that project, and there is this major investigation that could prove very serious. How do you balance that out? How do you work out your decision making?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: When we engage consultants, we do look at—Leighton is obviously a multinational Australian company—the probity issues involved. As you say, they are allegations. We are aware of them. The company makes us aware of those issues. At the end of the day, when we select contractors, we select on a whole range of criteria. If they are allegations, we treat the process as ongoing.</p> | 69 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|---------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Senator RHIANNON: When you say that Leighton made you aware of it, do they just say, 'We're being investigated,' or do they actually tell you the details of what it is and put their case, and you make a judgement on that?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to seek some advice on what occurred in this particular circumstance, as to what was made available to us or what was made known to us by other parties. I will take on notice the extent of the knowledge at the time we appointed them.</p> | | |
| 30 | 000199 | II | URQHART | CRADLE MOUNTAIN MASTER PLAN | <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay. I go to Cradle Mountain Master Plan funding. I noted that the Turnbull government committed \$1 million for a feasibility study of the Cradle Mountain Master Plan in the 2016 federal election campaign. Has that feasibility study been completed by the government?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will ask Ms Wall, who heads up our regional programs area, to see if she can assist.</p> <p>Ms Wall: To my understanding, I am not aware that it has been completed yet.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So it has not started the feasibility study. Okay. Can you detail why the feasibility study was required when Deloitte Access Economics had already conducted that analysis?</p> <p>Ms Wall: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Has the Tasmanian government made any representations to the Commonwealth about contributing to the costs of this project?</p> <p>Ms Wall: Not to my knowledge.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: So you are not aware of anything?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No. I could take it on notice for you if you like.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay. Has any other authority or organisation made any kind of representation to the Commonwealth for funding of this project?</p> <p>Ms Wall: Not to my knowledge, but I will take it on notice for you.</p> | 71-72 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|---------|---|--|-------------------|--|
| 31 | 000200 | II | URQHART | MURCHISON HIGHWAY - TASMANIA | <p>Senator URQUHART: This is about infrastructure in general and particularly about roads and other areas. Can you confirm if the Liberal election commitment for \$3.5 million to widen and install truck pullover bays on the Murchison Highway in Tasmania is funded in the 2016-17 and/or 2017-18 budgets?</p> <p>Ms Leeming: Do you happen to know what program that sits under?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: No, I do not.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: If they are election commitments, they will be funded. I will get the details of which financial year has the funding provided and come back to you.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: The other things I wanted to know are the exact Commonwealth contribution and the exact Tasmanian government contribution for that. I understand that it was to be completed by May 2018 as stated in the minister's November 2016 media release, so do you expect it still to be completed by May 2018?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will get that detail for you.</p> | 72 22/05/17 | |
| 32 | 000202 | II | URQHART | BASS HIGHWAY - TASMANIA | <p>Senator URQUHART: Has the Tasmanian government made any representations to the Commonwealth about contributing to the costs of the upgrade of the Bass Highway between Marrawah and Wynyard, excluding the existing contributions for the Wynyard intersections? They were announced during the election campaign and funded in this year's budget, but this is separate from that.</p> <p>Ms Leeming: They may have at a line area level, but I am not aware of any formal approach.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Can you take that on notice?</p> <p>Ms Leeming: Sure.</p> | 72 22/05/17 | |
| 33 | 000203 | II | URQHART | SHARED PATHWAY - WYNYARD TO LATROBE - TASMANIA | <p>Senator URQUHART: Has the Tasmanian government made any representations to the Commonwealth about contributing to the costs of the development of shared pathways between Wynyard and Latrobe?</p> <p>Ms Leeming: I think it is probably safer to take that one on notice too.</p> | 72 22/05/17 | |
| 34 | 000204 | II | URQHART | BASS HIGHWAY - TASMANIA | <p>Senator URQUHART: Has the Tasmanian government made any representations to the Commonwealth about reallocating surplus funds from a roads project at Westbury to a roads upgrade project for the Bass Highway east of Latrobe?</p> <p>Ms Leeming: Not that I am aware, but let's take that one on notice.</p> | 72 22/05/17 | |
| 35 | 000205 | II | URQHART | DEVONPORT ROADS | <p>Senator URQUHART: On 6 June 2016 the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Mr Chester, was joined by the then members for Braddon and Lyons, Mr Whiteley</p> | 72-73 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>and Mr Hutchinson, for a road funding announcement regarding Braddon and Lyons roads. Can you confirm whether those election commitment amounts were for \$195,000 for a roundabout at the intersection of Ronald and Madden streets in Devonport and \$70,000 for the intersection of Formby Road and Best Street in Devonport in the 2017-18 budget?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think we have got details on those projects with us. I think it is probably best if I can take those on notice and come back to you quickly.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Okay. If you could come back quickly, that would be appreciated. I have got a number of others. I will run through them but do not know whether you will have them there. There were election commitments for \$95,000 for the intersection of Tarleton Street and Thomas Street in East Devonport and \$95,000 for the intersection of Tarleton Street and Wright Street in East Devonport.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Again, I do not have them on my list of projects with us.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Does the fact that you do not have them on your list mean that they were not funded in the budget or just that you do not have them?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I may just not have the details with officers today. I will take those on notice.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Again, I do not have them on my list of projects with us.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Does the fact that you do not have them on your list mean that they were not funded in the budget or just that you do not have them?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I may just not have the details with officers today. I will take those on notice.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: All right. The next one is \$49,250 to remodel the junction of Mengha Road and Spion Kop Road in south Forest and \$32,500 to improve the intersection of Preolenna Road, Pages Road and Lapoinya Road near Moorleah.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Are these Tasmanian government commitments that were jointly announced?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: No.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: These are 2016 Commonwealth election commitments?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Mr Chester, Mr Whiteley and Mr Hutchinson I am sure would not be standing out there for state government announcements.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Given the amounts of money you were just talking about, these could be parts of election commitments that were made, so I think we are going to have to go away and seek advice, because we are not recognising the specifics of the \$100,000 here and the \$50,000 there within the commitments made in the election that are sort of in the millions—small millions but in the millions—in the</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|---------|---|--|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>numbers we have got here. We might need to come back and work out where they fit.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: That is fine. I will just go through them. But they were election commitments, and I am asking if they are funded in the 2017-18 budget.</p> <p>Ms Leeming: My advice thanks to a text message is that these are blackspot projects. That is why we were struggling a little bit. We do not usually have that granularity of detail about individual blackspot projects, because there are so many of them. And they are not actual election commitments, but they were announced during that period and have been funded.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: They have been funded. Okay.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: They have been funded and they are in the forward estimates.</p> <p>Ms Leeming: It might be good if we could just take them all as one question on notice and give you the list of all the blackspot projects that have been funded.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Do you want me to go through the others? I have three more.</p> <p>Ms Leeming: Sure.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: There was \$155,000 for curve improvements at the intersection of Railton Road and Dunorlan Road at Moltema, \$45,000 to improve a section of West Kentish Road and \$25,000 for Nowhere Else Road. I am not aware that these are blackspots, so, if they are—</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: What was it called—Nowhere Else Road?</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes. It is on the way to Paradise and a couple of other places in Tassie. We have some wonderful place names.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Now that we have ascertained they are part of the blackspots program, we can confirm they are funded and we will get you the detail of where they are at.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I would be really surprised if a road in Nowhere Else was a black spot, but I am happy to be corrected. The other one was \$50,000 to the improve Parkers Ford Road between Panatana Rivulet and St Louis Drive at Port Sorell, and \$10,000 to improve the intersection of Charles Street and Milldam Road at Squeaking Point.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: We will take those on notice and we will come back to you with that list and a status update on where each of those commitments is up to.</p> | | |
| 36 | 000206 | II | URQHART | ROAD FUNDING ANNOUNCEMENTS BY BRETT WHITELEY | <p>Senator URQUHART: Is the department aware of the address of the former member for Braddon, Mr Brett Whiteley?</p> <p>Mr Thomann: No, Senator, I am not aware of his address.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I understand that Mr Whiteley lives on Charles Street, Squeaking Point. Can you outline whether there are any probity issues with Mr Whiteley participating in the joint announcement with the minister and be then</p> | 73-74 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|--|--|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>member for Lyons?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Leeming: I think it is important to note that, if it is a black spot project, they are chosen by panels. Mr Whiteley would probably not have been part of that decision-making process.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: I would be interested in further advice in relation to whether or not that is a black spot and who was on the panel.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly.</p> | | |
| 37 | 000207 | II | McCARTHY | NORTHERN AUSTRALIA ROADS PROGRAM – NORTHERN TERRITORY | <p>Senator McCARTHY: With the Northern Territory roads, are those upgrades to just lift some of the causeways or are they the ceiling of the roads? What kind of upgrades?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: The majority of those projects are ceiling except for the Adelaide River floodplain project, which is to provide all weather access or improve access.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Can you tell me the total seal in kilometres?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: I would like the total in kilometres of these roads—how much is being sealed and the cost. Is that the same with the beef roads? Again, are they just improving causeways or actual ceiling?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: The majority will be ceiling projects.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: If you could provide the same detail as well in terms of just how many kilometres in ceiling and the cost.</p> <p>Ms Garbin: Yes, we can do that.</p> | 76 22/05/17 | |
| 38 | 000208 | II | McCARTHY | NORTHERN AUSTRALIA ROADS PROGRAM – INDIGENOUS EMPLOYMENT | <p>Senator McCARTHY: How much are you aware of local employment within your roads programs?</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Local employment, especially Indigenous employment and supply use, is very much uppermost in our minds. We have been discussing with our state colleagues. Certainly, for the Northern Australia Roads and Beef Roads programs, we are finalising the framework to ensure local employment is part of the structure of contracting.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Are you able to give me statistics on the Indigenous employees you have had on all these projects?</p> <p>Mr Thomann: We would be relying on the Northern Territory government—but we could certainly ask them—for those statistics.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: That would be great, if you could.</p> | 77 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|---|--|-------------------|--|
| 39 | 000209 | II | BACK | DIAMOND INTERCHANGE - QUEENSLAND | <p>ACTING CHAIR: I will not require you to give me all those. The Caloundra to Sunshine Motorway is Australia's first diamond interchange. What is a diamond interchange?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: I am not quite sure if I can explain this properly, but it is the first in Australia. It takes up less footprint, in terms of the interchange. That is being done at the Caloundra interchange as part of the Caloundra to Sunshine Motorway project. It is where traffic weaves through, the two lanes of traffic weave through, but you are not interacting as much. It is meant to be a lot safer and a free-flowing interchange over the Bruce Highway.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: It is not a criminal offence if you really cannot tell us, because we have no idea.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We can put on notice, table for you, a diagram—</p> <p>Ms Garbin: There is a link. We can—</p> <p>ACTING CHAIR: Queenslanders are not trying to repeat that Woolloongabba Fiveways of the sixties, which had five roads, three tramlines and a train going through the middle of it, are they?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: No.</p> | 83 22/05/17 | |
| 40 | 000210 | II | McCARTHY | NORTHERN AUSTRALIA CONCESSIONAL LOAN | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Can I just take you to the \$5 billion concessional loan facility for north Australia. What NT projects are earmarked under that?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am sorry. I do not think we have any details of that. We do not administer that program. It is with the northern Australia portfolio in the industry portfolio, so I cannot give you any details on which projects are being considered in that.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Minister, do you want to elaborate on that?</p> <p>Senator Nash: Certainly. I was just going to ask if you would like us to take that on notice for you?</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: That would be great.</p> <p>Senator Nash: I ask that because that is not the information that fits within this department. But I was actually going to raise that before as one of the other things we are doing for the north through the NAIF. I am very happy to do that for you, and I am trying to get that other information for you before the end of the day too.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: I am interested to know just how much of that will be earmarked for Northern Territory projects. What will those Northern Territory projects be or what are they?</p> <p>Senator Nash: All right.</p> | 84-85 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|--------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| 41 | 000211 | II | BUSHBY | MIDLANDS HIGHWAY - TASMANIA | <p>Senator BUSHBY: How many kilometres will be rebuilt as part of the entire project? Do you have those figures?</p> <p>Mr Collett: Across the entire Midlands?</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY: Yes. How much of this particular \$400 million program? Obviously, there is about 200 kilometres from Launceston to Hobart, but there are towns you are not doing, there are other bits you are not doing. I am just wondering how much of that 200 kilometres will actually be rebuilt as part of this, and then how much we have done so far? You can take that on notice.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: We will have to take that on notice. My map shows a line all the way up the Midland Highway.</p> | 86 22/05/17 | |
| 169 | 000348 | II | BROWN | MIDLAND HIGHWAY | <p>Senator CAROL BROWN: It is my understanding that a part of the Midland Highway had to be redone. The section north of Spring Hill in 2015 had to be redone. It was completed, and then they had to go back and do it again.</p> <p>Ms Leeming: I am not aware of that. I have a start date of 8 December 2014, and a finish date of 20 May 2015, but—</p> <p>Senator CAROL BROWN: There has certainly been more work. In fact, it looked like it was starting all over again. Can you just check that for me, please, and just come back on notice? That would be fine.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY: If it has been, whether you had to put any money in or not.</p> <p>Ms Leeming: Our funding commitment to the Midland Highway is stable.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY: Whatever has happened, I do not think it has cost the federal taxpayers any extra money.</p> <p>Senator CAROL BROWN: That is great. But if it had to be redone, why?</p> | 87 22/05/17 | |
| 42 | 000212 | II | STERLE | CONTINGENCY/ UNALLOCATED FUNDS | <p>Mr Mrdak: There is no remaining unallocated funding on the Bruce Highway.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What about Queensland overall? Is there anything there?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will check. I do not know if I have the details state by state, but I can get that for you.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: We will have to take that on notice because with the Bruce Highway a number of projects have come in under budget and as they come in under budget then we do have an unallocated pool for reallocation to even more projects on the Bruce Highway. It is a sort of rolling situation, so it is a point-in-time kind of answer.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: All right. We will see how we go. If you cannot, you can take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: I think we would have to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: So we are looking for Queensland overall?</p> | 87-88 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|----------|---|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Mr Mrdak: We will check, but I do not think there are any unallocated amounts at this stage.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Certainly the recent commitment in the budget allocated substantial funds to those additional projects that have just been announced.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What about the Midland Highway?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: There are no unallocated moneys.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: I think it is fully allocated.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: All right. See what you can find out for us.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: We can take it on notice and come back to you with a state-by-state breakdown, if you like, of any unallocated funds in the program of works.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Great. That would be tremendous.</p> | | |
| 170 | 000349 | II | STERLE | PAYMENT AHEAD OF ESTABLISHED MILESTONES 2016-17 | <p>Senator McCARTHY: So at this stage we take it that you are looking at grant funding?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Without seeing the projects, that is the intention, but it will depend on the projects coming forward.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Certainly that \$600 million you can see in the forward estimates is grant funding. That is how it is accounted for.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Have any payments been made to states ahead of established project milestones in 2016-17?</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Not that I am aware, but I could take on notice to check. We have a lot of milestones, so I would want to check against all the milestones to make sure.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: If you do not have that and no-one else at the table has got that info—</p> <p>Mr Thomann: No.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: that is okay.</p> | 88 22/05/17 | |
| 43 | 000213 | II | McCARTHY | OAKLANDS RAIL CROSSING – SOUTH AUSTRALIA | <p>Senator McCARTHY: In relation to the Oaklands rail crossing upgrade in South Australia, was any analysis conducted by the department, Mr Mrdak, before the current government committed \$40 million to upgrade Oaklands crossing on 27 June 2016?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I think we had considered previous proposals from South Australia. I will check with my officers as to what degree of information we had. I do not think officers here have the information—can I take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: If you could, please. Do you need me to repeat that?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No—I think it was: what analysis was undertaken before the election commitment last year of the \$40 million.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: If there was analysis, did the analysis conclude that this</p> | 89 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|--|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>project will have a positive cost-benefit? Will it reduce congestion? Will it improve travel times for motorists?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will check the analysis. As I said, I will check the details of what was provided pre the commitment, but my recollection is that there was certainly advice provided to the government in the lead-up to last year's commitment in relation to what we knew from South Australia at that point about the project.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: We are really in the planning phase, and one of the outcomes of the planning phase will be a business case, which will answer those questions. If the investment asked of the Australian government is \$100 million or more, that will need to be assessed by Infrastructure Australia as well. So we are really at the beginning of the process of analysing all those questions you have just raised.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Okay. Can I just add this, then—because obviously you are leaning towards the 'yes'. Was this analysis conducted before the state government announced a funding solution on 28 July 2016?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: There was certainly advice provided to the government. I will check how detailed that advice was.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Did the analysis conclude that this project will have a positive cost-benefit? Will it reduce congestion? Will it improve travel times for motorists?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Again, I will take on notice the extent of the analysis that has been able to be undertaken so far.</p> | | |
| 44 | 000214 | II | McCARTHY | OAKLANDS RAIL CROSSING – SOUTH AUSTRALIA | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Is it not the case, though, that the South Australian government has gone through the same approval processes for Oaklands crossing as it went through for the Flinders Link project, which was approved by the government and announced by the Prime Minister during the federal election campaign?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think we have the same level of information—I will check—in relation to Oaklands at this stage.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: So you will take that on notice?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice.</p> | 90 22/05/17 | |
| 45 | 000215 | II | MCCARTHY | NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Can I take you to the North-South Corridor in Adelaide. Is the Commonwealth still committed to former Prime Minister Tony Abbott's promise to turn Adelaide's South Road into a nonstop North-South Corridor by 2023?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: As I outlined to Senator Sterle this morning, that, in my understanding, remains the government's commitment.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: How does the Commonwealth expect to deliver on this</p> | 91 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|---------------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>commitment when no new funding for projects along the corridor is in the recent federal budget?</p> <p>Mr Thomann: The Australian government has committed more than \$1.6 billion to projects that are underway in the north-south road corridor.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: As Mr Thomann indicated, there is a significant amount of work underway on the North-South Corridor now. Future projects will be the subject of further work. We have not received any project proposals or business cases from South Australia for further work on the North-South Corridor beyond those commitments that are already there.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Is this commitment deliverable without an immediate funding commitment from the Commonwealth?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Again, in the absence of project proposals from South Australia, I cannot give you an answer to that question. I would need to know from them what they believe is the timetable that would be required to complete the corridor.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Will you take that question on notice?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly.</p> | | |
| 46 | 000216 | II | MCCARTHY | MALDON- DOMBARTON LINE | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Okay. Can I take you to the Illawarra, to the Maldon-Dombarton line. Has the minister or the department had any contact with the New South Wales government to progress this rail link?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will ask Mr Collett to answer that.</p> <p>Mr Collett: With Maldon-Dombarton, Infrastructure Australia, just before the last estimates hearing, considered the business case provided to them by the New South Wales government and recommended against Australian government investment in that project.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: At all. Can the department provide details of any meetings or provide copies of any correspondence around that?</p> <p>Mr Collett: Certainly. As I said, I am not aware of any since that Infrastructure Australia decision, but I will take that on notice and come back to you in terms of other areas of the department that may have had conversations.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Thank you. Is the department aware of any negotiations between the New South Wales government and interested entities to progress the construction of this rail link?</p> <p>Mr Collett: We would need to check that with the New South Wales government. I am not personally aware of any further considerations, but it is an area that I would not necessarily be, either. The New South Wales government would not necessarily flag for us that they were having those conversations, but I am happy to</p> | 91-92 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|-----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | take that on notice and come back to you with some advice. | | |
| 47 | 000217 | II | MCCARTHY | FUNDING | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Great; thank you. Is the department able to advise whether the rail link is going to be funded through the Infrastructure Investment Program or any other program?</p> <p>Mr Collett: That would be a decision for government, in terms of whether they wish to fund the project. As I say, at the moment Infrastructure Australia have advised against doing that, and the government has no commitment to the project at the moment.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: I realise you said that in the initial statement; but, we have just had the recent federal budget announcement of a major infrastructure spend, and there are still gaps in how that spending is going to take place. Has the department been in contact with the New South Wales minister's office regarding this rail link?</p> <p>Mr Collett: Not my area, but I will take it on notice to just check whether other parts of the department may have been.</p> | 92 22/05/17 | |
| 48 | 000218 | II | MCCARTHY | ASSESSMENTS | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Has the department or Infrastructure Australia been involved in assessing or evaluating any proposals that were put forward as part of the New South Wales government's register of interests processed during 2015?</p> <p>Mr Collett: I am fairly certain that the department and Infrastructure Australia were not involved. But that was an assessment by New South Wales officials, who then provided advice to their government. But I will check that on notice and come back to you.</p> | 92 22/05/17 | |
| 49 | 000219 | II | GALLACHER | ROAD SAFETY STATISTICS | <p>Senator GALLACHER: In relation to that much-needed expenditure, what will that \$552 million be spent on precisely? You have a very successful road separation program that has saved lives and prevented injuries and accidents. Tell us what the \$552 million will do?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So quite apart from the productivity improvements, do you have any statistics on the deaths and injuries on this highway? Do you keep stats on that? You mentioned black spots, pavement widening and all the rest of it. This is arguably one of the most dangerous roads in Australia. Do you do any work—outside of productivity improvements and improving infrastructure—on the avoidance of death and injury?</p> | 93-94 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|--------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Ms Garbin: There will be some stats. We do not have them with us today. We can take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: There are always pressing claims about this infrastructure being under-resourced and causing death and injury. I am putting it very clearly to you—does the department keep stats on death and injury on this particular piece of road?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, our bureau of transport economics does quite a bit of road safety research. I will get the details of that for you.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Mr Mrdak, I would really appreciate it if you could, on notice, give us the stats and which way they are heading, and tie the infrastructure spend hopefully to the decrease in death and fatalities. I think it is really important that people see that going on.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Absolutely. I will get the data for you, between us and Queensland. For anyone who has driven the section Cooroy-Curra, the section has already been completed. They were some of the most dangerous roads that I have driven, given the traffic volumes, in Australia. The substantial improvement that we have already seen with the completed stage of Cooroy-Curra really adds to what you have said about prioritising the highest road safety risk areas.</p> | | |
| 50 | 000220 | II | KETTER | GLADSTONE PORT ACCESS ROAD FUNDING | <p>Senator KETTER: I have questions on the Gladstone port access road funding, which I note is on the department's website under the 2016-17 program of works, which is the most up-to-date that I have—and I think you said there is an update that might be coming out soon.</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Yes, once we have a response from the Queensland minister responsible.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Could I have an update as to where that is at?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: Sorry, what was the question?</p> <p>Senator KETTER: The Gladstone port access road. I see in the 2016-17 program of works there was—</p> <p>Ms Garbin: There have been some early options analysis that were done a number of years ago but no further work has been done since.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Since when, sorry?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: I will have to get the exact dates of the options analysis that was done by Queensland. The Australian government did provide some funding through the former original infrastructure fund. I will grab the numbers for you.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: My understanding was that in the budget from last year there was an amount of money, \$3.83 million, for detailed design work for the Gladstone port</p> | 98-99 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>access road.</p> <p>Ms Garbin: The amount committed by the Australian government is \$3.83 million. There is \$2 million still available out that money. \$1.83 million has already been provided for some options analysis work.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: What was the \$1.83 million spent on?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: Options analysis and feasibility studies for the access roads to the port.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Okay. Is that the earlier work that you were referring to previously?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: Yes.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Are you going to come back to me as to when that was done?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: Yes.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KETTER: I am a bit surprised by that because I understood that in the 2014-15 budget the government had announced that there was going to be \$48.2 million for the extension of the Gladstone port access road to redirect large vehicles and hazardous goods movements away from the local and general traffic. That was a commitment from the 2014 budget. I am wondering if you could tell us why there has not been much progress in this area.</p> <p>Ms Garbin: We will probably have to take that on notice and come back to you with more details.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: So where is that \$48.2 million now?</p> <p>Ms Garbin: I think the original commitment was around \$50 million—from my understanding—from the former original infrastructure fund. The remaining funding commitment is \$3.83 million. The balance of that has been reallocated away from that project a number of budgets ago—I understand—to other priorities within the Queensland program.</p> <p>Senator KETTER: So the \$48.2 has been reallocated.</p> <p>Ms Garbin: I am not sure what the 48.2 number is.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I think we had better take it on notice and give you a more fulsome answer once we have had a look at it in detail.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator KETTER: Okay. I would like a more detailed update, so take that on notice. You said it was \$48.2 million that was announced back in 2014 as being available, so where is that money at this point in time?</p> <p>Mr Thomann: Yes, we can take that on notice.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|------|---------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| 51 | 000221 | II | RICE | INLAND RAIL FUNDING | <p>Senator RICE: Moving on to the Infrastructure Investment Program offsets, page 134 shows a reduction of \$1.6 billion in that program. Can you explain where that money is going?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes. It is funding a range of measures that are in the budget. If I can take you through the offsets, there is funding for the commitment to the faster rail connecting capital cities business planning.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: For the delivery of Inland Rail, there is funding for the department to deliver the Inland Rail component which falls to the department. I can give you this in detail, including—</p> <p>Senator RICE: Out of that \$1.6 billion, we have got so far only pretty small amounts—not that I would decry \$10 million, but it is pretty small change. You will have a lot of programs at that amount to add up to \$1.6 billion.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am coming to the larger numbers.</p> <p>Senator RICE: The Inland Rail one was how much?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will get you that number. I have the figures out over the forwards and I will give you these broken down, perhaps on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will list them first and then we can come back to areas you are particularly interested in. There is funding for the Department of Finance to assist the Inland Rail PPP delivery. There are offsets for the department in meeting the cost of the equity contribution, the public debt interest costs for the—</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you give me the amounts as well?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Not readily because I do not have them totalled. I just have the titles at the moment. I can get that for you. On the Inland Rail, we have not published those numbers because they relate to the equity injection and profile of that, and also the public debt interest cost parameters of that have not been published.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What is the order of magnitude, then, of the—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I would have to take that on notice and seek advice from ministers. The decision in the budget is not for publication.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay, so that is secret.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: There is some departmental funding for delivering the Western Sydney Airport.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Is the cost of equity also a secret?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, that is not for publication. In delivering the Western Sydney Airport, there is the department's cost in establishing the Western Sydney Airport company and oversight. There are some additional resourcing for the Department</p> | 101 22/05/17 | |
|----|--------|----|------|---------------------|---|-----------------|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | of Finance— | | |
| 52 | 000222 | II | RICE | NEW INFRASTRUCTURE | <p>Senator RICE: But if you have that \$1.6 billion is over at the forward estimates as a reduction, that \$600 million, as you just said, is being funded out of that \$1.6 billion pot.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: There is a process that has gone on, which is that the government has funded the last year of the forward estimates with around \$4.46 billion. It has then made some offsets and then put some money back into the program, including the national rail funding. That is how you end up with the 2021 allocation.</p> <p>Senator RICE: It still seems to me that you are double counting that \$600 million. If you were saying that it was coming out of that offset, that \$1.6 billion—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I can assure you it is not, but that is how the final 2021 year has been structured.</p> <p>Senator RICE: It would be good to get an itemised list of the new infrastructure spend in addition to what has been reallocated from that \$1.6 billion.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice.</p> | 102 22/05/17 | |
| 53 | 000223 | II | RICE | PORT RAIL SHUTTLE | <p>Senator RICE: The ongoing saga of the Port Rail Shuttle in Melbourne—in February you said that you understood that work was about to start happening now that we have had the sale of the Port of Melbourne. I think you said that some work on the Port Rail Shuttle was imminent. Have you got any updates as to what is happening?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: My understanding is work is underway.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What work?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: To provide access into the Somerton terminal, by VicTrack. My understanding is that work is underway, which will enable the first stages of that rail shuttle to start very shortly.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Do you know any more details of what that work is, because some stakeholders that I have are not aware of that work actually beginning?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: It involves some track work into the site. I can take it on notice and get you a more detailed answer.</p> | 105-106 22/05/17 | |
| 54 | 000224 | II | RICE | PORT RAIL SHUTTLE – VICTORIA | <p>Senator RICE: Okay. In terms of the Dandenong part of the Port Rail Shuttle, have you got any information about whether that is still within scope of the Port Rail Shuttle?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am sorry, I am not familiar with Dandenong.</p> <p>Senator RICE: With the Port Rail Shuttle, my understanding of the works that are</p> | 106 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|--------|-----------------|---|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>needed is you need to have the connections to Somerton in the north and Dandenong in the south-east, and Laverton or Derrimut in the west. There are works going on on the Dandenong line at the moment with the level crossings removal program, and we have been told that it does not look like they are taking into account the need for rail freight operations down to Dandenong.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am not familiar with the work that is being undertaken in relation to freight, but I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You have no information about the freight connection into Dandenong and how that it is part of the Port Rail Shuttle.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No, I do not, sorry. I will seek advice from the Victorian government.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay. Thank you.</p> | | |
| 55 | 000179 | II | STERLE | HIGH-SPEED RAIL | <p>Senator STERLE: I am sure that, regardless of whatever government is in power, they will want to start looking for ways of replacing revenue. Let us talk about the high-speed rail. According to your website, the Australian government is currently consulting with the governments of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and the ACT on the best approaches to protecting a corridor for a future high-speed rail network and other considerations for high-speed rail. I know we have discussed this before, but I want to ask a few more questions. When was the last meeting of the senior officers group on high-speed rail?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I have to apologise, Senator. The team that handles high-speed rail was here earlier in our rail area. Can I take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Of course you can, absolutely. I will put a few more on notice for you too then. When is the next scheduled meeting of the group?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What current matters are on the group's agenda? What matters have been completed in the past 12 months?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What specific targets is the group working towards? What was the 2016-17 cost to the federal budget of resourcing the work of this group?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: The cost of the work has been absorbed by the department in its departmental budget, so there is no specific allocation for high-speed rail work. It is work that is undertaken by our rail branch. But I will take the other questions on notice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What is the 2017 budget—do you have a budget for the high-speed rail group work?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No, it is captured within our rail team.</p> | 107 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|--------------|--|---------------------|--|
| 56 | 000225 | II | MCCARTHY | BBRF PROGRAM | <p>Senator McCARTHY: How many rounds of the Building Better Regions Fund program will there be, and what amounts will be allocated to each round?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: The current round is now up for assessment, and that advice should be available on the timetable available to ministers by the middle of this year. Given the time involved, it is most likely that ministers may choose to do a further round of BBRF either later this year or early next year.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Have you had any representations from outer metropolitan area councils facing pressures due to population growth and lack of community infrastructure about being excluded from the program?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, Senator.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Which councils are they?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not have that detail. Can I take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: You can; thank you. Can you provide an update on round 1 of this program?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Assessments are currently being completed by the assessment hub which has been established. We anticipate the results of that assessment will be available to us and to ministers probably towards the end of June.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: When you say they will be available to you, do you mean in terms of the projects being announced for the infrastructure stream and the community investment stream?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes, Senator.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: It will be the end of June.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: At this stage, that would be the time frame. I think we indicated in the guidelines that the assessment would be completed by June.</p> | 110-111 22/05/17 | |
| 57 | 000231 | II | RICE | CYCLING | <p>Senator RICE: What work with regard to cycling is going on at a federal level at the moment?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: The Australian government is funding its contribution to the Australian Bicycle Council, which is continuing its work this year. Additionally, as we have discussed previously, in our Infrastructure Investment Program we do fund a range of projects which involve providing active transport options, including bikepaths and footpaths.</p> <p>Senator RICE: As we have discussed in previous years, I think I have asked you whether you are able to articulate what money is spent on cycling infrastructure at a federal level.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We certainly have provided answers in relation to where, as part of</p> | 113 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|---|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | land transport infrastructure projects, we have provided funding for active travel options. I am happy to take that on notice. Senator RICE: Would you take on notice as to what is currently planned that has been spent in the last financial year and what is planned to be spent. | | |
| 58 | 000226 | II | MCCARTHY | BUILDING BETTER REGIONS FUND | <p>Senator Nash: As we have said, for the Building Better Regions Fund, the maximum contribution from the Commonwealth, as you know, is \$10 million. For this new major regional projects fund, the minimum contribution will be \$10 million, so it is very much geared at larger projects.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: How are projects identified for funding under this program—because they are election commitments?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Some projects are that the government has made commitments to. Other than that, they are projects that have been initiated by ministers or with decisions taken by ministers to initiate a project.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: So they are either an election commitment or they are a minister's suggested project.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: To initiate, that is correct.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: How many of those are there?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not have that detail, I am sorry. The community development grants are administered in our infrastructure division, which has left us tonight. The officers who look after that program have gone. I can take questions on notice, in relation—</p> | 116 22/05/17 | |
| 59 | 000227 | II | MCCARTHY | CONTRACTED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Now that you have provided 453 community development grants you do not expect to be announcing any more, do you? Minister?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: There is not, at this stage, any further scope, unless there are savings or projects that do not proceed.</p> <p>Senator Nash: That funding has been committed, as the secretary has outlined.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Of the 453, are they publicly listed?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: As projects are contracted, we provide the details on our website. On our website we have all of the contracted projects.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: How many of those would be contracted?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice.</p> | 117 22/05/17 | |
| 60 | 000228 | II | MCCARTHY | COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS - | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Just out of curiosity, do you have any Indigenous components to those contracts?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Again I will take that on notice, if I may. Do you mean in terms of</p> | 117-118 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|----------|--|--|---------------------|--|
| | | | | INDIGENOUS EMPLOYMENT | Indigenous employment requirements? Senator McCARTHY: That is correct. Mr Mrdak: Certainly a number of projects have identified Indigenous employment as part of the project, but let me take that on notice and get the details from the team. | | |
| 61 | 000229 | II | MCCARTHY | STRONGER COMMUNITIES | Senator McCARTHY: Can I take you to Stronger Communities. Have all projects awarded grants under previous rounds of the Stronger Communities Program proceeded? Mr Mrdak: Again, I do not have the team here with me tonight. Can I take that on notice? Senator McCARTHY: Sure. I will give you another question. Could you please also give details of the projects that did not proceed, their location and the reason for this. Mr Mrdak: Certainly. | 118 22/05/17 | |
| 62 | 000275 | II | DUNIAM | HERITAGE PASSENGER RAIL STANDARDS | 1. What standards are in place relating to heritage or tourism passenger railways that might prevent them from running on commercial freight lines? 2. What differing standards apply for commercial passenger lines as compared to commercial freight lines? 3. What accreditation would be required by heritage tourism railway operators or drivers in order to run on a commercial freight line? | WRITTEN 24/05/17 | |
| 63 | 000189 | II | BURSTON | PROPOSED ROUTE FOR THE INLAND RAIL PROJECT | How was the current route for the proposed Inland Rail project chosen? Has a cost benefit analysis been completed or being considered for the current proposed route of the Inland rail project? Have other alternate routes been considered? Has Infrastructure Australia consider the estimated tonnes of freight per annum that could be transported when choosing the route of the Inland rail project? Is Infrastructure Australia aware of the proposed route by the National Trunk Rail for the Inland rail project that takes in the food bowls of Shepparton and the MIA? | WRITTEN 25/05/17 | |
| 64 | 000280 | II | HUME | TRANSURBAN EQUITY RETURN AND CONCESSION | The Concession Deed provides that the State may terminate the Concession Deed on prescribed dates prior to the 34 years and 6 months anniversary from Completion in 2000, if Transurban has achieved a 17.5% real after tax equity return | WRITTEN 30/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|------|---|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | | DEED | on the following anniversaries – 25 years and 6 months, 27 years, 29 years, 31 years or 33 years after the Date of Completion. What is the dollar amount of the equity which is used to calculate the Equity Return on the relevant anniversary dates? | | |
| 65 | 000281 | II | HUME | TRANSURBAN EXPENDITURE | The CEO has stated publically that Transurban has spent \$2 billion on the road network, using this as justification why profits earned by Transurban won't reach the trigger level for termination of the Concession Deed. Can you give the Committee a breakdown of what that \$2 billion has been spent on? | WRITTEN 30/05/17 | |
| 66 | 000282 | II | HUME | COMPLETION OF EQUITY RETURN CALCULATIONS PRIOR TO EXTENSION OF THE CONCESSION PERIOD FOR THE WEST GATE TUNNEL PROJECT | Will equity return calculations to date be completed prior to Transurban and the State agreeing to any further extension of the Concession Period as part of the West Gate Tunnel Project negotiations and will you make those calculations public? | WRITTEN 30/05/17 | |
| 67 | 000283 | II | HUME | BASE CASE FINANCIAL MODEL | The Base Case Financial Model within the Concession Deed is the financial model, along with associated assumptions, projections and calculations which are used to determine certain payments and returns. Are you aware of any changes that have been made to the Base Case Financial Model under the circumstances set out in the Agreement? If so, could you make available to the Committee the changes, and the rationale for the changes, to the Base Case Financial Model approved under clauses in the Deed, 14.3(d) or, if approved under 14.3(e), what changes to data or what revisions were incorporated? | WRITTEN 30/05/17 | |
| 68 | 000284 | II | HUME | TRANSURBAN EQUITY RETURN | 1. There are a number of factors that will influence the trigger of 17.5% equity return to terminate the Concession Deed. Real toll increases, which have out-stripped CPI by almost 2%. State works, including the Tulla-Calder works and the Monash Upgrade, which have significantly increased feeder capacity by up to 15%. | WRITTEN 30/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|--------|---|--|--------------------|---|
| | | | | | <p>Enhanced traffic management improvements. Traffic growth of at least 5%, possibly as high as 30% above the Base Case traffic model. Corporate tax rate reduction from 36% to 30%. Re-financing in an environment of declining rates. Is it your position that, despite these factors, Transurban has not received an equity return of at least 17.5%. If yes, what has been the rate of return?</p> <p>2. If Transurban were not to invest in the West Gate Tunnel Project, would Transurban be likely to reach an equity rate of return of 17.5% at any of the termination anniversaries?</p> | | |
| 69 | 000286 | II | STERLE | INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING BY STATE/TERRITORY AND PROGRAM | Can the Department provide a breakdown of funding for each of its programs on a state/territory by state/territory basis for each year between 2013/14 and 2020/21? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | . |
| 70 | 000287 | II | STERLE | BRUCE HIGHWAY: DECEPTION BAY OVERPASS (QUEENSLAND) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When is construction estimated to begin? Is the \$120 million allocated just for the upgrade of the bridge, or will it include the four-laning of Deception Bay Road back to Park Road? What proportion of the funding has been previously allocated in past budgets, and how much is new funding? Has the Government's share of funds allocated for the feasibility study been paid to the State Government? Are there any deficits in the funding for the Deception Bay Road overpass that may hinder its progress? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 71 | 000288 | II | STERLE | 2016-17 UNDERSPEND | Can the Department explain why there will be \$1.6 billion underspend in the current financial year i.e. 2016-17? Can you indicate, by project, where there underspends are expected? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 72 | 000289 | II | STERLE | BRUCE HIGHWAY UPGRADE | Can you provide the funding profile for the Government's 10 year \$6.7 billion Bruce Highway Upgrade Program, starting in 2013-14? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|--------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| 73 | 000290 | II | STERLE | MILESTONES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have any payments been made to States or territories ahead of established project milestones in 2016-17? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, can you list the projects and the amounts paid in advance? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 74 | 000291 | II | STERLE | PACIFIC HIGHWAY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much will be invested this year (2016-17) in upgrading this road? How much will be invested in 2017-18 in upgrading this road? How much will be invested in 2018-19 in upgrading this road? How much will be invested in 2019-20 in upgrading this road? How much will be invested in 2020-21 in upgrading this road? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 75 | 000292 | II | STERLE | GRANT FUNDING | <p>In Estimates on 22 May 2017 the Department (Mr Thomann) confirmed total grant funding for the period 2017-18 to 2026-2027 is \$51.3 billion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much of the \$10 billion National Rail Program is included in that \$51.3 billion figure? How much of that \$51.3 billion is already allocated to specific projects? How much of that funding is currently unallocated? Can you provide a year by year breakdown of the unallocated funding? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 76 | 000293 | II | STERLE | TASMANIAN INFRASTRUCTURE (BASS HIGHWAY – WYNYARD) | <p>On 6 June 2016 the Government announced that if re-elected they would provide \$650,000 for right hand turn lanes at the intersection of the Bass Highway/Reservoir Drive at Wynyard.</p> <p>On 27 June 2016 the former local Federal Member announced that the Federal Government would provide \$2.13m to Waratah Wynyard Council, who will partner with the State Government to deliver road upgrades at the five dangerous intersections on the Bass Highway, include the Bass Highway/Reservoir Drive intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the Department confirm whether the \$650,000 announced on 6 June been absorbed into this project? Can the Department confirm whether it has received a project proposal or any correspondence from the Tasmanian Government that would allow this much needed funding to be released? If not, when is something likely to be received? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|----|--------|--|--|--------------------|--|
| 77 | 000294 | II | STERLE | TASMANIAN INFRASTRUCTURE (BASS HIGHWAY – COOEE TO WYNWARD) | <p>The Government's infrastructure budget media release confirmed a \$500,000 election promise for Bass Highway planning between Cooe and Wynyard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the Department answer whether it has received a project proposal from the Tasmanian Government that would allow this funding to be released? If not, when is something likely to be received? Can the Department advise why local government would be responsible for delivering this project? Is the Department aware of any other situation where local government is responsible for delivering a Federally-funded project on a state road? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 78 | 000295 | II | STERLE | TASMANIAN INFRASTRUCTURE (BASS HIGHWAY AT LATROBE) | <p>In February of this year the Federal Member for Braddon wrote to the Minister regarding road safety issues on the Bass Highway at Latrobe. The correspondence referred to a proposal to be submitted by the Tasmanian Government to gain approval for surplus Federal funds from work on the Bass Highway at Biralee and Westbury to be reallocated to the Bass Highway at Latrobe. In the Minister's reply on April 5, he stated that he expected a project proposal from the Tasmanian Government in the coming months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Department received that proposal? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, has the request been agreed to by the Minister? What amount of surplus funding are they seeking to reallocate? When will work commence on the project? If the proposal has not been received, when is something likely to be received? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 79 | 000296 | II | STERLE | TASMANIAN INFRASTRUCTURE (BASS HIGHWAY) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Tasmanian Government made any representations to the Federal Government about contributing to the cost of the upgrade of the Bass Highway from Marawah to Wynyard, excluding the existing contributions for the Wynyard intersections? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you, can the Department detail the scope of the work and the amount being sought? Has the Tasmanian Government made any representations to the Federal Government seeking a contributing to the cost of developing shared | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|-----|----------|--|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | pathways between Wynyard and Latrobe? | | |
| 80 | 000308 | II | RICE | INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING | <p>What is the total grant funding within the Infrastructure portfolio for each year of the forwards (including the 2017-18 FY)?</p> <p>What was the total grant funding for FY 13-14, 14-15, 15-16 and 16-17?</p> <p>Could the above please be broken down both by financial year, funding stream (ie. Roads for Recovery, Infrastructure Investment Programme, Black Spot) AND project (where possible)?</p> | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 81 | 000309 | II | RICE | FUNDING OUTSIDE THE NPP GRANTS | <p>Could the Department please list all infrastructure funding OUTSIDE the NPP grants to the states between FY 2013 and the final year of the forward estimates broken down by year, program and project (where possible) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Equity investments b. Concessional Loans c. Direct payments to the states outside NPP grants d. Contingency funds | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 82 | 000334 | II | RHIANNON | REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE TO BUILD OR INVESTIGATE THE FEASIBILITY OF BUILDING THE F6 | <p>1. Has the government received any requests from the NSW government, road builders, tollway companies or any corporate interests for any form of assistance to build or investigate the feasibility of building the F6 – sometimes known as the M6 – from Wollongong to Sydney’s inner west or part of that proposed motorway?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If yes, please provide details. | WRITTEN 8/06/17 | |
| Policy and Research (3) | | | | | | | |
| 83 | 000230 | PAR | STERLE | APPLICATIONS | <p>Senator STERLE: Can you tell me what the rationale is for excluding a not-for-profit organisation established less than two years prior to the time of applying? There is a stare-off going on here from one end of the table to the other!</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Sorry, Senator; you have lots of people ready to respond to questions. My apologies.</p> <p>Ms Power: I do not have the detail. I assume you are reading from the guidelines.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: No, I am reading from the briefing. Please—I have no ideas—tell</p> | 108-109 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----|------|-----------------|--|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>me.</p> <p>Ms Zielke: It is not an eligibility criterion.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I do not think we are familiar with that.</p> <p>Ms Power: It appears in a couple of places in the guidelines. The reason for my hesitation is in part that I would like to see the context. Could we take that on notice, Senator?</p> <p>Senator STERLE: All right. You can. I think it also says, or it must, that a higher education provider of technical and further education being a TAFE body is excluded. That is correct?</p> <p>Ms Power: That is right.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Why do applicants only get 20 points out of 100 for meeting the industry growth sectors identified in the local investment plans?</p> <p>Ms Power: It is because we need to strike a balance between the plan itself and other merit criteria, so, although it is not an unimportant factor, it is obviously not the only factor taken into consideration.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What are 'other merit criteria'?</p> <p>Ms Power: The other merit criteria include—I am going to have to take that on notice, Senator. I am concerned that I will give you a slightly inaccurate answer because I do not have it specifically in my notes.</p> | | |
| 84 | 000232 | PAR | RICE | BICYCLE IMPORTS | <p>Senator RICE: The implementation report shows a sharp drop in the number of bike imports in the last year, which has been bucking a longstanding trend of increasing numbers of bikes being taken up. It does not correlate that to participation data; it just says that the 2017 survey will perhaps elicit some information there. But don't we know from past participation surveys that the numbers of riders is actually flatlining? Is there any relevance in the fact that the number of bike imports has decreased?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: But the strategy over its five years had an overarching goal of doubling cycling participation, so we have had very small increases. We now know that the number of bikes being imported has decreased, so we have not come anywhere near doubling participation, have we?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Not that I am aware of, but again I am happy to take those figures on notice.</p> | 114 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------|----------|----------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| 85 | 000233 | PAR | MCCARTHY | JOB CUTS | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Minister, have you done any analysis of the jobs cut by other ministers in regional Australia like the jobs in the tax office and in Centrelink?</p> <p>Senator Nash: I am not aware of those particular ones you are talking about.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Do you want to take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator Nash: Certainly I can do that.</p> | 120 22/05/17 | |
| Australian Maritime Safety Authority (5) | | | | | | | |
| 86 | 000234 | AMSA | CAMERON | MAEVE ANNE RESPONSES | <p>Senator CAMERON: Good morning everyone. Mr Kinley, as you are aware, on 29 March I submitted a number of questions to Minister Chester. They were due for response on 28 April. Why have I had no response to these? Has the department provided advice to the minister on these issues?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: Good morning, Senator. Are you referring to the questions on the <i>Maeve Anne</i>?</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Yes. Those are the only ones I have put.</p> <p>Mr Kinley: We have certainly put our answers through.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: When did the answers go to the minister's office?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: I would have to check on that. It was not that long ago. I have a copy here, but I do not think they have a date on them.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: I said they were due back on 28 April. Did you meet that time line with the minister's office?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: We certainly met the time line that we were given.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: So the responses were there by 28 April. Where are they? Minister, do you know why I have no responses?</p> <p>Senator Nash: I am sorry, I am not aware of that information, but I am happy to take it on notice for you.</p> | 5 23/05/17 | |
| 87 | 000235 | AMSA | CAMERON | EXEMPTIONS | <p>Senator CAMERON: On what grounds did the AMSA issue the specific exemption for the <i>Maeve Anne</i> on 6 October?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: Those exemptions are requirements for, as I have said earlier, things that are not relevant to a non-propelled barge, under the National Law. It includes things like masts; for position of signals; for a vessel's propulsion fluid and steering systems, which of course are not relevant; certain safety equipment; communications and nav equipment; and tools that are not needed for barges that are not self-propelled. That exemption was also granted to certain conditions—namely, that life jackets be worn at all times, that a means for reboarding from the water be provided, that navigation lights and shapes were to be displayed when</p> | 8-9 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|------|---------|-------------|--|---------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>undertaking transit voyages and that the operator provide a standby vessel to carry safety equipment for the total number of persons on board the barge.</p> <p>Communications requirements were also a condition there, as were the owner of the vessel determining appropriate crew for the operations, stability and structural calculations for each specific operation and loading being completed by an AMSA accredited surveyor, and manufacturer's instructions for safe working load and deck pressures not to be exceeded. There were a range of conditions on that.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Exemptions were provided for all of those that you have outlined?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: They were the conditions that I just mentioned, on the exemptions being given for things like masts and things that a non-self propelled barge—</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Is there a document somewhere that says: here are the exemptions you have got?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: Yes.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Have you got it here? Can you table the document?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: I do not have it here, but we can certainly provide it to you.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: You were not expecting to be questioned on this issue, were you?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: I was expecting to be questioned, but I was also—</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Why can't you tell me the basic—</p> <p>Mr Kinley: Because I just read out what the conditions were, Senator.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: I want a copy of the exemption document. Can you table that?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: Yes, certainly.</p> | | |
| 88 | 000236 | AMSA | CAMERON | INSPECTIONS | <p>Senator CAMERON: What inspections did AMSA, as delegated agencies, or any accredited private marine surveyor carry out in granting the exemptions? We know there was an exemption, but what was done?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: The exemptions were considered in connection for the application of survey submitted to RMS. The information included on the certificate of class for Lloyd's register—Lloyd's register, as the classification society, inspect the vessel to ensure it maintains itself in class. The survey of the vessel and the stability books for the vessel were to be approved by other accredited surveyors accredited by AMSA, and I think there was an inspection done by the accredited surveyor as well.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: So you cannot tell me who the accredited surveyor was; you do not know.</p> <p>Mr Kinley: We do know; I just do not have that name with me.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Did they actually go on board and do inspections?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: Yes, Senator, they would have done.</p> | 9 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|---------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Senator CAMERON: When did they do that?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: I would have to check on the actual exact date, Senator. But it would have been prior to that being issued, of course.</p> | | |
| 171 | 000350 | AMSA | CAMERON | MAEVE ANNE DOCUMENTATION | <p>Senator CAMERON: Can you provide me all documentation in relation to the inspections and the exemptions and the prohibitions that were issued by AMSA in relation to the Maeve Anne?</p> <p>Mr Kinley: Yes, Senator, we can do that.</p> | 10 23/05/17 | |
| 89 | 000238 | AMSA | STERLE | SAFETY CLEARANCE BETWEEN CONTAINERS | <p>Senator STERLE: Thank you. I believe that previously there was a safety clearance of 550 millimetres for working between containers—is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Schwartz: Yes, that was a number that was given in the marine order in different areas.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What is it now?</p> <p>Mr Schwartz: There is an International Labour Organization code of practice, which I think talks in some cases up to a metre and there is a variety of distances between containers on access areas as well. So it would just depend on exactly which distance. I would probably have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: I will probably come back a couple of steps here to assist not only you but me importantly. I am led to believe previously there was a safety clearance of 550 millimetres between working containers, should someone have to be taken out of there if they have been hit or fainted or whatever—is that correct?</p> <p>Mr Schwartz: It sounds very familiar to me, yes.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: That is great. Now I am led to believe that that is not the case. If it is not the case what is it now? I did ask you that earlier and you did say you think it is a metre.</p> <p>Mr Kinley: I do not have Marine Order 32 with me; I only have the code of practice.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Take it notice that is fine.</p> | 17 23/05/17 | |
| 90 | 000239 | AMSA | STERLE | MARITIME ORDER 32 | <p>Senator STERLE: Stick around for later. Thank you, Mr Kinley. I want to put some questions to you, Minister Nash, if I may. I do not know if you have been following the conversation on maritime order 32?</p> <p>Senator Nash: I have been following it in part—in as much detail as I could understand, Senator, not being familiar with the issue.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: That is quite all right. Are you aware of the recent repeal and reissue of maritime orders part 32, these being the principle legislative measures to protect the safety of Australian workers on foreign flagged vessels?</p> <p>Senator Nash: I am not. What I might suggest, if you have a line of questioning</p> | 18 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-----|---------|---|--|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>around this, is that I am happy to take it on notice for you for the minister.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Yes, sure. Absolutely. No dramas. I will put them to you. In fact, I have no problem if you just want to take them all on notice.</p> <p>Senator Nash: That sounds fine, thank you.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: I would ask: what role did the minister's office play in designing or approving the revised maritime order 32? I would also ask: does the minister think it is acceptable for new maritime order 32 to be introduced when it could lead to fatalities—as is the belief of some people in the industry, where workers are 14 times more likely than the average to be killed on the job? Is it the intent of the government to lower the workplace standards to those of Third World countries? And I know you are going to take that on notice.</p> | | |
| Aviation and Airports (10) | | | | | | | |
| 91 | 000240 | AAA | URQHART | INTERNATIONAL FLIGHT ROUTE NEGOTIATIONS - HOBART | <p>Senator URQUHART: Turning to the Hobart airport runway extension, has the government and the minister for tourism progressed discussions about securing direct international flights from the Hobart airport?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We understand discussions have been held with a number of international airlines. I will ask Ms Spence to give you an update.</p> <p>Ms Spence: The airport are actually in negotiations with international carriers. We understand they have been progressing well, but we do not have any firm details.</p> | 70 22/05/17 | |
| 92 | 000241 | AAA | URQHART | INTERNATIONAL FLIGHT ROUTE NEGOTIATIONS - HOBART TO CHINA | <p>Senator URQUHART: I understand that Hobart airport indicated that flights between the airport and China may be possible. Has the possibility of those flights been progressed that you are aware of?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I think there has been an announcement in relation to some progressive talks in relation to freight, particularly of fresh milk.</p> <p>Ms Spence: That is right.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We can get an update for you in relation to that, on notice.</p> | 70-71 22/05/17 | |
| 93 | 000242 | AAA | URQHART | INTERNATIONAL FLIGHT ROUTE NEGOTIATIONS – HOBART TO NEW ZEALAND | <p>Senator URQUHART: That would be great. Also, Hobart airport has indicated that flights between Hobart and New Zealand may be possible. Do you know if the possibility of those flights has been progressed?</p> <p>Ms Spence: Again, I understand there have been discussions, but I am not aware of where those discussions have concluded.</p> | 71 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----|------|--|--|------------------------------|--|
| 94 | 000243 | AAA | RICE | CYCLING ACCESS AT BRISBANE AIRPORT | <p>Senator RICE: That is right. In fact, compared with the usual things that we discuss in this area, it is important but not a core issue, and it is about cycling access at Brisbane Airport.</p> <p>Unidentified speaker: Cycling?</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes. You are surprised by that? I want to know whether you are aware of Brisbane Airport Corporation's plan which has changed safe bicycle and pedestrian access to workplaces under the general aviation area.</p> <p>Ms Horrocks: We have some details on the cycling plans right across the Brisbane Airport. They have quite a significant strategy that I understand is in place. The recent issue in regard to access to general aviation is as a consequence of, obviously, the new runway that is under construction at the moment, and the particular issue about access to the general aviation area was in regard to protecting safety and also protecting security. That is as much detail as I have. If you want any more detail, I can take that on notice for you.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you tell me why there is not a separated bike lane and pedestrian access provided as part of the underpass?</p> <p>Ms Horrocks: As I said earlier, I understand it is about personal safety and security issues with regard to the underpass.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you expand on that?</p> <p>Ms Horrocks: I am sorry; I cannot, but I can provide you further details of that later.</p> <p>Senator RICE: How are you going to resolve the fact that it is then cutting off walking and cycling access? You can have underpasses that provide for personal safety. There are many underpasses all around the country that provide for personal safety. Similarly, there are many underpasses around the country that have separated bike facilities. To me it seems like something that should be resolvable.</p> <p>Ms Horrocks: I will, obviously, get you further details on that as I take that on notice, but I do understand that there is a safety issue and a security issue. That is as much detail as I can give you today.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Okay. Thank you.</p> | 19-20 23/05/2017 | |
| 95 | 000244 | AAA | RICE | TULLAMARINE AIRPORT | <p>Senator RICE: Moving away from drones and onto the Tullamarine third runway and other works that are occurring at Tullamarine airport. Can you confirm that there are currently three processes that involve Tullamarine Airport. We have the master plan, where the next one is being developed in 2018. We have the new third runway, running east-west, and the extension of the current east-west</p> | 23, 24 and 25 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----|----------|---------------|---|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>runway.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: So you have to separate projects but they are both being included under the major development plan. Will they be assessed separately or will they be amalgamated?</p> <p>Ms Horrocks: As I said earlier, that has not been finalised as yet.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What is the process going to be for finalising that decision?</p> <p>Ms Horrocks: We will be working with APAM on that.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator RICE: Right. The other issue is the timing.</p> <p>Ms Spence: Yes.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you have two projects that are being undertaken and, in fact, are happening at quite different times, if there is something that is more imminent then it is more likely to be of interest to the community.</p> <p>Ms Spence: I expect those are the issues that would be taken into account dealing with APAM, whether it is easier for the community to deal with a single consultation on the two projects through a single document or if the timing means that one is happening far sooner and then to split them into two.</p> <p>Senator RICE: When do you expect APAM will make that decision?</p> <p>Ms Horrocks: I am not sure. We are in constant contact with them, almost on a daily basis, and talking with them about the projects and where things are up to. Obviously, there are a whole range of things which need to come together.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Could you take that on notice—when it is expected and whether there will be one plan or another.</p> <p>Ms Horrocks: Yes.</p> | | |
| 96 | 000253 | AAA | XENOPHON | PLANNING LAWS | <p>Senator XENOPHON: So do you think that building, the DFO at Essendon, with its proximity to the end of the runway, would meet your criteria for fulfilling CASA's views as to the safety criteria for a building of that size, of that height, in that proximity to the runway?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: So if the ATSB says, 'We need to review public safety zones—</p> <p>Mr Carmody: I would be very interested if they came out with something like that. At the moment, the investigation is afoot, I understand. I do not know what the cause of the accident was. I know what the consequences were. But I think that that is part of the picture.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: There is always the cause, but would the outcome have been different if that building were not in the way?</p> | 83-84 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----|----------|------------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Mr Carmody: And that is correct.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And it also is those on the ground, in that building. Just to finalise that, Mr Mrdak, could you please, on notice, provide me with details of what the department says are the legal and constitutional limitations of the Commonwealth overriding state planning laws in relation to these issues.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: I am surprised that not even the corporations power, or various powers, could be used in respect—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We will provide you an update on where the work on public safety zones is up to and the legal position.</p> | | |
| 97 | 000254 | AAA | XENOPHON | PUBLICATION OF NASAG MINUTES | <p>Ms Spence: We have been progressing this through the National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group. It is a matter where we have had to get agreement from all the states and territories. As Mr Mrdak mentioned, on 14 March members reconfirmed their commitment to developing and implementing the public safety zone guidance for airports. The next meeting of NASAG is on 2 August, and before that NASAG members are going to brief their respective ministers on the draft public safety zone guidelines that have been developed by the Commonwealth and the Queensland governments in consultation with NASAG members. Subject to the minister's agreement, NASAG will conduct targeted stakeholder consultation with selected airports in the second half of 2017, and then the draft guidelines will be released for wider consultation.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Are these minutes made public?</p> <p>Ms Spence: I do not think the minutes of NASAG are made public.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Is there any reason why they cannot be made public?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I am happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Maybe it is a question for the committee as to whether or not they are made public as well. But can you take it on notice, and if you do not wish to make them public then it could be a question of an order for the production of documents. I will put some questions on notice.</p> | 84 23/05/17 | |
| 98 | 000255 | AAA | FAWCETT | IMPORT CONTROLS | <p>Senator FAWCETT: To follow up briefly, before Senator Back starts a different line of questioning: we have talked before, when discussing ARPAS, the fact that this should be a whole-of-government solution—not just the safety regulation, but also import restrictions. I raised the question at the time: have you engaged with other departments? That includes you as well, Mr Mrdak. At the time you had no answer for me. Can I ask the question again: have you engaged with other departments</p> | 87 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|------|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>specifically to look at import prohibitions for drones that do not meet a requirement that we may choose to lay down, in terms of shaping the safety environment for drones, to ensure compliance, given that, to date, voluntary education in the form of things on your website or pieces of paper in a box have not proven to curtail or restrict the way that some people choose to use these devices?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: The department has been scoping the issue of import controls. That is part of the work that will feed into the government's position on these matters.</p> <p>Senator FAWCETT: Can I just clarify: when you say 'scoping', are you talking internally, or have you engaged with other government departments?</p> <p>Mr Carmody: My understanding is we have engaged with other government departments, but, if Ms Spence cannot help, I will confirm that on notice.</p> <p>Ms Spence: We have had some high-level discussions, but I will take on notice any more details that I can provide.</p> | | |
| 99 | 000317 | AAA | RICE | MELBOURNE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I understand that Melbourne Airport is proposing to run the Master Plan 2018 and the proposed runway addition/extension projects together. Would the Master Plan 2018 have to be approved and in existence prior to approval for runway MDP project? 2. I understand that the Melbourne Airport Strategy (MAS) of 1990 was the original strategic document for the new airport at Tullamarine, and that since the privatisation of the airport, each Melbourne Airport Master Plan subsequent has continued to refer to the planned four runways. In the 1990 document, specific mention was made of arrivals from the east and it was determined that arrivals would generally occur during peak periods. However, it appears that The Master Plan 2103 does not mention any of the measures listed above, contained in the MAS 1990. On what basis is the Department satisfied the Master Plan 2013 is consistent with the findings and recommendation of the MAS 1990? | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 100 | 000318 | AAA | RICE | ACTIVE TRANSPORT AT BRISBANE AIRPORT | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regarding Brisbane Airport, I'm advised that there is no pedestrian access or safe bicycle routes to the Domestic Terminal, or Banksia Place, or Da Vinci Precinct at the Brisbane Airport. Does the airport have plans to build safe bicycle and pedestrian connections to these areas? If so, when will they be completed? 2. I understand that the 2014 Brisbane Airport Masterplan lists active transport | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------|----|-----------|-------------------------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>initiatives for the next five years as: 'Expand the active transport network across the airport' and 'Improve footpaths, aiming to improve pedestrian connectivity between key precincts'. What will the Department do to ensure the Brisbane Airport Corporation complies with the Airport Masterplan in regard to provision for active transport users?</p> <p>3. Given that the proposed underpass at Dryandra Road at Brisbane Airport will preclude active transport users – how will the Brisbane Airport Corporation going to stop people walking through the underpass when they have no other option to get to their place of work? And how will their safety be ensured?</p> <p>4. How does the Brisbane Airport Corporation propose pedestrians and cyclists access the general aviation area, other than incurring a personal expense on shuttle buses, taxi fares or private transport?</p> <p>5. Given changes to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure at Brisbane Airport, how are the people who catch the train or bus to the domestic terminal and then walk the 750m to work expected to get to work now?</p> | | |
| Airservices Australia (16) | | | | | | | |
| 101 | 000263 | AA | GALLACHER | CONFLICT OF INTEREST REGISTER | <p>Senator GALLACHER: You have, as a board, a conflict of interest register? I would presume, in the terms of a huge contract like this, there would be a regular conflict of interest statement for decision-making subcommittees or boards. Do you have and have you kept that?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Yes.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: The committee would like those supplied—</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Those can be supplied.</p> | 39 23/05/17 | |
| 102 | 000245 | AA | XENOPHON | CONTRACTS – 407 AND 457 VISAS | <p>Senator XENOPHON: I need to ask this question. If you have signed somebody up for a 12-month contract in good faith—this is not a criticism of Airservices—and the federal government have announced changes, as they are entitled to, what does that mean legally in terms of liability for, say, a 12-month contract or a longer contract that you may have signed?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I am not sure what the liability is, because it would depend on the contract arrangements.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Can you take it on notice?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Yes, I will take it on notice, but we will not be operating like that. We will be making sure that the individuals are compensated appropriately and it is at</p> | 60 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|----------|---|---|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>no cost to them, depending on what the situation is.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: But do you know—Mr Logan, can you tell me—how many people are involved, those who have not yet come to the country who were going to come but, because of the changed arrangements, will not be coming?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Can we take that on notice?</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Is it a dozen, two dozen?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: It would be fewer than five.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Okay. So you can tell us what the arrangements would be in relation to that.</p> | | |
| 103 | 000246 | AA | XENOPHON | PUBLICATION OF FOI DOCUMENTS ON WEBSITE | <p>Senator XENOPHON: I just want to go to the question of the publication of documents on your website. If you had documents that have been released under FOI, there is a protocol that you are required by law to publish them on your website; is that right?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I am unfamiliar with that, but it is supposed to be that, once you have published them, they should be available to everyone.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Isn't there a legal requirement? Maybe, when Senator Rice is asking some questions, I will do a quick bit of research to find the relevant section if there is.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: If there is, we need to comply.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: The stories that were published by the ABC on the accelerate program, back in February of this year—they do not appear to be online, as I understand they are required to be.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I will check that, because there should be no reason that they are not.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Let us go back a step, though. Is there a protocol to ensure that documents that have been released under FOI are on your website?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: There should be a protocol that we should be publishing them as per the FOI legislation.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And who can tell me what that protocol is? Is anyone here—</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I do not have the FOI protocol in front of me.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Could you provide an explanation as to why the documents that were released under FOI that the ABC obtained for their stories earlier this year do not appear to be on the website? If they are on the website and I have not been able to find them, I apologise, but they do not appear to be on the website.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: We will find them, and we will give you an explanation of that.</p> | 60-61 23/05/17 | |
| 104 | 000247 | AA | XENOPHON | COMPLAINTS - ACCELERATE | <p>Senator XENOPHON: Have there been many complaints about the Accelerate Program? Is there a complaints mechanism or is there a hotline to ring? Usually</p> | 61-62 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|------|------------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>people complain to their immediate superiors about an issue with the Accelerate Program. How do you know how many complaints there have been about the Accelerate Program? If it stops at the supervisor level, you may not know about it. How can we be assured that it is filtering up to the upper echelons of Airservices?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Because there are a range of mechanisms that can be used. It is well known within the organisation that, if you report something to your supervisor and you do not get the resolution that you require, then you have the ability to go above that person. You have also got the fact that we have an ethics hotline. It can be done anonymously. We have also got what we call a confidential word, where you can put in something confidential that goes straight to the executive level, to report it. There are a range of mechanisms so that, if there is a case where someone feels that the supervisor, for example, is not reporting it, there is a mechanism—</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: In terms of those various mechanisms that you have described, could you give details, on notice, about how many complaints to those various hotlines and mechanisms there have been, say in the last two to three years? Do you do the reporting on a financial or calendar year basis?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Yes, we can report on how many reports we got through those mechanisms.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: And in the last, say, three years whether there has been an increase since the Accelerate Program. That might be useful.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Just so I can clarify what you are looking for: you just want to see whether there has been an increase in those areas at the time of the Accelerate Program?</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Yes, insofar as you have a number of reporting mechanisms—the ones that you have described and if there are any others—what the numbers have been, say going back from three years ago.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Coming through that period, absolutely.</p> <p>Senator XENOPHON: Going back to 2014-15, 2015-16 and this year.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: We will take it back to 2014.</p> | | |
| 105 | 000248 | AA | RICE | COMMUNITY FORUMS | <p>Senator RICE: Maybe you could provide on notice details of the community forums that are away from the airports, because that seems to be a significant thing. What I have been told with regard to Tullamarine is that there are flight paths that used to be over so-called green spaces—or, in fact, blue spaces; they used to merge and turn over Port Phillip Bay—but now they are on a flight path that is merging over the inner eastern suburbs of Melbourne, particularly around Kew. That is what I have been told. There seem to be significant changes and residents are being</p> | 63 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|------|-----------------|--|----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>affected by this concentration of flights in areas where they did not previously experience noise, and they do not feel that they have been engaged at all. There has not been the opportunity to effectively be consulted about the impact these changing flight paths are having on them.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Understood, and we will take it on notice to provide that information. However, recently in Melbourne in particular, with the changed weather patterns, suddenly we are using the northerly runway a lot more, which has started to see extra traffic going over the eastern suburbs of Melbourne, where previously, because of the weather conditions, we were not using that runway as often. So that could be the basis of the change, but we will come back to you.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You say there have been some community forums outside the CAGs around the airports. What have been the reasons and the basis for those and how frequently have they been held?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I will give you detail on the frequency but just to give you an example. In Perth a few years ago there was concern about some flight path changes. We were talking about Roleystone—and Senator Back would be able to tell you the distance from Perth airport to Roleystone in the hills—and we were engaging very heavily with that particular community about that change—</p> <p>Senator RICE: But not in Melbourne?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I would have to provide some advice on that.</p> | | |
| 106 | 000249 | AA | RICE | NOISE STANDARDS | <p>Senator RICE: In response to a question you took on notice last time about the assessments you have undertaken, you responded: This assessment stage is focused on whether the change has the potential to cause significant impact to the environment and is undertaken against a suite of metrics (which have been informed by best practice in other noise-generating industries) ... What are those metrics and what is their relationship to community amenity and the human and natural environment?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I would like to provide specific details on notice, because off the top of my head I could not—</p> <p>Senator RICE: Do you have any ideas? Can you give me some broad ideas?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I would not like to even attempt it.</p> <p>Senator RICE: I am interested, because as far as I know there is not a noise standard for aircraft in flight, is there? Basically there are noise standards relating to aircraft arriving and departing, but is there a noise standard for aircraft in flight?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Not to my knowledge.</p> <p>Senator RICE: How can you decide whether something is acceptable if you do not have a standard to compare it against?</p> | 64 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|------|------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Mr Harfield: From my understanding, which could be incorrect, they will sit there and make an assessment around the decibel level. There are certain requirements around airports where you cannot build houses within a certain range.</p> <p>Senator RICE: We know that there are certain flight paths—I know them quite well—and you cannot build houses in that area. Again, it is mostly close to the airport where aircraft are taking off or landing, but we are talking about further away from the airport where those conditions do not apply.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: There are no standards, but we will come back to you with detail of how do that.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Can you also provide me with a copy of the national operating standard?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Yes, we can.</p> | | |
| 107 | 000250 | AA | RICE | HELICOPTER NOISE | <p>Senator RICE: And that the number of helipads has increased and the number of helicopters has increased? I have heard that here are hundreds of movements a week. Is that your understanding of what is going on there as well?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Across the board we are seeing an increase in helicopter movements. That seems to be the growth area of general aviation at the moment.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What are the controls around air noise surrounding those helipads?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: It is the same as anywhere else.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Tell me what they are.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: If they are an acceptable area for take-off and landing—</p> <p>Senator RICE: What standards and controls have you got around those helipads?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: For those helipads on the Yarra River we actually do not control the air traffic at that stage. It is uncontrolled airspace.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Yes, so what standards and controls are there around those helipads?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I have to take that on notice with regard to noise. There is a fly-neighbourly agreement in place—</p> <p>Senator RICE: which is voluntary. So what you are telling me is that they are in uncontrolled airspace and there are not actually any standards that need to be complied with with regard to noise around those helipads.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Not that I am aware of, but we will come back on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Is that acceptable? We have increasingly got residents that are very nearby those Yarra River ones. We have tens of thousands of residents, in fact, in the apartments nearby, and increasing numbers of helicopters are going to be having significant impacts on them, and yet you have not got any noise controls as far as you are aware.</p> | 64-65 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Mr Harfield: Not that I am aware of.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You would be aware if there were noise standards there, wouldn't you? I would have thought that you, as the Chief Executive Officer of Airservices Australia, would have been the person that would be aware if there were standards.</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Nothing comes to the forefront of mind, and that is why I said we will take it on notice just to confirm that my recollection is correct.</p> | | |
| 108 | 000251 | AA | RICE | RUNWAY USAGE DATA - MELBOURNE | <p>Senator RICE: Okay. Do you document the amount of time the northern runway would be used compared with the other one?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Absolutely.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Could you take on notice some statistics about that over recent years?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Yes, we could do that. We will provide you the runway usage data at Melbourne for the last three years so you can see the trend.</p> <p>Senator RICE: How about the last five?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Okay, five.</p> | 65 23/05/17 | |
| 109 | 000252 | AA | RICE | NOISE MONITORING | <p>Senator RICE: Can I have a follow-up question in response to one of your answers to Senator Back about the noise monitoring? In your detailed response to my questions from last time there is a section that says 'data driven approach to monitoring noise' and that Airservices has a 'noise and flight path monitoring system to collect data within a network of permanent noise monitors set up around major airports'. Is that what you are referring to?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Yes.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So that is only around major airports?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: Yes.</p> <p>Senator RICE: It says NFPMS does not have nor is required to have permanent noise-monitoring set-ups at secondary airports; however, a program of short-term noise-monitoring of periods of three to 12 months has been used at various secondary airports around the country—for example, at Jandakot, Moorabbin and Parafield. Does that mean that, in the noise monitoring within the Melbourne metropolitan area, the location at Moorabbin is the only noise monitoring location?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: I might have to take on notice where we have got them positioned around the Melbourne basin. It will not be just one; there will be a number.</p> <p>Senator RICE: But are they around of the airports?</p> <p>Mr Harfield: They are based around the flight path leading to and from the major</p> | 66-67 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | airports. Senator RICE: Could you take on notice where those noise monitoring stations are in the capital cities? Mr Harfield: Yes. | | |
| 110 | 000310 | AA | RICE | NEW INTERNATIONAL NOISE STANDARDS FOR JET AIRCRAFT | a. Given the new International Noise Standards for Jet Aircraft at Major Airports from 1st January 2018, what implications does this have for the the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> ? b. I understand that the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> includes an environmental exemption to have no limit on the noise caused by aircraft in flight. Does Airservices agree that these new International Noise Standards change the circumstances in which the Act operates, and thus the environmental exemption can now be removed from the Act? | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 111 | 000311 | AA | RICE | STATE EPAS | a. What is Airservices' view of the State EPAs taking back noise management for Secondary Airports? b. If Airservices does not support State EPAs taking back noise management for Secondary Airports, please set out all the reasons for opposing this step. | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 112 | 000312 | AA | RICE | ANEIS FOR SECONDARY AIRPORTS | 1. Has Airservices ever tested any residential area at any of the Secondary Airports against the 30 ANEI contour? If it has, what were the results? 2. Can Airservices publish ANEIs for Secondary Airports at least quarterly, and use data from permanent noise monitors, ensuring the relevant planning authorities are made aware of results? | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 113 | 000313 | AA | RICE | 'LIVE' SYSTEM FOR 'SPIKES' FOR A PEAK NOISE READING | Can a "live" system be put in place for "spikes" for a peak noise reading, or to report locations where the number of flights per hour exceed the limit? | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 114 | 000314 | AA | RICE | HELICOPTER NOISE IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS | Regarding the issue of helicopter noise in residential areas, what (if any) steps has Airservices taken to minimise the impacts of helicopter training circuits occurring over residential areas? | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| 115 | 000315 | AA | RICE | NOISE MANAGEMENT OF FLIGHT TRAINING ACTIVITIES | What was the reason for noise management of flight training activities being taken away from State EPAs and included in the Act (some 20+ years ago)? | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 116 | 000316 | AA | RICE | OUTCOME OF THE DISCUSSION OF THE USE OF THE TWIN-ENGINE BEECHCRAFT BARON WITH THE SINGAPORE FLYING COLLEGE | Please report on the outcome of the discussion, as flagged in response to previous QoNs: Proof Hansard Page: Written (15 March 2017) Senator Rice, Janet asked: Answer to Question 5 (a) and (b). <i>“Airservices will discuss the use of the twin-engine Beechcraft Baron with the Singapore Flying College.”</i> | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| Civil Aviation Safety Authority (10) | | | | | | | |
| 117 | 000256 | CASA | RICE | DRONE STRIKES/BIRD STRIKES | Senator RICE: Can you take this on notice? I assume there have been some comparisons in other jurisdictions around the world on what the relative impact of drone strikes versus bird strikes would be. Have you analysed that data yourself? Mr Carmody: We continue to look at material all the time on those sorts of matters, but, as I said— Senator RICE: Could you take it on notice to provide for the committee some of your rationale about the difference between bird strikes and drone strikes, and your basis for deciding that drone strikes are, it sounds like, no more of an issue than bird strikes? Mr Carmody: I would be happy to. I think that the need to know more about the issue is the point we are endeavouring to make. We have a lot of bird strikes and a lot of animal strikes. CHAIR: There are a hell of a lot more birds than drones out there at the moment. Senator RICE: But regarding the issue of what impacts a drone strike would have—particularly the recreational drones; the under two-kilogram drones that are being used for recreational purposes that we know are flying where they should not be in controlled airspace, out of sight and far higher than they are meant to— Mr Carmody: We can certainly take it on notice. | 73 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|------|---------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| 118 | 000257 | CASA | RICE | COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE | <p>Senator RICE: If you provide the comparison to the committee, that would be very useful for us. Another bit of information that I would like to know is: you have been talking about your communications program to inform recreational users—how much assessment and what knowledge do you have about the level of knowledge amongst those recreational users of what the rules are and whether they can play with them?</p> <p>Mr Carmody: We are communicating constantly—</p> <p>Senator RICE: That is not my question. My question was: how much knowledge in the community is there?</p> <p>Mr Carmody: I would prefer to take it on notice. I think that I can probably find the answer for you.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Have you done any analysis of the level of understanding amongst recreational drone users of what the rules are?</p> <p>Mr Carmody: I am not aware, so I will take it on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p>CHAIR: I am familiar with when it was. You referenced that. You would, no doubt, have information about who you consulted and what the breadth of the consultation was. Could you take that on notice and provide us with who you consulted and if there are any documents where they made a submission to you, you exchanged or a file note—could you also produce that for us?</p> <p>Mr Carmody: I am happy to. We have a pretty standardised process for consultation. We are very happy to take it on notice.</p> | 73-74 23/05/17 | |
| 119 | 000258 | CASA | RICE | COMMUNICATION COST | <p>Mr Walker: Correct. We look at how they gain their information. It would be quite simplistic to say that we would take out some advertising, et cetera, which we do in drone publications and, obviously, IT magazines. But where we have been targeting is very much in the social media space. An example is our Facebook site—CASA now has a Facebook site. We started that a couple of years ago; we have seen an exponential growth in the number of people looking at that site. We now have 30,000 followers, and the vast majority of those and a vast amount of the traffic we are seeing is around drones and people wanting to know more information around drones. We have used social media specifically—including Twitter—around targeting the mums and the dads and the 13-year-old kids. And then the next area we have looked at is very much, I suppose, the hobbyist and enthusiast who is not necessarily interested in buying a commercial off-the-shelf drone; they actually buy their components via the internet and they build their own. That has been another key target area.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What has been the cost of your communications campaign so far?</p> | 74 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|------|-----------------|---|-------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Mr Walker: In terms of total spend, I would have to take that on notice. In terms of social media, we manage that in-house—that is, the staff, relying on the expertise we have with our own subject-matter experts, and the content is all generated and delivered in-house as part of our normal communications packages.</p> | | |
| 120 | 000259 | CASA | RICE | AVALON AIR SHOW | <p>Senator RICE: Getting to my other question, it is all very well to be putting that communication out there. And with the drones, you have also got the information in the yellow leaflets—is that what you were referring to? Is it the leaflet that we saw at our drones inquiry?</p> <p>Mr Carmody: It is a leaflet; I have seen multiple ones, but yes—</p> <p>Senator RICE: It is a DL-size yellow leaflet. But I think for your average 15-year-old, once they get their drone out of the package from Harvey Norman, the leaflet would end up with the wrapping paper and it would not even be looked at. I want to know what sort of analysis you are doing of the effectiveness of your communications program. How are you evaluating whether you are indeed reaching your target audience?</p> <p>Mr Walker: In answer to that, we intend to go out to market and actually test that via survey.</p> <p>Senator RICE: You intend to go out to market—so you have not tested it as yet.</p> <p>Mr Walker: Not as yet, but we do monitor a number of things on a weekly and a monthly basis, specifically around our website and around the internet traffic. In a couple of the other forums that we attend, we also do a high degree of exit polling of those attendees. If I could give you an example of that, recently at the Avalon air show, we happily participated in and were very supportive of what was called the 'Drone Zone'. On the public days at the Avalon air show, they specifically targeted mums and dads and kids that were turning up, to provide education around drones. We had members of our staff there to answer questions and provide information, and we also then asked people on the way out whether or not that information had been useful, as we do in all our forums.</p> <p>Senator RICE: How many people would you have reached at that show, for example?</p> <p>Mr Walker: Over the three days, I would have to take it on notice to give you precise numbers; obviously, it tends to be a little bit anecdotal. I know I had three staff on the stand and they were literally hammered for the three days.</p> | 74-75 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|---------|------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| 121 | 000260 | CASA | RICE | DRONE FIELD WORK | <p>Senator RICE: I would like to go back to what you said before—that you intended to go to market to do some evaluation of your effectiveness. Can you tell me more about the time lines and about what you are proposing to take to market in terms of evaluating the effectiveness of your communications?</p> <p>Mr Walker: The intent is that later this year we will be going to market to do a further sample of our stakeholder engagement relationship with industry. As part of that, we are in early discussions with the service provider that does that for us as to whether we can include a component around drones and drone awareness and also drone safety. It is early days, but I would like to think that we will be going out before the end of this year to do that.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Will that be targeted at the group that we are concerned about, the recreational drone users?</p> <p>Mr Walker: Yes, this would be targeted at the general public—targeted at, I suppose, mums and dads and kids—to try and understand what their level of awareness is and, based on that, what our level of effectiveness has been in delivering the communication packages that we have.</p> <p>Senator RICE: So you are hoping to have determined the program by the end of the year or be out in the field by the end of the year?</p> <p>Mr Walker: I would like to think we will be out in the field by the end of the year in a position to have some data on the back end of that early in the new year.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you could provide on notice some details of what you have planned in that field, that would be appreciated.</p> <p>Mr Walker: Certainly, happy to.</p> | 75-76 23/05/17 | |
| 122 | 000261 | CASA | FAWCETT | SAFETY SYSTEM | <p>Senator FAWCETT: Mr Mrdak, as you are aware, we have spoken before about manual of standards part 139, which goes to airport design. Over the years we have seen what have essentially been open spaces for airports, with standards put in place. But as commercial pressures have built up that real estate and that airspace have been encroached upon right up to, and in some cases, I would argue, intruding into, the limits that MOS 139 is supposed to put in place.</p> <p>What Senator Xenophon was pointing to, I think, is the fact that if you look at a safety system holistically—a bit like James Reason and his accident causation model—what we are finding is that each of those pieces of Swiss cheese has been thinned to the absolute minimum that is permissible by law, which maximises the chance of an accident by minimising the options for a pilot who has a malfunction in an aircraft. I guess the request here is that we sit back and look at this holistically, as opposed to saying, 'Yes, they have met this requirement or that requirement,' and look at the aggregation of the loss of margin and, therefore,</p> | 84-85 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|----------|---|--|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>options for an aircrew member who has an issue with an aircraft. Public safety zones are but one element of that whole system.</p> <p>I guess I am seeking assurance from you, Mr Carmody, that CASA's approach to this, as we have discussed here on multiple occasions, will move beyond the, 'It can be made safe by limiting the operations' to, 'This is what an airport is designed to do in terms of the Commonwealth lease'—which says it must maintain its existing capacity and have the option to grow capacity—so that CASA will put its hand up and say, 'If these changes are made for existing or future operations, it will be unsafe,' as opposed to saying, 'It can be made safe by limiting operations,' which has been the practice in the past. I am seeking that assurance from you that the organisation will change the way it views its role in assessing that aggregation of safety implications.</p> <p>Mr Carmody: I will certainly look at that.</p> | | |
| 123 | 000262 | CASA | FAWCETT | RECOMMENDATIONS | <p>Senator FAWCETT: Could I ask you on notice to give the committee a list of recommendations that you believe have been implemented, recommendations that are still open and the actions that you either plan to take or that you have decided, for whatever reason, not to implement.</p> <p>Mr Carmody: Certainly. As I indicated, we are doing that work now anyway, so by the time the notice period comes through we should have worked through a number of those things with Mr Forsyth. I am hopeful that Mr Forsyth, as the author of the review, and I, as the regulator that is implementing those things, will be agreeing on each one of the recommendations that have been closed out and the ones that remain. That is my aim. So I would be delighted to provide that information. Of course, a number of the recommendations are also departmental and we have been managing the actual list of recommendations through the department. I have worked very closely with the department to conclude that list.</p> | 90 23/05/17 | |
| 124 | 000304 | CASA | XENOPHON | PUBLIC SAFETY ZONE AROUND BADGERY'S CREEK | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has CASA had discussions with relevant authorities planning Badgerys's Creek on the requirements for a public safety zone around the new airport's site? 2. Will CASA be the approving authority for that airport in respect of public safety zone? | WRITTEN 5/05/17 | |
| 125 | 000305 | CASA | XENOPHON | IMPACT ON AIRSPACE MANAGEMENT ABOVE THE | Is CASA conducting any studies into the impact Sydney Airport will have on airspace management above the Sydney basin? | WRITTEN 5/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|------|-----------|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| | | | | SYDNEY BASIN | | | |
| 126 | 000306 | CASA | XENOPHON | NASAG OVERRIDE OF CASA ON AIR SAFETY | Can National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group (NASAG) override CASA on a matter of air safety? If so, under what circumstances? | WRITTEN 5/05/17 | |
| Australian Transport Safety Bureau (2) | | | | | | | |
| 127 | 000264 | ATSB | RICE | AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS | <p>Senator RICE: I know that there are lots of components in aircrafts, and this might be a naive question, but in order of magnitude how many components or how many planes are we talking about? What proportion do not need to be inspected and are essentially relying upon the design at the beginning of their life?</p> <p>Mr Hood: I am also not an engineer, so I will take that one on notice. I did see recent YouTube footage where more than three million parts are put onto a modern aircraft these days. But I will check.</p> | 97 23/05/17 | |
| 128 | 000265 | ATSB | GALLACHER | DRONE OWNERSHIP | <p>Senator GALLACHER: I am really curious about how you protect your property. There are people capable of writing programs to take over anything, particularly remote controlled aircraft. How do we know that your drone is your drone, if someone else takes it over?</p> <p>Mr Hood: Senator, I am not the drone expert for ATSB but certainly I will take your question on notice. I know that with any electronic frequency spectrum you can jam, you can interfere and potentially, if you found the right frequency, my understanding of basic electronics is that you could actually take over the control of that drone.</p> | 100 23/05/17 | |
| Office of Transport Security (2) | | | | | | | |
| 129 | 000266 | OTS | STERLE | YOUTUBE VIDEO | <p>Senator STERLE: I want to bring you back to a YouTube video in which the International Transport Workers' Federation national coordinator boarded a foreign flagged ship alongside an inner city wharf in Glebe in Sydney. He just walked up the gangplank. The video was shot just over a year ago and was shown to the Senate inquiry in March. How can anyone access a foreign owned, foreign flagged, foreign crewed ship in a working Australian port without any checks at all?</p> <p>Ms Wimmer: I think I know the video you are referring to, but I would need to clarify. I think the issues there were that the port was not a regulated port and</p> | 110 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|-----|---------|--------------------|--|----------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>there was not a security zone in operation at the time that vessel—</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Glebe in Sydney is not a regulated port? This is getting worse.</p> <p>Ms Wimmer: I would have to go back and check, but, based on my recollection, it is not.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Let us take that on notice. I am not familiar with the YouTube video. I will go and review it and come back to you with advice in relation to access to that vessel.</p> | | |
| 130 | 000267 | OTS | STERLE | PORTS | <p>Senator STERLE: How many of our ports in Australia have no physical barriers to, or security checks on, the ship's gangway?</p> <p>Ms Wimmer: I think we have had a conversation before about secure zones and how they can actually be ephemeral. They may apply when a ship is in the port but then not apply. They are not there permanently. So it is very hard to say where there is a secure zone and where there is not a secure zone.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Is it fair to say that there are some ports that are not regulated—so evildoers could just slip into that port?</p> <p>Ms Wimmer: That is right. We do not regulate every port.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Are there some ports where we only regulate some berths? I did not know this.</p> <p>Ms Wimmer: Richard can help me out with this.</p> <p>Mr Farmer: It would depend on the operations of the port. There are some ports that have permanent zones established with a ship-to-shore interface. There are some ports where the zones are turned on and off depending on the arrival and departure patterns of vessels. There are other ports, as Ms Wimmer has said, that are not security regulated ports. It really depends on the operation of the port and the type and frequency of traffic which is coming in and out of that port.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: What about Glebe? Is that a regulated port?</p> <p>Ms Wimmer: We will take that on notice and get back to you.</p> | 111 23/05/17 | |
| Surface Transport Policy (19) | | | | | | | |
| 131 | 000237 | STP | CAMERON | QUESTION ON NOTICE | <p>Senator CAMERON: Do you have a date when those responses went to the minister's office?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We are just checking as to whether the minister has cleared the answers to be provided. I will get an answer for you as quickly as possible.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Okay. I have questions on notice.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Just in relation to that, I have made inquiries. My understanding is that</p> | 5, 14-15 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|--------|---------------|--|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>advice has been provided, and I will undertake to seek the minister's agreement to finalise that response to you as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: Can I just indicate my concern that these questions are over a month overdue. Not one question has been answered, and I think that is treating this committee with contempt and senators with contempt. We are entitled to have legitimate questions answered, especially when it relates to a death. Tuesday, 23 May 2017 Senate</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly, and I will undertake to find out why the answer has been delayed and, as I said, I will seek the minister's agreement to expedite the answer.</p> <p>Senator CAMERON: I will have a look at the <i>Hansard</i> of this, and there may be further questions arising from the <i>Hansard</i>. Chair, thanks very much for your indulgence on this.</p> <p>CHAIR: Can I say, Mr Mrdak, I join Senator Cameron's comments about these answers to questions on notice, particularly on these important matters, and I think I can speak on behalf of the whole committee in asking you to go to the minister to ask him or her to prioritise the return of these as soon as possible.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Certainly. I think we have provided answers to questions taken on notice in this committee on time, but these were questions asked in the Senate, and Senator Cameron is quite right to ask that those time frames be met. I will undertake to find out why that has not taken place.</p> | | |
| 132 | 000268 | STP | STERLE | CONSULTATIONS | <p>Senator STERLE: No. I will get to the point. I was reading the submission from North Star Cruises. Were they consulted?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Yes.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: Was the entire cruise industry consulted?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: They were provided with the opportunity. We would have to double-check exactly who was in the industry as opposed to those that made submissions, but we went to the industry associations and invited submissions through them as well, where they passed on that information. But I am not sure if every single one attended the consultation.</p> <p>Senator STERLE: I would be very interested to know, because they are fired up, as you know. They are really unhappy people, but I am sure they will have reason to be unhappy with the way that things might be going. Let us hope I am wrong. Can I take you to the <i>Coastal shipping reforms</i> document. I want to go to the amendments.</p> | 116-117 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|-----------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| 133 | 000269 | STP | GALLACHER | ROAD SAFETY BUDGET | <p>Senator GALLACHER: I want to talk about road safety. I have been waiting all day for this. Is there someone at the table who has a handle on the budget figures for road safety?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Yes.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: The budgeted amount was \$24,068,000, and we only spent \$23,402,000. Do you agree with those figures?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: What program are you referring to?</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Program 3.2—road safety expense. It is in the budget statements: PBS expenses, last budget, 2016-17. It is on page 31. It says \$23,402,000 was spent out of a budget of \$24,068,000. In an environment where we lost 1,300 Australians to death in a year and 8,000-plus were seriously injured, how is it possible that we cannot even spend the money allocated for road safety programs?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: I still cannot see what it is you are referring to. I apologise.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: Do you have the budget statements?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: I have the PBS in front of me. You said it was on page 31?</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: My extract here says that for program 3.2—road safety—the budget was \$24,068,000. In this budget we see that \$23,402,000 was actually spent. So someone in my office has taken the budget and compared what you wanted to spend with what you actually spent. My point is that you are \$666,000 underspent. While 1,300 Australians were losing their lives and over 8,000 were being seriously injured and hospitalised, you could not get the allocation to road safety spent. You cannot even spend this pitiful—my word—allocation for road safety. Can you give me a reason for that?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: I am conscious that you referring to departmental expenses in that regard. I am sorry, but I do not think I am going to be able to answer your question in detail. I suspect it relates to the way we work with the states and territories in distributing funding. But I will need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: My overriding theme is: there is a very low allocation in the budget to road safety despite the fact that we lose 1,300 Australian lives each year and have 8,000-plus injuries, and we do not even expend that miserly allocation. That is my point. The figures that my staff have produced show that we underspent by \$666,000 in the year we are in. If we look at the forward estimates for 2017-18—which did not have a commitment for keys2drive, which is another absolute disgrace, although you did find the money—it looks like you are going to underspend again.</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Senator—</p> | 118 23/05/17 | |
|-----|--------|-----|-----------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|-----------|-------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Senator GALLACHER: The two points I am putting to you are the \$666,000 for 2016-17 and then, looking forward, that you are going to underspend by \$866,000 in 2017-18. I do not understand a department that does not prioritise road safety. I do not understand why allocated funds cannot be spent when there are any number of state and territory programs crying out for funding to alleviate those 1,300 deaths and 8,000-plus serious injuries. I just do not understand how you can get to the stage where you do not even get the money you have allocated onto the table. I would argue that it is a miserly amount anyway. I would like to know, on notice, why that is.</p> <p>Ms Zielke: Certainly.</p> | | |
| 134 | 000270 | STP | GALLACHER | ROAD SAFETY FUNDS | <p>Senator GALLACHER: And if you look forward to 2018-19, it looks like you are budgeting \$993,000 less. So, I would characterise the underspend and the lack of forward spend as a complete abrogation of your responsibility in terms of road safety. I do not see any evidence that you are determined to spend your allocated funds on a vital piece of spend—1,300 dead, 8,000 injured, and we are not even spending the money we allocate. I would like someone to address that. I am happy for you to take it on notice, but I do want a considered response. Does it mean that you are bereft of ideas, that you have no new safety programs? That is a rhetorical question. But if you cannot spend the money you are allocated, the conclusion could be drawn that you do not have any initiatives and you do not have any new ideas, and I find that quite surprising.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Well, that is certainly not the case. The minister, in his budget statement, made clear a number of new initiatives as part of the National Road Safety Strategy, including three key areas that he is now leading work on, on behalf of all the jurisdictions—first, distractions, particularly mobile phones and electronic devices; second, roadside drug testing; and third, how to better utilise the Roads to Recovery funding with a safety focus.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: So, if the secretary of the department can articulate what is going on, why can't the officers responsible for the—</p> <p>Ms Zielke: We are very happy to give you information in relation to what we are doing on road safety.</p> <p>Senator GALLACHER: No, the information I require is why you do not even spend your funds.</p> <p>Ms Zielke: My concern is that I do not know the exact make-up of the figures you are referring to. I am very happy to come back to you with that information. But if your question was what activities we are undertaking at the moment, then, as Mr Mrdak just said, we have a number of activities that we are undertaking, and in</p> | 119 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|-----------|---|--|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | addition— | | |
| 172 | 000344 | STP | GALLACHER | US AND EU AUTONOMOUS BREAKING TECHNOLOGY | <p>Senator GALLACHER: I accept that that is the bulk of the department's spend, but what I would like to put to you is that you could complement that effort by investigating. Minister, could you take this to the Hon. Darren Chester: why can't we give these people better protection by adopting technologies that have been tried and proven in the United States and in the European Union in respect of autonomous braking technology for heavy vehicles and for lighter vehicles? You could really make the place safer and better with the administrative stroke of a pen. I would like to hear in detail the arguments for not moving quicker than we are at the moment. I know the impediments that are before us. But I also know this: there are companies in Australia—maybe BHP, Rio—who are mandating five-star vehicles for all of their staff. The governments, state and territory, should be mandating five-star vehicles for every part of their fleet. It will then immediately affect that second-hand market. That is how you change the profile of my state, which has probably got the oldest vehicle fleet. We do know, and ANCAP is doing this now. They are getting an eight- or 10-year-old Toyota Corolla, crashing it and comparing it to a new one. People think, 'Child is going on the road—get them a second-hand car.' We do not want to put our most vulnerable road users in the unsafest vehicles. I think we can move lot quicker on this. Minister, if you could get me an answer from the Hon. Darren Chester, I would appreciate that.</p> <p>Senator Nash: I most certainly will, Senator. I will convey all of that to him and I will certainly undertake to specifically put that through on notice for you.</p> | 122 23/05/17 | |
| 135 | 000271 | STP | RICE | ELECTRIC VEHICLE | <p>Senator RICE: What policy measures or initiatives is the government currently looking at to encourage electric vehicle—</p> <p>...</p> <p>Ms Wieland: What I was going to say is that, under the Clean Energy Finance Corporation, there are arrangements to allow fleet owners to get attractive financing for purchasing electric vehicles.</p> <p>Senator RICE: What are those financing arrangements?</p> <p>Ms Wieland: I do not have the detail of that in front of me. That is actually the environment portfolio, so you may want to direct that question to them. As part of the ministerial forum, there is a collaborative whole-of-government effort across portfolios. We work very closely with the Department of the Environment and Energy in this space.</p> <p>Senator RICE: Is there a time line on any proposed expansion of initiatives? If we</p> | 123-124 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|----------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>are going to get anywhere close to the sorts of targets that are being set elsewhere in the world, we are clearly going to have to do a lot more than just provide information, which seems to be the bulk of what the government is doing at the moment.</p> <p>Ms Wieland: Yes. The other element which I forgot to mention earlier is that, in the luxury car tax arrangements, there is certainly a concession for low-emissions vehicles, and, with the current price of electric vehicles, that translates to about a \$3,000 tax concession. I can provide you with more detail of that on notice.</p> <p>Senator RICE: If you could. If there are any other initiatives that you have forgotten to encourage electric vehicle uptake, if you could take that on notice we would appreciate that.</p> <p>Ms Wieland: Yes, we can certainly do that.</p> | | |
| 136 | 000272 | STP | MCCARTHY | COASTAL TRADING GREEN PAPER | <p>Senator McCARTHY: The coastal trading green paper that was prepared following what looks to have been extensive consultations throughout 2016 was presented to government at the end of 2016. Is that correct?</p> <p>...</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: But many of the concepts in that paper were not considered in the discussion paper, though.</p> <p>Ms Zielke: There were requests or recommendations that were made in the paper that were not taken up in the discussion paper. That is correct</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Can you tell me why not?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: A number of them were actually outside the bounds of the coastal trading legislation.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: For example?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: There were suggestions in relation to tax treatment, for example.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Is that the only example?</p> <p>Ms Zielke: No; there were other examples. Would you like us to come back to you with more detail on that?</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Yes, if you could. What other feedback has the government provided to participants in the green paper process?</p> | 125 23/05/17 | |
| 137 | 000273 | STP | WILLIAMS | NHVR | <p>In correspondence to my office Mr. Mrdak indicated the Regulator is hoping to move away from the road access permits through the development of “national notices”.</p> <p>Can you clarify how these will work and will it reduce the red tape and frustration heavy vehicle operators are now facing when faced with conflicting decisions from</p> | WRITTEN 24/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|----------|--|---|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | the NHVR and State-based jurisdictions. | | |
| 138 | 000274 | STP | WILLIAMS | NHVR FEEDBACK | In March this year the NHVR conducted market research and sought feedback on its role, performance and service. Responses had to be in by the 14th of March. Are the results public and if so how does the Regulator rate in public opinion? | WRITTEN 24/05/17 | |
| 139 | 000299 | STP | STERLE | TASMANIAN FREIGHT EQUALISATION SCHEME | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much funding was budgeted for in the 2016-17 for the scheme? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much do you now expect to pay out in 2016-17? How much is allocated in the budget for the 2017-18? Can you provide a breakdown of the allocations in the budget as against the actual expenditure for the last five years? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 140 | 000300 | STP | STERLE | COASTAL SHIPPING REFORM | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What process will be undertaken to consult with stakeholders on any substantial shifts from the concepts outlined in the discussion paper? What process will be undertaken to consult with stakeholders on finessing the concepts outlined in the discussion paper? The Coastal Trading Green Paper that was prepared following what looks to be extensive consultations throughout 2016 was presented to Government at the end of 2016 – is that correct? Many of the concepts in that paper were not considered in the Discussion Paper, can you tell me why not? What feedback has the Government provided to the participants in the Green Paper process? | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |
| 141 | 000303 | STP | STERLE | DOMESTIC COMMERCIAL VESSELS | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why is the government not making any appropriation for the funding of the national system for domestic commercial vessels? Why is the government pursuing a full cost recovery model from the maritime industry when comparable arrangements for other sectors (light aviation for example) have a government appropriation? Why is the government expecting industry to pay for the transition costs from | WRITTEN 2/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|-----------|---|--|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>the State to Federal regime?</p> <p>4. How are functions currently being delivered by AMSA for the national system being funded? If from AMSA budget, is that cross subsidisation for the levies applied to other parts of industry? How does that comply with guidelines that specify cross subsidisation ought not occur?</p> | | |
| 142 | 000307 | STP | RICE | DRAFT REGULATION IMPACT STATEMENT FOR VEHICLE EFFICIENCY | <p>At this stage, when is the expected date for the completion of the draft implementation plan for consideration by Government?</p> <p>Why was the overall emissions target of 95g CO2/km by 2025 (as opposed to a 105g CO2/km target that would result in a 95g CO2/km average for passenger vehicles and 147g CO2/km average for light commercial vehicles) not included or costed as a potential policy option for the “Improving the efficiency of new light vehicles: Draft Regulation Impact Statement”?</p> <p>Was it a departmental or ministerial decision to include or not include the 95g CO2/km target?</p> <p>Is there likely to be any opportunity to revisit the options presented in the draft regulation impact statement after consultation on further options?</p> <p>Has the Ministerial Forum done any work on investigating both the costs and benefits of implementing a 95g CO2/km 2025 target?</p> <p>If so, when was this work completed?</p> <p>Would you be able to supply a copy to the committee?</p> <p>In either case, does the department have any estimate of what the total cumulative CO2 abatement to both 2025 and 2030 would be with a 95g CO2/km by 2025 target compared to Business as Usual?</p> | WRITTEN 6/06/17 | |
| 143 | 000336 | STP | GALLACHER | REVENUE FROM THE IDENTIFICATION PLATE FEE | <p>What was the revenue made from the \$6 identification plate fee over the last 3 financial years?</p> <p>It was stated in Estimates that the Road Safety Division recovers that money - what programs does that fund?</p> | WRITTEN 16/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-----|-------------------------|---|---|---------------------|--|
| 144 | 000337 | STP | GALLACHER | EMPLOYMENT | How many staff are employed in the Road Safety Division? How is this compared to the last 5 years? | WRITTEN 16/06/17 | |
| 145 | 000338 | STP | GALLACHER | TECHNOLOGY PRIORITIES FOR THE DEPARTMENT | It was discussed that ABS for motorbikes became a priority for the department – how do technologies such as Autonomous Emergency Braking become a priority? | WRITTEN 16/06/17 | |
| 146 | 000339 | STP | GALLACHER | PRIORITY LIST FOR MOTOR VEHICLE STANDARDS | What is currently on the priority list for motor vehicle standards? | WRITTEN 16/06/17 | |
| 147 | 000340 | STP | GALLACHER | INQUIRY INTO NRSS | Could you provide more information in regards to the new inquiry into the National Road Safety Strategy? | WRITTEN 16/06/17 | |
| 148 | 00341 | STP | GALLACHER | FUNDING FOR STATE AND TERRITORIES | How much of the funding do you distribute to states and territories? Can you provide a breakdown of funding for each state and territory? Is this funding attached to specific programs? If so can you provide the detail of each of these programs? | WRITTEN 16/06/17 | |
| 149 | 000342 | STP | GALLACHER | PROGRAMS, REGULATIONS AND LEGISLATION | Can the Road Safety division identify all the programs, regulations, and legislation that you preside over? | WRITTEN 16/06/17 | |
| Local Government and Territories (4) | | | | | | | |
| 150 | 000276 | LGT | MCCARTHY / GALLACHER | RDA REVIEW | Senator McCARTHY: What has been the cost of the RDA review? Ms Middleton: We would have to take that on notice. ... Senator GALLACHER: Did you have a budget for the review? Was there a budgeted amount that would be set aside to conduct this review? Mr Dreezer: I am not aware of the budget. I wasn't part of the team that formulated the budget. We would have to take that on notice for you. ... Senator McCARTHY: Does anyone else on the table have figures? | 129 23/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------|-----|----------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>Senator GALLACHER: We do not come here to swap goodwill; we come here to get factual figures about expenditure. I find it extraordinary that, out of the line of questioning, when it comes down to it: we cannot see the report, it will not be published and now you will not tell us how much it cost.</p> <p>Ms Spence: We will take the final amount on notice. It was under \$50,000, as I recall.</p> | | |
| 151 | 000277 | LGT | MCCARTHY | RDA REVIEW EXPENDITURE | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Can you tell me just where Mr Smith travelled as part of the review?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: I think we will have to take on notice to give you the full program of Mr Smith's travel and consultations.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Over that three-month period, that would be very good.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Yes.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: What was the cost of Mr Smith's work?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Essentially, Ms Spence has given you what we—</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: That was under \$50,000 for the whole review, which I suspect—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: That was predominantly his costs—both payments and travel.</p> <p>Senator McCARTHY: Under \$50,000. But you will get that confirmed in totality—the breakdown.</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: That is right.</p> <p>Senator Nash: We will get back to you with the figure.</p> | 130 23/05/17 | |
| 152 | 000278 | LGT | MCCARTHY | ORIMA | <p>Senator McCARTHY: Orima Research, an independent research company, has been contracted to conduct an online survey and provide the results to inform the independent review of the RDA program. What was the cost of that work?</p> <p>Ms Middleton: We would have to take that on notice, too.</p> | 130 23/05/17 | |
| 153 | 000335 | LGT | RHIANNON | FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE TORRES STRAIT ISLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Federal government make a financial contribution to the Torres Strait Island Regional Council to directly compensate for the administrative burden on local government as day-to-day managers of Traditional Visitor movements? Does the Federal government make a financial contribution to Torres Strait Island Regional Council to directly compensate for the infrastructure and services impacts on local government as hosts of Traditional Visitors? | WRITTEN 8/06/17 | |
| Western Sydney Unit (7) | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|--------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| 154 | 000319 | WSU | STERLE | JOB AT WSA | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What guaranteed percentage of jobs at the Western Sydney Airport will be for residents of Western Sydney in the construction phase of the airport? 2. The Government states there are 3000 construction jobs being generated by WSA – what is the breakdown of those jobs, for instance how many are in road work/upgrades, terminal construction, earthworks, and any other categories. Does that estimate include the jobs for construction of the business park and other structures in the airport precinct? | WRITTEN 7/06/17 | |
| 155 | 000320 | WSU | STERLE | MERGE POINT OVER THE BLUE MOUNTAINS | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The EIS specifies “no single merge point” over the Blue Mountains. Will there be any merge points over the Blue Mountains? If so, how many? 2. What percentage of incoming flights will need to traverse the corridor above the Blue Mountains? | WRITTEN 7/06/17 | |
| 156 | 000322 | WSU | STERLE | BUSINESS CASE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF WSA | When will the Department finalise the business case for the construction on WSA? | WRITTEN 7/06/17 | |
| 157 | 000323 | WSU | STERLE | MODELLING ON THE IMPACTS OF VEHICLE MOVEMENTS | Has modelling been done on the impacts of vehicle movements to and from WSA on the M4, heading east and west? What does that modelling show? | WRITTEN 7/06/17 | |
| 158 | 000324 | WSU | STERLE | FLIGHT PATH DESIGN FOR WSA | <p>Part B, Chapter 7 of the Western Sydney Airport EIS states the following:</p> <p><i>"The Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development will be responsible for delivering the flight path design for the proposed Western Sydney Airport, working in close collaboration with Airservices Australia and the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA). The proposed airspace design arrangements will be formally referred under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act). CASA would ultimately approve the proposed airspace management arrangements, including the authorisation of final flight paths, before the commencement of operations."</i></p> <p>Question: What steps has the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development taken to develop:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Air Routes b. Arrival and Departure Procedures | WRITTEN 8/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|--------|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| | | | | | <p>c. Instrument and Visual Approach Procedures for Western Sydney Airport?</p> <p>d. What involvement has Air Service Australia had in this work?</p> <p>How does the government intend that these will be developed? What is and will be the involvement of private sector organisations in this and related airspace design?</p> <p>If this work is being undertaken by private sector organisations, what process has the Department followed for the issue of tenders and selection of contractors and consultants in this respect?</p> | | |
| 159 | 000325 | WSU | STERLE | <p>VIABLE INSTRUMENTS AND VISUAL FLIGHT PROCEDURES FOR BANKSTOWN AIRPORT</p> | <p>1. There is considerable concern amongst operators of general aviation aircraft at Bankstown Airport as to the future of that airport if instrument approach and departure procedures are withdrawn, as doing so would affect the viability of scores of businesses, employing hundreds of people. What action is the Department taking to effect the following statement at section 7.4.1 (Part B, Chapter 7) of the EIS?</p> <p><i>“...an airspace design could be implemented for single runway operations at the proposed airport without changing the current design and flight path structure for Sydney Airport or Bankstown Airport”</i></p> <p>If the Department is not taking any action to secure viable instrument and visual flight procedures for Bankstown Airport, when and how will it communicate with stakeholders who have made investments at that location? If the Department is taking action in this respect, how is the stakeholder consultation and technical concept and detailed design work being undertaken?</p> <p>2. Has the Department reached any understanding with Sydney Metro Airports (BAC Holdco) for continuation of instrument and visual flight operations at Bankstown Airport, given that the lease held by latter has more than 35 years to run? If so, what is that understanding? If not, when does the Department propose to consult with Sydney Metro Airports and its sub-lessees in relation to the continuing viability of their investments?</p> | <p>WRITTEN 8/06/17</p> | |
| 160 | 000326 | WSU | STERLE | <p>WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT AIRSPACE AND FLIGHT PROCEDURES AT</p> | <p>Section 7.3 (Part B, Chapter 7) of the EIS indicates three models with differing levels of ongoing operations at Bankstown Airport once Western Sydney Airport commences operations. Model 1 appears to imply no change to the viability of instrument flight at Bankstown Airport, whilst Models 2 and 3 are predicated on</p> | <p>WRITTEN 8/06/17</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|-----|----------|----------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| | | | | BANKSTOWN AIRPORT | <p>the withdrawal of those types of operations. The source document for this analysis, “<i>Western Sydney Airport Preliminary Airspace Management Analysis Final Report 10 April 2015</i>” heavily qualified the viability of Model 1 at page 28, section 7, as follows:</p> <p><i>"IFR operations at BK will reduce the capacity at WSA on runway 23. The influence of BK IFR operations at WSA does not present as a consistent hourly impact. For example, existing BK arrival traffic typically peak in the evening.</i></p> <p><i>Analysis indicates that if BK was confined to VFR operations only, WSA could realise full capacity of 50 movements per hour for both runway 05 and 23."</i></p> <p>Question: when and how will the Department publicly communicate the true effect of its decisions in relation to Western Sydney Airport airspace and flight procedures on Bankstown Airport?</p> <p>Is the Department undertaking further study or analysis by portfolio agencies or through external consultants?</p> <p>What instructions or requests has the Department made to the CASA Office of Airspace Regulation, external private sector consultants or service providers, and/or Airservices Australia, in relation to further airspace and flight procedure design for Bankstown Airport to accommodate the requirements of Western Sydney Airport?</p> <p>If it has not done so, why?</p> <p>If it has, which agencies or external consultants have been instructed or engaged, and on what terms?</p> | | |
| National Capital Authority (1) | | | | | | | |
| 161 | 000333 | NCA | RHIANNON | WEST BASIN BUILDING ESTATE | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has there been a heritage or social impact study for the West Basin Building Estate? 2. Has the National Capital Authority approved the Foreshore Development despite the lack of these studies? 3. Given the expense of the bridging of Parkes Way (part of CttL), there was supposed to be a revised masterplan for the West Basin Building Estate with a revised bridging of Parkes Way. Has that master plan be released for public | WRITTEN 8/06/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-----------|---------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | | consultation? | | |
| | | | | | 4. Given the public distress about the proposed West Basin Building Estate will the NCA undertake or enforce a review of the CttL West Basin to address extensive public concerns before the proposal that obliterates parkland in West Basin commences? If not, why not? | | |
| Executive (4) | | | | | | | |
| 162 | 000188 | EXECUTIVE | URQHART | SEWERAGE AND STORMWATER - LAUNCESTON | <p>Senator URQUHART: Going to TasWater and sewerage issues, I noted that there were issues surrounding these questions in the February estimates and that questions on notice were answered by the water division with a response from Treasury. I want to ask them here in the first instance because they relate to Infrastructure Australia's work priority projects list, so I will kick off and—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: We need to take them on notice. Infrastructure Australia has left for the day. We can take on notice questions for you.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: All right, I will go through the questions because I thought this would have been under the investment—</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: No, Infrastructure Australia was on this morning.</p> <p>Senator URQUHART: Yes, I know that, but I thought these questions would have fitted under investment. Maybe if I ask them and, if you cannot answer them, we can get the answers from the others. I noted that on Infrastructure Australia's list of priority projects published in January this year it identifies, as a proposed initiative, the Tasmanian sewerage infrastructure upgrades. Has the minister or the department been contacted by TasWater or the Tasmanian government for Commonwealth funding for water and sewerage infrastructure in Tasmania?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Not to this portfolio that I am aware, but there may have been approaches to the water portfolio. I will take that on notice.</p> | 71 22/05/17 | |
| 163 | 000196 | EXECUTIVE | URQHART | SEWERAGE AND STORMWATER - LAUNCESTON | <p>Senator URQUHART: I also note that the City of Launceston has a combined sewerage and stormwater system without separation of sewerage and stormwater outflows. Has any material been supplied to the federal government as to the likely cost of separating sewerage and stormwater within the City of Launceston?</p> <p>Mr Mrdak: Again, I will take that on notice and seek advice from my colleagues in water and the Prime Minister's department.</p> | 71 22/05/17 | |
| 164 | 000197 | EXECUTIVE | URQHART | SEWERAGE AND STORMWATER - | Senator URQUHART: Is there any material to suggest that separating sewerage and stormwater within the City of Launceston will have an effect upon the incidence of | 71 22/05/17 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|---------|--|---|----------------|--|
| | | | | LAUNCESTON | discharge of raw sewage in breach of environmental obligations? Mr Mrdak: Again, I will take that on notice. | | |
| 165 | 000198 | EXECUTIVE | URQHART | SEWERAGE AND STORMWATER - LAUNCESTON | Senator URQUHART: Has the federal government received any submissions as to the likely increase in sewage volume to the system and the capacity for the Launceston sewerage system to cope with anticipated increases in volume? Mr Mrdak: Again I will take that on notice with the water department. | 71 22/05/17 | |