

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 15
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000013

Program: 1.1
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Infrastructure Investment Program allocations 2019-20 onwards
Proof Hansard Page: 35 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: Sure. So, of that nearly \$8 billion—the \$7,982 million that has been allocated—can you tell us what projects you have allocated that money to?

Mr Mrdak: Certainly. I can give you the numbers—firstly, on 2019-20, what the projected spend is, which falls within that year. We can take the balance on notice for you and I will try to get that to you as quickly as possible this morning.

Mr Thomann: The predicted spend for the Infrastructure Investment Program is now \$4.084 billion. Along with the addition of the Financial Assistance Grants for local roads components, the number you would see in MYEFO for 2019-20 would be \$4.947 billion.

Senator STERLE: That is part of the FAGs?

Mr Thomann: With the addition of the local roads component of FAGs, that brings that number up to \$4.947 billion. You will see that number in the infrastructure table—payments to the states—in the MYEFO update.

Mr Mrdak: In relation to projects beyond the forward estimates, we will take that on notice and come back to you as quickly as we can. But, as I said, it involves some large commitments such as Bruce Highway and also some other projects which are extending beyond 2020.

Answer:

Refer to Question Number 75.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 16
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000015

Program: Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Bruce Highway contingency
Proof Hansard Page: 35-36 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Mr Mrdak: Following the adjustments made in MYEFO, there are no longer any contingency amounts remaining in 2016-17.

Senator STERLE: Is that usual?

Mr Mrdak: It is not unusual. Governments have effectively committed the funds in the program.

Senator STERLE: So there is no more commitment there—no more funding. Can you tell us what the contingency is for the Bruce Highway even though you have touched on it?

Mr Mrdak: The unallocated component?

Senator STERLE: Yes.

Mr Mrdak: I will get that for you.

Answer:

The Australian Government remains committed to the 10-year Bruce Highway Upgrade Programme and is on track to deliver all projects within the package.

The Australian Government together with the Queensland Government is looking into options for future priorities on the Bruce Highway to which funding can be allocated within the existing funding envelope.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 17
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000016

Program: Infrastructure Investment Programme
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Queensland and Bruce Highway contingency
Proof Hansard Page: 36 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: Let us do Queensland overall as well. There are a couple of projects in there, aren't there—the Midland Highway?

Mr Mrdak: There is a range of programs in Queensland. There is only a component of the Queensland funding which is Bruce Highway. That remains unallocated in Queensland. I will get that number for you. As I said, it is allocated to the extent that it is committed to the Bruce Highway program, but it is not committed at this stage to specific projects beyond what has been announced in the program to date.

Senator STERLE: It is just a little pot there in case.

Mr Mrdak: I will see if Mr Pittar can help you, otherwise we will take it on notice and come back to you.

Senator STERLE: I am happy for you to take it on notice. All I stress is that, if you are to take it on notice, can you come back before the close of the day?

Mr Mrdak: That would probably be best. Rather than tying up your time now, we will try to get that to you through the course of the day.

Senator STERLE: And we are not tying up officers for weeks on end.

Mr Mrdak: It is best if we take it on notice.

Answer:

See Committee Number 16.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 18
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000017

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: NorthLink WA – Swan Valley Bypass - milestones
Proof Hansard Page: 37 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: I will not dwell too much on it, because, to be honest with you—and Senator Back will back me up here—it is not hard for governments to sharpen the pencil when there is no bloody work over there. Let us move on to another angle then. As you stated, the federal government or the department will pass on payments when milestones are achieved. You did allude to that and we understand that is the case. Can I put this to you, Mr Pittar: in terms of the Swan Valley bypass, have all of the state government's milestones been met—all of them that you were expecting in this time period?

Mr Pittar: We would pay on the basis of milestones. I do not have all of the milestones—

Senator STERLE: You made that very clear.

Mr Pittar: I do not have the milestones in front of me.

Senator STERLE: I do not want to be here until midnight. You have made that very clear. I am quite happy if you—if you do not give me the answer I am looking for, I am not going to cry. But let us just get straight to the point if we can, just so that we do not get sick of each other's voices. Have they been met?

Mr Pittar: As far as I am aware, Senator. I do not have the milestones sitting in front of me.

Senator STERLE: Could you please find out for us?

Mr Pittar: I can.

Senator STERLE: Thank you. Can you tell us when the project should be or is expected to be completed?

Mr Pittar: The Swan Valley bypass?

Senator STERLE: Yes.

Mr Pittar: We expect construction to conclude in 2019.

Senator STERLE: Is that the beginning or the end or anything closer?

Mr Pittar: At the moment I have 2019.

Senator STERLE: All right. When you come back with the milestones and where we are at, that might give us a clue. Can I move on—

Answer:

The Australian Government has made payments for the Swan Valley Bypass project based on the achievement of the following milestones agreed with the Western Australian Government:

- Complete ultimate planning concept – April 2015;
- Complete business case – September 2015;
- Completion of planning work – April 2016; and
- Contract award central section – December 2016.

The project is expected to be completed by September 2019.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 19

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000019

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Great Western Highway

Proof Hansard Page: 39 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: Is it easy for you to table that to show us? All I was asking was what was expected to be spent, what was promised to be spent and what actually has been spent to 2016-17.

Mr Mrdak: Certainly, we can do that for the Great Western Highway.

Senator STERLE: And where are we with milestones. Do you want to do that on notice or do you just want to throw it at me now?

Mr Mrdak: I think it is better if we do it on notice because that way we can actually give you the individual projects. In a program like Great Western, you are actually talking about a number of projects. What New South Wales has done, as you know well through other jurisdictions, is look at a section of road—say, Lithgow to Katoomba—and highlight some critical safety or productivity functions and they will do work at those locations as part of an overall program. We will get you the details of that.

Senator STERLE: Could I expect those details this afternoon? Is that unreasonable for me to think that?

Mr Mrdak: We will try, but I suspect that, given the amount of projects, it is probably going to be one that I would give to you in writing.

Answer:

The Australian Government committed \$200 million towards the \$250 million upgrade of the Great Western Highway between Katoomba and Lithgow. As at February 2017, \$54.77 million is still to be paid.

In 2016-17, the Australian Government has made payments for the Great Western Highway project based on the achievement of the following milestones agreed with the NSW Government.

Forty Bends Upgrade – Completion of the slope treatment on retaining wall 58 and completion of the base – Oct 2016.

Hartley Valley Safety Works – Completion of 50% asphalt wearing course. Completion of cutting 3 slope treatments within section 6. Completion of retaining walls 1, 2, 3 and 4 within section 4 – Oct 2016.

Mt Victoria Village – Completion of key construction activities including completion of retaining wall 6, structural concrete works for retaining walls 1 and 2 completed, and sandstone facing being applied – August 2016.

Mt Victoria Village – Completion of retaining walls 1, 2 and 3 in section 2 – Oct 2016.

The project is expected to be completed in 2018-19.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 20

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000020

Program: Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Milestone Payments 2016-17, Pacific Highway, NSW

Proof Hansard Page: 40 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: Okay. Once again, if I can, I am going to try now so I do not have to put all of this work in the lunch break and then have six weeks of pain while we get to the other round of estimates and then questions all come in a flurry. Can you tell us why it has not met the projected spend so far? This is, once again, milestones.

Ms Leeming: We have not finished the financial year.

Senator STERLE: I am aware of that.

Ms Leeming: Probably the main reason that we have not spent half the funding, if you thought you would spend half the funding in half the financial year, is that there have been a number of large procurement packages that have just been let by RMS, so those milestones have only recently been met. That is probably the main reason. But the project is progressing well. I would not say that it has delays on it.

Mr Mrdak: No. It is one where work is progressing. Anyone who has driven the Pacific Highway recently would have seen large works packages underway. I think that at the moment our spend pro rata is about where it needs to be. But we will get you some details on that.

Answer:

The Australian Government has committed \$5.64 billion, from 2013-14 onwards, towards the upgrade of the Pacific Highway. Of the \$1,298.2 million allocation for 2016-17, \$515 million had been paid as at 28 February 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 21
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000014

Program: Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Bruce Highway
Proof Hansard Page: 43 (27 February 2017)

Senator Ludlam, Scott asked:

CHAIR: I am just wondering whether there is information you are going to provide. Where there is a variation to a date, you might need another column that says what the reason was.

Mr Mrdak: We will do that in terms of replying on notice where we can. Where we say a project is delayed is really when it starts to push out its estimated completion date.

Answer:

The Bruce Highway Upgrade Programme commenced in 2013-14 and is being delivered on schedule. The Programme is expected to be completed by 2022-23.

For details on each project within the Bruce Highway programme, including timelines, please go to www.investment.infrastructure.gov.au/funding/projects/brucehighway.aspx.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 22
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000021

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Perth Freight Link – Australian Government funding through the Asset Recycling Fund
Proof Hansard Page: 44 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: What was the basis for the calculation of the component of the Perth Freight Link funding that is provided under the Australian government's asset recycling initiative?

Mr Pittar: That component of funding is for the asset recycling fund, which is separate to the asset recycling initiative.

Senator STERLE: Was there any calculation on the component of the PFL for the other one you mentioned?

Mr Pittar: Funding for a number of projects came from that specific allocation.

Senator STERLE: Could you find them and let us know?

Mr Pittar: I would need to take that on notice. I have not got that off the top of my head.

Answer:

The Australian Government funding contribution to Perth Freight Link from the Asset Recycling Fund (Infrastructure Growth Package) is \$866 million. The remaining Australian Government funding commitment is provided through the Infrastructure Investment Programme (\$319.8 million).

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 23
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000022

Program: Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Perth Freight Link – Heavy vehicle charging
Proof Hansard Page: 44 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: No dramas. Thank you. As part of the Perth Freight Link, the state government has proposed a freight user charge. We talked about this earlier. Is this a condition for Commonwealth funding? I know you cannot tell me how much it is. That is the state government.

Mr Mrdak: The Commonwealth's involvement in the project was premised on the Western Australian government introducing a charging regime for the road. The charging regime for heavy vehicles was discussed prior to the project being supported. That is seen as a critical component of the project.

Senator STERLE: And what was the outcome? You are not going to tell me per vehicle, but I am sure there will be some sums hidden somewhere for an expectation of how much it is going to pull in daily, monthly and yearly.

Mr Mrdak: I do not think we have those figures with us in terms of what underpins the business case. But we can certainly take on notice what work has been done.

Answer:

The Perth Freight Link Business Case remains the property of the Western Australian Government and the release of specific information on the heavy vehicle user charge and traffic modelling underpinning that business case would be a matter for the Western Australian Government.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 24
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000023

Program: Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Perth Freight Link – legal costs
Proof Hansard Page: 45 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: Thank you for that, Mr Mrdak. Exactly how much did this cost the taxpayers with the lawyers, including the SC, in the two years and nine months with the combination of airfares, other personnel working on the case and whatever costs were associated to block the freedom of information application that Ms MacTiernan had put in? Can you supply me that, please?

Mr Mrdak: I will take that on notice.

Senator STERLE: If you take it on notice, could you have it back to me in an hour, Mr Mrdak?

Mr Mrdak: I do not think that is going to be possible in an hour. I will do my best to have that to you by close of business tonight. If that is not possible, then I will table it back to the committee as soon as I can.

Senator STERLE: Thank you. Could you break it up into every single external dollar cost to taxpayers?

Mr Mrdak: Certainly.

...

Senator STERLE: I have a question for you to take on notice. Mr Mrdak, did you have any luck with my request for the cost of the FOI on the Perth Freight Link?

Mr Mrdak: I will check during the dinner break and come back to you straight after dinner, if I can

Senator STERLE: thanks, Mr Mrdak.

...

Senator STERLE: I am wondering, Mr Mrdak, how you went with my FOI information—costings, accommodation, travel, staff, legals, everything. How did you go?

Mr Mrdak: Sorry. I still have teams working on it. I will try and get it tonight.

...

Mr Mrdak: While we are waiting for the new agency, Senator Sterle asked me a question earlier today in relation to legal costs of the FOI. I am advised by my officers that we are trying to compile that information. The invoices are not all received as yet from the legal firms. I will take that on notice and aim to have a full answer when we respond on notice.

Answer:

The Department has handled the freedom of information application in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

The total cost of Ms MacTiernan's Freedom of Information application as at 15 March 2017 is \$271,203.68, consisting of legal (\$268,215.36), travel (\$2,340.19), and accommodation (\$648.13) expenses.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 25

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000024

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments

Proof Hansard Page: 50 (27 February 2017)

Senator Urquhart, Anne asked:

Senator URQUHART: Thanks very much. I have some questions on the Hobart airport roundabout—some storage issues and a couple of other things—so I will try to get through quickly. I understand that the government has committed \$24 million for a grade separation to replace the Hobart airport roundabout. Is that commitment still \$24 million?

Mr Mrdak: Yes.

Senator URQUHART: When does the government expect construction to begin on that project?

Mr Mrdak: I will just see if we have those details with us.

Ms Leeming: The Hobart airport roundabout was an election commitment. The Tasmanian government has agreed on the election commitments with the Commonwealth. A number of election commitments are starting to be progressed. That is not one that has started to be progressed as yet owing to the fact that there are complexities with that project, as I understand it—I do not have great detailed knowledge of it—with access to airport land, for example.

Senator URQUHART: So you do not have a timeframe for that?

Ms Leeming: We do not have a timeframe as yet. As soon as I become aware of one, I am sure I can brief the committee. But it is progressing and we are having some conversations both with our airport's branch and our infrastructure branch with the state government.

Answer:

The Tasmanian Government has commenced planning on the project and construction is expected to commence in late 2018.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 26
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000025

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Commonwealth and Tasmanian Government funding proportions – Hobart Airport Roundabout project
Proof Hansard Page: 50 (27 February 2017)

Senator Urquhart, Anne asked:

Senator URQUHART: I understand that the costs will be shared between the federal and state governments. Has the Commonwealth government approached the Tasmanian government about funding that commitment yet?

Ms Leeming: We have agreed funding commitments.

Senator URQUHART: Can you tell me what the proportion of that is?

Ms Leeming: I might have to take that on notice, sorry, Senator.

Senator URQUHART: Are you able to get back to me today?

Ms Leeming: Yes.

Answer:

The Tasmanian Government has confirmed its commitment of \$6 million towards the Hobart Airport Roundabout project. The Australian Government has committed \$24 million towards this project.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 27
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000028

Program: n/a
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Funding Approval Process for Infrastructure Projects over \$100 million
Proof Hansard Page: 54 (27 February 2017)

Senator Ludlam, Scott asked:

Senator LUDLAM: Maybe, Senator Nash, you might want to take this if it strays into policy. The coalition made an election commitment that any infrastructure project receiving more than \$100 million in federal funding would require a full public business case to be conducted and a full public cost-benefit analysis to be conducted. Is that still formal government policy?

Senator Nash: I would need to take that on notice. I am sorry, but it is not part of my portfolio. I would need some advice.

Answer:

The Australian Government's policy is that Infrastructure Australia must evaluate all infrastructure proposals where Commonwealth funding support of \$100 million or more is being sought. This includes economic and social infrastructure proposals but excludes defence proposals.

Infrastructure Australia publishes its assessments on its web-site: www.infrastructureaustralia.gov.au.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 28
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000029

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Perth Freight Link – benefit cost analysis
Proof Hansard Page: 55 (27 February 2017)

Senator Ludlam, Scott asked:

Senator LUDLAM: The nub of the question, I guess, is this commitment, which you have now on two occasions confirmed is still current policy. There has been no published business case or CBA for the Roe Highway project. I just wonder why we have strayed so far out of the guidelines. On how many other occasions have you funded a project without publishing those materials?

Mr Mrdak: I will just check.

Mr Pittar: We have a public form of a business case that was released in December 2014. Infrastructure Australia has also assessed the full business case and released its findings on that full business case.

Senator LUDLAM: And the same goes for the cost-benefit analysis. There is summary material available, but as for the business case, there is no way to independently evaluate how you have weighted various factors that you clearly believe stack up. There is obviously a huge amount of public scepticism, not just amongst residents but people who do this stuff for a living. It would greatly assist if those materials were put into the public domain, as is government policy. Getting a top line benefit-cost analysis ratio does not tell us anything about how weightings were used to arrive at that particular number.

Mr Mrdak: I well understand. Let me take on notice that question.

Answer:

A significant amount of information on the Perth Freight Link project, including information on the economic analysis, has been made publicly available. This includes the business case summary and other material released by the Western Australian Government, available at www.project.mainroads.wa.gov.au/perthfreightlink/newsinfo/Pages/default.aspx. The Perth Freight Link business case is the property of the Western Australian Government. The release of the Perth Freight Link business case is therefore a matter for the Western Australian Government.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 29
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000030

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Ocean Reef Road and Wanneroo Road interchange – business case
Proof Hansard Page: 61 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: During the last year's federal election, the government also committed \$20 million towards the upgrade of the intersection between Ocean Reef Road and Wanneroo Road. Can the department table the business case or the funding submission for this project?

Mr Pittar: We do not have that. My understanding is that WA is currently working on the concept design for that project as well.

Senator STERLE: So there is no business case that you have?

Mr Pittar: I am not aware of one. I would need to check. I do not believe so.

Answer:

The WA Government has not yet provided a business case to the Australian Government.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 30
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000031

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Yanchep rail extension
Proof Hansard Page: 62 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: In the last five years, has the department received any request from the Western Australian government for federal funding for any of the following projects: The Yanchep rail extension?

Mr Pittar: I might have to take some of these on notice.

Mr Mrdak: In relation to that, yes, there have been discussions held. A number of developers in that area have had discussions with ministers and the local member in relation to opportunities for Yanchep development.

Senator STERLE: Can you give us an update on how that is going?

Mr Mrdak: We are yet to see any details on any specific proposal from the Western Australian government. It is part of their long-term rail strategy set out in their transport master plan.

Senator STERLE: Is this the same one they had at the last election and the election before? Do not answer.

Mr Mrdak: It is the one that was released last year.

Answer:

The Department has no additional information to add to the response provided by Mr Mrdak.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 31
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000032

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Interest owed to the Commonwealth from the WestConnex concessional loan
Proof Hansard Page: 64-65 (27 February 2017)

Senator McCarthy, Malrmdirri asked:

Senator McCARTHY: Thank you, Mr Danks. So what is the interest bill thus far on that \$400 million of debt?

Mr Danks: I am not sure I have that level of detail here. I can take that on notice.

Answer:

As at 27 February 2017, the total amount of interest owed to the Commonwealth on the WestConnex concessional loan was \$3.3 million.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 32
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000033

Program: n/a
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Asset Recycling Expenditure
Proof Hansard Page: 67 (27 February 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

Senator RICE: How much of the allocation towards asset recycling was spent and how much was not spent? What got reabsorbed back into the budget bottom line?

Mr Mrdak: I would have to take that on notice. I do not have those details with me.

Answer:

The Asset Recycling Initiative (ARI) is a Treasury programme. Information concerning ARI can be found at: www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/npa/infrastructure.aspx.

Any further questions about the ARI should be sought from the Department of the Treasury.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 33

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000034

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Active transport projects funded under Regional Programmes

Proof Hansard Page: 68-69 (27 February 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

Senator RICE: You will probably need to take this on notice. Do you have an analysis of how much, through these community programs, funding is being provided for active transport projects through those funding streams?

Mr Mrdak: We would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

Through the Community Development Grants Programme, National Stronger Regions Fund and Stronger Communities Programme the Government has invested \$34.4 million to walking and bike paths and pedestrian connectivity.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 34
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000035

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Infrastructure Investment Funding
Proof Hansard Page: 69 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

ACTING CHAIR: Is it true that over the forward estimates Victoria will be receiving less federal funding than every other state on mainland Australia?

Mr Mrdak: I would have to check that.

Answer:

No. This is not true.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 35
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000036

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Sun Herald Report re \$750 million funding offer for Western Distributor
Proof Hansard Page: 71 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

ACTING CHAIR: Can you now tell us about the Prime Minister's claim in the Herald Sun on 17 December last year that the Commonwealth had offered Victoria \$750 million. Is that true?

Mr Mrdak: I am not familiar with that article, I am sorry. I would have to go and look at that.

Answer:

The Department is not aware of such an offer.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 36
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000037

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Assessment of an East West Link by Infrastructure Australia
Proof Hansard Page: 72-73 (27 February 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

ACTING CHAIR: What was Infrastructure Australia's assessment of the East West Link project?

Mr Mrdak: I would have to refresh my memory. I think it did list the project. I believe it was a priority or a high priority project, but I would need to take that on notice and come back to you. I will just get someone to check.

Senator RICE: I thought \$1.5 billion had been allocated to a range of projects.

Mr Mrdak: So \$1.5 billion had been prepaid effectively by the Australian government. The Australian government's commitment is on top of that. It will provide a further \$3 billion should the project proceed further. There were two commitments. There was \$1.5 billion and then a subsequent commitment of \$1.5 billion for the second stage. That \$1.5 billion that was paid to Victoria has now been reallocated to other projects.

Senator RICE: So even though that \$1.5 billion has been reallocated, the federal government is still saying they would commit a total of \$3 billion if the project was built?

Mr Mrdak: That is correct. An additional \$3 billion. We will take that on notice. It certainly appeared on their list, but it has been removed now that the project is not being proceeded with at the moment. So I will come back to you with the IA ranking and when that was done.

Answer:

In 2010 and 2011, Infrastructure Australia (IA) assessed the Western Section of the East West Link (formerly known as Westlink) as a 'real potential' initiative that clearly addresses a nationally significant issue.

In 2012, and again in 2013, IA also assessed the Eastern Section of the East West Link as a 'real potential' initiative.

In 2015, IA identified the east-west corridor as one of Melbourne's major congestion challenges in its Australian Infrastructure Audit.

IA has continued to identify an improved east-west connection as a 'near term', 'high priority initiative', including in its most recent *Infrastructure Priority List*, released on 25 February 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 37

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000038

Program: Infrastructure Investment Programme and Northern Australia Roads Programme

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Funding for the Outback Way

Proof Hansard Page: 75 (27 February 2017)

Senator McCarthy, Malrindirri asked:

Senator McCARTHY: Mr Mrdak, what is the total federal funding commitment to this project with the Outback Way in terms of the road and tracks between Winton in Queensland and Laverton in Western Australia via Alice Springs?

....

Senator McCARTHY: So how much funding has been spent and how many kilometres of previously unsealed road has been sealed?

Mr Pittar: I may have to come back to you on that one.

Senator McCARTHY: On the sealing of roads, could you just give us some costs? Given that it covers two states and a territory, what are the costs per kilometre of sealing the roads?

Mr Pittar: I do not believe I can give you anything that is particularly accurate in terms of costs for sealing the roads because the roads are often in very different stages of condition. So we are aware that some of the roads in the NT, for example, are a lot lower than the surrounding countryside. So before you can seal it, you need to build the road up to be at least at the same level as the surrounding countryside. Otherwise they will just flood. So the cost of getting them to a point where you could seal them would be higher than, say, a road that had the formation at least at ground level. So the costs would vary considerably depending on, if you like, the base at which you are starting.

Senator McCARTHY: I appreciate, Mr Pittar, that there is different geography and landscapes along the way. But just in terms of the figures, you must have an idea—if you cannot, you can take it on notice—of the costs. You must be able to give the committee some idea of costings irrespective of the landscape and the terrain.

Mr Pittar: It depends very much on what you are starting with. We can perhaps give some indicative costs, taking some assumptions into account. I do not have those figures with me.

Mr Thomann: I think what my colleague Mr Pittar is trying to say is there is a significant variation in the cost per kilometre because across this length of road there are significant variations in the condition of the road. Some sections are sealed. Some sections are a single bitumen seal.

Senator McCARTHY: I appreciate that.

Mr Thomann: So we would probably have to take it on notice and give you a bit of an indication maybe section by section.

Answer:

The Australian Government has made three separate commitments to the Outback Way, totalling \$170 million, across Queensland, the Northern Territory and Western Australia. This includes the 2016 election commitment of \$100 million; the 2016 funding announcement through the Northern Australia Roads Programme of \$28 million; and the current Infrastructure Investment Programme commitment of \$42 million.

Almost 200 kilometres of the Outback Way will be sealed under the current \$42 million Australian Government commitment (a total project cost of \$75.75 million).

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 38

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000039

Program: Northern Australia Roads programmes

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Programme status

Proof Hansard Page: 76-77 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: All right. I want to finish mine and then we can get on. Let us talk about the Northern Australia Beef Roads Programme while we are up in that part of the world. Let us stay up there. Is the department able to tell us of the 15 priority projects announced by the minister last October how many of them are currently underway, if any?

Mr Pittar: At this stage, we have project proposal reports, I believe, for three projects, which are the forerunner for construction to start.

Senator STERLE: Which three are they, Mr Pittar?

Mr Pittar: I do not know if I have that information in front of me. I believe that they are Queensland projects at the moment. I do not have the detail of which projects they are.

Senator STERLE: All right. If can you find out which ones they are, give the costs. You know how to do it. And when they are starting.

Mr Pittar: Sorry?

Senator STERLE: Come back to us with which three projects they are, how much they cost, when are they starting and when they are going to be finished, please.

Mr Pittar: Yes.

Senator STERLE: Is the department able to tell us how many of the projects in the northern Australia roads program announced by the Deputy Prime Minister and the minister last September are currently underway?

Mr Pittar: I do not have that information. I do not believe that any of them are actually under construction at this stage. Again, they are going through the approvals stage as well, with requirements on states to come back agreeing to projects.

Senator STERLE: Let us just go with none at the moment. If there is any change, you will let us know. Is that easier?

Mr Pittar: Yes.

Answer:

As of 24 April 2017, the Department has received three Project Proposal Reports (PPR) seeking approval for six projects committed to under the \$100 million Northern Australia Beef Roads Programme:

Project Name	AG Contribution	Total Project Cost	Estimated Construction Commencement	Estimated Construction Completion
Diamantina Developmental Road (Boulia to Dajarra) Rehabilitation and Widening	\$4.03 million	\$5.03 million	Early-2018	Late-2018
Richmond to Winton – Progressive Sealing – Package One	\$2.97 million	\$3.71 million	Mid-2018	Late-2018
Richmond to Winton – Progressive Sealing – Package Two	\$0.80 million	\$0.99 million	Early-2019	Mid-2019

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Project Name	AG Contribution	Total Project Cost	Estimated Construction Commencement	Estimated Construction Completion
Clermont to Alpha Road – Progressive Sealing – Package One	\$2.0 million	\$2.5 million	Early-2018	Late-2018
Clermont to Alpha Road – Progressive Sealing – Package Two	\$4.01 million	\$5.01 million	Mid-2018	Early-2019
Clermont to Alpha Road – Progressive Sealing – Package Three	\$0.96 million	\$1.20 million	Early-2019	Mid-2019

The Department has received four PPR's seeking funding under the \$600 million Northern Australia Roads Programme. On 20 April 2017, the Australian Government announced its approval for all four projects as outlined below:

Project Name	AG Contribution	Total Project Cost	Estimated Construction Commencement	Estimated Construction Completion
Flinders Highway – Townsville to Torrens Creek	\$13.60 million	\$17.00 million	Mid-2017	Early-2019
Flinders Highway – Charters Towers to Richmond	\$20 million	\$25 million	Mid-2017	Late-2019
Kennedy Developmental Road – Mount Garnet to the Lynd	\$2.66 million	\$3.32 million	Mid-2017	Late-2017
Kennedy Developmental Road – The Lynd to Hughenden (Hann Highway)	\$40 million	\$50 million	Mid-2017	Early-2020

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 39
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000040

Program: Northern Australia Roads programmes
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Programme status
Proof Hansard Page: 77 (27 February 2017)

Senator Watt, Murray asked:

Senator WATT: I would like to recap a couple of things that Senator Sterle has just covered with you about the beef roads and Northern Australia Roads Programme, or NARP. I will just start with the beef roads program. You may have been about to go and get this information. You told the committee that, to the best of your knowledge, with the beef roads program there are three project proposal reports that are underway. Is that correct?

Mr Pittar: I did. I might need to correct what I said. I need to check whether we have project proposal reports for beef roads or the Northern Australia Roads Programme. I will leave that open until I can confirm that.

Senator WATT: So it could be one or the other?

Mr Pittar: It could be one or the other.

Answer:

Please refer to Committee Number 38.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 40
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000042

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Exclusion of MPs Electorates from the Building Better Regions Fund
Proof Hansard Page: 80-81 (27 February 2017)

Senator McCarthy, Malrmdirri asked:

Senator McCARTHY: This might be a question for the minister. Have there been any MPs who have made similar representations to you about the exclusion of their electorates or parts of their electorates from this program?

Senator Nash: Not that come immediately to mind. I am happy to take that on notice. There may have been one or two others. But just to be very clear, the boundaries have not changed. We have made it clear that after any of these types of programs run, we will review, obviously, the boundaries after round 1. But there have been no changes to the current boundaries.

Senator McCARTHY: I know you have taken the previous question on notice, but I want to put an example to you about a strong case put forward by the member for Wakefield regarding the exclusion of parts of his electorate from this program. Do you understand the geography of South Australia and that you have excluded the regional town of Gawler from this program?

Senator Nash: The individual towns, Senator, obviously are a matter I would need to look at. But I just need to be very, very clear that we have excluded the major metropolitan centres, and those boundaries will remain for round 1.

Answer:

Three Members of Parliament have written to Senator the Hon Fiona Nash, Minister for Regional Development, about the Building Better Regions Fund boundaries:

- The Hon Shayne Neumann MP, Member for Blair;
- Ms Rebekha Sharkie MP, Member for Mayo; and
- Mr Stephen Jones MP, Member for Whitlam.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 41
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000045

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Potential Conflicts of Interest for the Stronger Communities Programme
Proof Hansard Page: 82 (27 February 2017)

Senator McCarthy, Malrindirri asked:

Senator McCARTHY: Ms Zielke, how many MPs or applicants wrote to the department regarding potential conflicts of interest?

Ms Wall: I would have to take that on notice. I do not have that information with me today.

Senator McCARTHY: In these cases, how many actual conflicts of interest were identified? What steps did the department take to manage these?

Ms Zielke: We can take that on notice at the same time. I will note that they are potential conflicts of interest.

Senator McCARTHY: Did any grants proceed where a conflict of interest was identified?

Ms Zielke: Again, we can put that in the information.

Answer:

Six Members of Parliament and one member of a community committee wrote to the Department regarding potential conflicts of interest.

The Departmental delegate considered each declaration in accordance with the Department's Accountable Authority Instruction for probity. None were found to be material conflicts of interest.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 42
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000047

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Stronger Communities Programme projects proceeding
Proof Hansard Page: 82 (27 February 2017)

Senator McCarthy, Malrindirri asked:

Senator McCARTHY: Have all projects awarded grants under this program proceeded?

Ms Wall: There have been some that have withdrawn since approval. I would have to take it on notice with regard to the detail. We have had a number of projects where the scope has been changed slightly.

Senator McCARTHY: So how many?

Ms Wall: I would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

Four.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 43
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000049

Program: Community Development Grants
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Community Development Grants Programme
Proof Hansard Page: 84 (27 February 2017)

Senator McCarthy, Malrindirri asked:

Senator McCARTHY: Could you provide the committee with a list of projects and funding by electorate?

Mr Mrdak: Well, I can certainly take that on notice.

Senator McCARTHY: Sure.

Mr Mrdak: That is something I will have to refer to our minister.

Senator McCARTHY: Take that on notice. Are you able to speak about some of the projects, if I ask you about a few of them?

Mr Mrdak: We can certainly see what information we can provide at the table. Otherwise we will have to take it on notice.

Senator McCARTHY: It looks like there is a strong correlation between marginal seats and the amount of funding given. So the marginal Liberal seat of Gilmore, for example, has secured \$5.4 million in funding so far and yet the marginal Eden-Monaro got \$10,000. Is that correct?

Ms Zielke: I do not have that information with me. I am also conscious of what Mr Mrdak had previously advised—that some of the projects are still being assessed. So you would need the complete grouping to be able to make assessments like that.

Senator McCARTHY: I will give you that question on notice.

Mr Mrdak: Certainly.

Senator McCARTHY: So \$5.4 million for the seat of Gilmore. I beg your pardon; it is around \$10,000 for Eden-Monaro. It certainly looks like seats that are not coalition seats do not get as much. Is that a fair question?

Mr Mrdak: I am not in a position to give you an answer to that. I would have to look at specific instances, I am sorry.

Senator McCARTHY: If you could look at those examples of the seat of Gilmore and Eden-Monaro and the Victorian electorate of McEwan, that would be helpful.

Mr Mrdak: We will come back to you with projects that are being funded in those electorates.

Senator McCARTHY: And Corangamite as well, please.

Mr Mrdak: Certainly.

Answer:

A list of all announced contracted grants under the Community Development Grants Program can be found on the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development's Grants Reporting web page at:

www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/grants/index.aspx.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 44
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000051

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Mount Dandenong Tourism projects
Proof Hansard Page: 85 (27 February 2017)

Senator McCarthy, Malrmdirri asked:

Senator McCARTHY: No. That is separate again. There is \$2.5 million for the ridge walk connecting Tecoma to Montrose. There is Upwey to Montrose via Ferny Creek. You would know that, would you not? There is Mount Dandenong. There is \$10 million for the widening of the Mount Dandenong tourist road. Would they be tourism projects or yours?

Ms Wall: I will have to take that on notice.

Mr Mrdak: The road project is likely to be ours, I think.

Senator STERLE: It sounds like it, does it not? And there is a trail there, too, is there not?

Ms Wall: I do know that I have a number of trail projects, but I would have to take it on notice because this is one of them.

Answer:

Shire of Yarra Ranges has received an election commitment for \$2.5 million for the Ridgetop Walk project. The project will be delivered through the Community Development Grants programme.

The Australian Government has committed \$10 million to the Mount Dandenong Tourist Road Upgrade project under the Infrastructure Investment Programme. The project scope and schedule for the upgrade is currently being developed by the Victorian Government.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 45
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000052

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Moorebank Intermodal Terminal
Proof Hansard Page: 85 (27 February 2017)

Senator Rhiannon, Lee asked:

Senator RHIANNON: I want to ask questions about the Moorebank intermodal. What impact will the Moorebank intermodal have on future traffic systems and movements around Liverpool and the surrounding area?

Mr Mrdak: I will just get our officers to the table. Essentially, the traffic impacts were assessed as part of the environmental assessment and the planning assessment commission process. I do not have those details with us. We can certainly find for you the assessment details of traffic.

Senator RHIANNON: Could you supply that please, because I was interested in relooking at it considering some of the recent developments. Stage 1 incorporates an initial capacity of 250,000 TEUs. That is enormous. Then there are people who live there as well. How are you going to manage all that? Could you take that on notice?

Mr Mrdak: Certainly. We will provide you with the relevant sections of the environmental assessment.

Answer:

The traffic impacts were assessed as part of the environmental planning approvals process. The information is provided in the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (dated April 2015) which is Appendix E of the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal Response to Submissions Report (dated May 2015), which can be found at the following web page:

www.majorprojects.affinitylive.com/public/84067c2a7cc94095d7b8983db3324f74/Appendix%20E_%20Traffic%20and%20Transport%20Impact%20Assessment.pdf

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 46

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000053

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Moorebank Intermodal Terminal

Proof Hansard Page: 85-86 (27 February 2017)

Senator Rhiannon, Lee asked:

Senator RHIANNON: The government wears solely the surrounding infrastructure changes. That could become very costly, could it not, because the traffic issue seems to be becoming more contentious?

....

Mr Mrdak: I will get the details for you of what contribution to the infrastructure the key consortia along with the Moorebank company are making off terminal roads. I will get those details for you and then come back to you on that question.

Senator RHIANNON: That would be good. This is specific because I am staying with this transport issue. I notice that there is controversy. I understand that the new chair of MICL, Dr Schott, has said there was an error. I am referring to the statement that this project would take 3,000 heavy vehicles per day off the surrounding roads and possibly a section of the M5. I understand that she has now said that there is an error. Are you aware of those developments?

Mr Mrdak: I am not personally, I am sorry.

Senator RHIANNON: Is there anybody who works on the project who could comment on that and give us an update, really, about the analysis with regard to traffic?

Mr Collett: Senator, I would need to come back to you on notice with regard to the specifics on that. I do know that there was analysis which showed increases in the traffic around the site of the terminal and an overall significant decrease in the number of heavy vehicle kilometres travelled in Sydney more broadly. It is one of the things that goes. Mr Mrdak is talking about the state government's responsibilities in terms of the roads. A lot of the benefits that accrue in terms of taking heavy vehicles off the roads accrue across Sydney. The New South Wales state government would be the beneficiary, so to speak, in terms of the reduction on other roads. I do know that some of the analysis has suggested that during peak periods the traffic associated with the project would be around three per cent of the traffic on the M5.

....

Senator RHIANNON: I was looking at it in light of the EIS from the company. This is on page 5. It states that there were up to 3,000 fewer truck journeys to and from Port Botany each day, which has been used as a big seller of the project. But now that is under a cloud. Meanwhile, many locals are concerned about their own situation. I thought it would be useful to clarify that.

Mr Collett: Certainly, Senator, it would be useful to clarify it. I do not have the specifics of what the chair's comments related to, so we would need to come back to you on notice with the detail.

Answer:

As required in the project's Concept Proposal approval, the Moorebank Intermodal Company and its developer/operator Sydney Intermodal Terminal Alliance are currently working with NSW Roads and Maritime Services to determine the impact of future development stages on local roads. Project details are yet to be finalised.

Truck movements on the roads (including the M5 Motorway) surrounding the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal, which are addressed in the answer to Committee Number 45, are distinct from the truck movements to and from Port Botany. There is no error and no correction to the estimate that moving 1.05 million of Port Botany's containers by rail rather than by road would result in 3,000 fewer truck trips to and from Port Botany each day.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 47
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000054

Program: N/A
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Melbourne Metro Commonwealth Funding Background
Proof Hansard Page: 86 (27 February 2017)

Senator Rice, Janet asked:

Senator RICE: I want to have a final reprise. I know we have covered this during the day, but hopefully it will not take too long. Give us as a preliminary statement the history of engagement between Victoria and the federal government on funding for Melbourne metro.

Mr Mrdak: Well, I do not have a chronology with me. I am happy to try to provide you with that, if that would assist.

Senator RICE: Even if it is without the actual dates. It ended up that there was a request from the Victorian government. You have talked through it today. I just want to have it summarised.

Mr Mrdak: Essentially, as the Victorian government took office and made this their number one priority, in commissioning this project, they did seek Commonwealth funding support.

Senator RICE: And how much support did they seek from the Commonwealth?

Mr Mrdak: I would have to check, but they certainly did look at fifty-fifty funding for projects like the tunnels and the stations.

Answer:

In a letter to the Prime Minister dated 23 February 2016, the Premier of Victoria provided the project business case and requested funding of \$4.5 billion as the Australian Government contribution to the estimated total construction cost of \$10.9 billion.

On 8 April 2016, the Australian Government committed an initial \$10 million for a joint planning strategy to review elements of the project including route selection, preferred station locations and impacts on urban renewal to assist in informing further investment decisions.

In the 2016-17 Budget, the Australian Government committed a further \$857.2 million from the Asset Recycling Initiative (ARI) to support the project.

The Victorian Government did not accept the Commonwealth's \$10 million for a joint planning strategy or the ARI funding for the project.

On Wednesday 27 April 2016, the Victorian Government announced that it would fully fund the Melbourne Metro Project without assistance from the Commonwealth Government, committing \$2.9 billion to progress the project's construction.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 48
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000055

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Bass Highway – Westbury Road Intersection Upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Bass Highway – Westbury Road Intersection Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$400,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The project start date has not yet been determined.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 49
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000056

Program: Community Development Grants Programme
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Launceston General Safety Improvement Package project
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Launceston General Safety Improvement Package

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with Launceston General Safety Improvement Package?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$230,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The proponent is yet to provide the Department with a project commencement date.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 50
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000057

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Legana Local Road Upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Legana Local Road Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$2.8 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Construction is expected to commence in mid-2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 51

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000058

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to sealing Highland Lakes Road

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Sealing Highland Lakes Road Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$5 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Construction on the project is expected to commence in late 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 52
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000059

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Glen Road Upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Glen Road Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$1.45 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) The funding commitment is \$1.50 million.
- c) Construction on the project is expected to commence in late 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 53
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000060

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Industry Road upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Industry Road Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$2.4 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Construction on the project is expected to commence in late 2018.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 54

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000061

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Soldier Settlement Road upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Solider Settlement Road Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$2.1 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Construction on the project is expected to commence in late 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 55

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000062

Program: Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Upper Esk Road bridge upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Upper Esk Road Bridge Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$237,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) The 'Upper Esk Road Bridges Upgrade' project was completed by Break O'Day Council using council's own funds. An alternative project, 'Replacement of St Marys and Upper Scamander Bridges', has been proposed by Break O'Day Council and submitted for Government consideration. The proposal is currently being assessed by the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development.
- b) The funding commitment is \$300,000.
- c) Construction on the 'Replacement of St Marys and Upper Scamander Bridges' project is expected to commence in early to mid-2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 56

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000063

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Cove Hill bridge upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Cove Hill Bridge Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$800,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Construction on the project is expected to commence in early 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 57
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000064

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Saltwater bridge upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Saltwater Bridge Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$80,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) The funding commitment is \$100,000.
- c) Construction on the project is expected to commence in early 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 58

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000065

Program: Community Development Grants Programme

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Wild Mersey Mountain Bike Development

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the cycling trails in Wild Mersey Mountain Bike Development

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Cycling trails in Wild Mersey Mountain Bike Development?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$300,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The proponent estimates the construction start date to be 3 May 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 59
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000066

Program: Community Development Grants Programme
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Meander Valley Cycling Strategy
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Meander Valley cycling strategy

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Meander Valley Cycling Strategy?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$150,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The proponent is yet to provide the Department with a project commencement date.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 60

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000067

Program: Community Development Grants Programme

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Devonport Golf Club project

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the new function Centre for Devonport Golf Club

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Devonport Golf Club?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$3.5 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The project is expected to commence in July 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 61
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000069

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Bass Highway – Cooee and Wynyard Planning

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Bass Highway – Cooee and Wynyard Planning?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$500,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The Tasmanian government is currently developing the project, with planning expected to commence in late 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 62

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000070

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Carlton River bridge upgrade

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Carlton River Bridge Upgrade?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$1.2 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Construction on the project commenced in February 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 63

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000071

Program: Community Development Grants Programme

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Community Development Grants Programme

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Exeter Community Precinct

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Exeter Community Precinct?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$1 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The proponent is yet to provide the Department with a project commencement date.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 64

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000072

Program: Community Development Grants Programme

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Brighton CBD Revitalisation

Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Brighton CBD Revitalisation

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Brighton CBD Revitalisation?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$840,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The project is currently underway.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 65
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000073

Program: Community Development Grants Programme
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Redevelopment of Campbell Town War Memorial Oval Precinct
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the upgrade of the Campbell Town War Memorial Oval Precinct

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Campbell Town War Memorial Oval Precinct?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$750,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The project is currently underway.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 66
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000074

Program: 1.1 Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Tasmanian Election Commitments
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Bridport Western Access road

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Bridport Western Access Road?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$2.6 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) The funding commitment is \$1.90 million. In addition, the Tasmanian Government is contributing \$1 million and Dorset Council is contributing \$1.385 million to the project.
- c) Construction on the project is expected to commence in late 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 67
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000075

Program: Burnie City Council
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Upgrade of the Burnie Tennis Club
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to upgrading facilities at the Burnie Tennis Club

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Upgrade Facilities at the Burnie Tennis Club?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$391,000?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) This project was completed on 23 January 2017.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 68
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000076

Program: Community Development Grants Programme
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Community Development Grants Programme
Proof Hansard Page: Written (2 March 2017 Senator Urquhart and 8 March 2017 Senator Sterle)

Senator Urquhart, Anne and Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In regards to the Launceston City Heart

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Launceston City Heart Project?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$7.5 million?
- c) When does the Government expect this project to begin?

Answer:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The proponent is yet to provide the Department with a project commencement date.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 69
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000018

Program: Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Reallocation of savings
Proof Hansard Page: Written (8 March 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

When did the Government approve the reallocation of funding from the NorthLink project to the Kwinana Freeway widening project? What date did the Minister sign off on this reallocation?

Answer:

There has been no reallocation of funding to the Kwinana Freeway widening project from the NorthLink WA project.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 70

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000102

Program: Infrastructure Investment Programme

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Bruce Highway project funding

Proof Hansard Page: Written (8 March 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Can the Department detail the amount of Federal funding allocated to each year of the 10-year Bruce Highway Action Plan? Can the Department also list the projects to be funded as part of the Action Plan, including when work on each of them began/is expected to begin, and when work on each was completed/is expected to be completed?

Answer:

The *Bruce Highway Action Plan* is a Queensland Government plan, which was developed in 2012. The Australian Government has since committed to the 10-year programme of works on the Bruce Highway as part of the Infrastructure Investment Programme from 2013-14 to 2022-23.

For details on each project within the Bruce Highway programme, including timelines, please go to <http://investment.infrastructure.gov.au/funding/projects/brucehighway.aspx>.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 71

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000103

Program: Community Development Grants

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Projects to be delivered under the Community Development Grants Programme and Infrastructure Investment Programme

Proof Hansard Page: Written (8 March 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Three Capes Track

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to still proceed with the Three Capes Track completion?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$3.8 million?
- c) Under what program is it being funded?
- d) When does the Department expect this project to begin and be completed?

Puffing Billy

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to fund the upgrade the "iconic" Puffing Billy, including construction of all-weather facilities?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$6.5 million?
- c) Under what program is it being funded?
- d) When does the Department expect this project to begin and be completed?

Emerald-Cockatoo multi-use trail

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to fund the extension to the Emerald-Cockatoo multi-use trail to Gembrook?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$1 million?
- c) Under what program is it being funded?
- d) When does the Department expect this project to begin and be completed?

Ridge Walk

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to fund the Ridge Walk project, which would build a 25 kilometre walking path linking Upwey/Tecoma to Montrose via Kalorama, Olinda, Sassafras and Mt Dandenong?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$2.5 million?
- c) Under what program is it being funded?
- d) When does the Department expect this project to begin and be completed?

Mount Dandenong Tourist Road

- a) Can I confirm the Government plans to fund the widening of the Mount Dandenong Tourist Road to reduce congestion and improve safety?
- b) Is the funding commitment still \$10 million?
- c) Under what program is it being funded?
- d) When does the Department expect this project to begin and be completed?

Answer:

Three Capes Track

- a) Yes
- b) Yes.
- c) The project is being delivered under the Community Development Grants Programme.
- d) The project commenced construction in January 2017 and is expected to be completed by December 2019.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Puffing Billy

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The project is being delivered under the Community Development Grants Programme.
- d) It is anticipated that the project will commence construction in April 2018 and be completed by June 2019.

Emerald-Cockatoo multi-use trail

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) The project is being delivered under the Community Development Grants Programme.
- d) It is anticipated that the project will commence construction in September 2017 and be completed by January 2018.

Ridge Walk

- a) Yes
- b) Yes.
- c) The project is being delivered under the Community Development Grants Programme.
- d) It is anticipated that the project will commence construction in September 2018 and be completed by September 2019.

Mount Dandenong Tourist Road

- a) Yes
- b) Yes.
- c) The project is being delivered under the Infrastructure Investment Programme.
- d) The project scope and schedule for the upgrade is currently being developed by the Victorian Government.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 72

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000105

Program: Community Development Grants Programme

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Commitments being delivered under the Community Development Grants Programme

Proof Hansard Page: Written (8 March 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

1. Please provide a list of grant recipient organisations and their Federal electorate, where grants have been announced under the Community Development Grants Program and including the date of the grant announcement.
2. Please provide a list of grant recipient organisations and the federal electorates where grants have been contracted under the Community Development Grants Program.
3. Please confirm if this program is referred to in MYEFO as “Community Infrastructure Projects – new announcements” and the funding allocated to this program for the forward estimates.
4. Please outline the steps in the “value for money” assessment that the Department undertakes for projects selected by the Minister under this program.

Answer:

1. A list of all announced contracted grants under the Community Development Grants Program can be found on the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development’s Grants Reporting web page at: www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/grants/index.aspx.
2. See answer to Question 1.
3. Yes.

Funding allocations for the Community Development Grants for the forward estimates is set out below.

2016-17 (\$,000)	2017-18 (\$,000)	2018-19 (\$,000)	2019-20 (\$,000)
160,006	293,176	219,180	66,600

4. Once a project is identified by the Australian Government to be delivered under CDG, the proponent must submit a Request for Information form, which provides sufficient project information for the Department to undertake a value with relevant money assessment. This includes an assessment of project and proponent viability and project sustainability. The assessment is commensurate with the risk of the project.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 73
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000110

Program: n/a
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: High Speed Rail
Proof Hansard Page: Written (8 March 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

According to the Department's 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."

- How many meetings involving officials from all 5 jurisdictions have taken place?
- When did those meetings occur and what were their outcomes? What actions have been agreed to when it comes to protecting a corridor for a future High Speed Rail network?
- How much Federal dollars are currently set aside for acquiring land along the proposed corridor?

Answer:

A group of senior officials met in-person and via phone to discuss High Speed Rail in 2014 and 2015. At the last meeting in 2015 it was agreed to primarily progress discussions bilaterally. Bilateral discussions continued in 2016.

Jurisdictions are seeking to incorporate the High Speed Rail preferred corridor in their city and regional plans, and into their land use planning processes. The timeframes for the finalisation of this work are the responsibility of the State and ACT governments in their role of controlling planning policies within their jurisdictions.

The Australian Government has not allocated funding to protection of a corridor for High Speed Rail at this stage.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017

Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 74

Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000101

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Infrastructure Investment Program commitments

Proof Hansard Page: Written (8 March 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

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 2014/15 and 2019/20?

Answer:

Funding from 2013-14, the start of the Government's Infrastructure Investment Program, to 2019-20 provided on a state by state basis is outlined in the table below.

This reflects funding through the Infrastructure Investment Program and funding for transport infrastructure through other Portfolios and mechanisms, including the Asset Recycling Initiative, GST Equalisation measures, Interstate Road Transport and also smaller initiatives in different financial years. In addition, the Australian Government continues to hold a contingent liability of \$3 billion, available to the Victorian Government for the East-West Link project and is investing over \$1.5 billion in equity in land transport infrastructure, including in the Australian Rail Track Corporation.

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING BY STATE AND TERRITORY FOR THE 7 YEAR PERIOD 2013-14 TO 2019-20

BY STATE	NSW	VIC	QLD	WA	SA	TAS	NT	ACT	National	Total
APPROPRIATIONS	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
Infrastructure Investment	10,176.85	3,379.01	9,249.02	2,375.83	1,766.73	554.68	379.78	6.91	527.17	28,415.98
Black Spot	136.62	99.72	85.10	45.73	33.00	11.36	6.39	6.58	0.00	424.50
Roads to Recovery	1,017.33	735.31	740.29	532.96	323.77	116.35	107.17	52.15	2.20	3,627.53
Heavy Vehicles Safety and Productivity	86.25	25.06	20.31	21.61	13.58	5.86	24.79	0.28	90.25	288.00
Bridges Renewal Programme	66.17	20.90	89.74	13.25	3.97	7.63	7.75	1.69	148.90	360.00
Plan for the Future (BAF and Major Cities)	8.00	1,271.50	0.00	339.00	189.35	0.00	0.00	111.09	0.00	1,918.94
Infrastructure Growth Package	2,166.86	148.97	746.09	971.35	461.17	24.43	110.54	12.02	0.19	4,641.63
Northern Australia and Beef Roads	0.00	0.00	280.67	184.32	0.00	0.00	222.19	0.00	12.82	700.00
National Smart Managed Motorways	3.00	9.80	17.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30.22
Untied local roads grants	1,377.64	978.94	889.67	726.03	278.77	251.63	111.23	152.26	0.00	4,766.16
Asset Recycling Initiative (Treasury)	2,190.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.40	67.10	0.00	2,298.20
Victorian Asset Recycling Fund Contingency	0.00	877.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	877.00
Interstate Transport	232.00	134.69	47.58	19.88	60.85	2.69	2.69	2.69	0.00	503.08
WA GST Equalisation	0.00	0.00	0.00	989.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	989.06
Additional minor projects and programs	44.10	42.50	39.20	2.90	1.10	0.20	0.20	10.20	0.00	140.40
Total Australian Government Funding	17,505.53	7,723.40	12,205.09	6,221.92	3,132.29	974.83	1,013.13	422.98	781.52	49,980.69

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 75
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000111

Program: 1.1
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Infrastructure Investment Program funding 2019-20 onwards
Proof Hansard Page: Written (8 March 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

In an answer to a Question on Notice (Question no. 94) from Senate Lambie, the Secretary referred to a figure of \$7,982 million in the column entitled "19/20 Onwards".

- What does "19-20 Onwards" actually mean? Is all the \$7,982 million listed in that column expected to be spent in 2019/20, or in 2019/20 and subsequent years?
- o **If it's the later**, then how much is actually allocated in 2019/20?
- And can you list the projects that \$7,982 million has been allocated to?

Answer:

The total of \$7,982 million for 2019-20 onwards represented funding allocated in 2019-20 and subsequent financial years.

Funding allocations were updated at the 2016-17 MYEFO, with current commitments from the Infrastructure Investment Program estimated to be \$4.084 billion in 2019-20. Along with the addition of the Financial Assistance Grants for local roads components and interstate road transport, the allocation in MYEFO for 2019-20 is \$4.947 billion.

Schedules detailing updated funding allocations from the Infrastructure Investment Program in 2019-20 and from 2020-21 onwards, on a project by project basis can be found at the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development's web-site at: www.investment.infrastructure.gov.au/funding/projects/index.aspx.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Additional Estimates 2016 - 2017
Infrastructure and Regional Development

Committee Question Number: 76
Departmental Question Number: SQ17-000153

Program: Infrastructure Investment
Division/Agency: Infrastructure Investment
Topic: Hale Road/Woolworths Drive intersection
Proof Hansard Page: 88 (27 February 2017)

Senator Sterle, Glenn asked:

Senator STERLE: There was an announcement at the last round of estimates about an infrastructure project in Perth in the suburb of Forrestfield. Mr Wyatt, the member for Hasluck, announced that there was some government funding. It is called Hale Road and Woolworths Drive. Does that ring a bell for any of your people at the back? Sorry to do this to you as we are changing. I do not want to hold up. I am happy to have an answer in the smoko break or something like that.

Mr Mrdak: I will chase it up. I think the relevant officer has bolted for the carpark.

Ms Zielke: It is in Forrestfield?

Senator STERLE: It is in the suburb of Forrestfield. It is Woolworths Drive and Hale Road.

Mr Mrdak: We will find out.

Senator STERLE: Thanks very much.

Answer:

The Australian Government committed \$300,000 during the 2016 Federal Election to upgrade the Hale Road/Woolworths Drive intersection in Forrestfield, WA.