

## Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

**Questions on Notice**  
**Supplementary Budget Estimates 2014-15**  
**Monday 19 October 2015**

**Infrastructure and Regional Development Portfolio**

QoN No.	PDR No.	Division	Senator	Broad topic	Question	Proof Hansard page and hearing date or Written	Date answered
<b>Corporate Services (12)</b>							
01	459	CORP	GALLACHER	Ministerial Responsibilities	<p>...</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. Do we actually know which ones he is going to have responsibility for? Are they able to be listed?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, I can provide that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I think it would be helpful if you could do that. But that will be subject to a charter letter—is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It is in place now. The charter letter will simply confirm the arrangements that have been put in place.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. So the arrangements are done, it is just that the charter letter has not been issued—is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is correct.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Does that then apply equally to ministers Truss, Fletcher and McCormack—exactly what they are going to be doing?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> As I have described, the arrangements are settled. The charter letter will simply confirm the areas and particularly provide priorities that the government—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So can we get a list of their respective responsibilities?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, I can provide that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And will you get that by the end of the day so that—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will endeavour to do that, yes.</p>	6 19/10/15	

02	458	CORP	GALLACHER & BULLOCK	Legal Costs: AAT Matter	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Legal costs: in the respect to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal matter between MacTiernan and the Secretary of the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development, which was in the Perth registry 2015, what legal fees have been incurred by the department?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will check if I have those details with me. Sorry, Senator, we do not have that detail. I will take that on notice, if you don't mind.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can you get it to us over the course of the day?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will certainly endeavour to, yes.</p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> You will recall that we asked what costs the department incurred in attempting to prevent Alannah McTiernan from gaining freedom of information access and I believe there is answer.</p> <p><b>Mr Wilson:</b> Yes, I believe the costs were in the order of \$20,000. I will take the question on notice, as we did this morning, and provide you with a precise number, but I am advised it was in that rough order of estimate.</p>	14 & 105 19/10/15	
03	381	CORP	GALLACHER	Charter letter	<p>Please provide the PM's Charter letter, or alternatively, the content of the letter that is in place, as at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) October 31, 2015</li> <li>(ii) November 30, 2015</li> <li>(iii) December 31, 2015,</li> </ul> <p>if different versions apply at these dates.</p>	Written	
04	379	CORP	GALLACHER	Contracts on foot	<p>For each of the contracts listed and summarised in Attachment A, please provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The Departmental Division which commissioned the contract</li> <li>(ii) The reason for commissioning the contract</li> <li>(iii) The scope of the contract</li> <li>(iv) How the contract helps achieve portfolio Outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>A description of the goods or services to be provided under the contract.</p>	Written	
05	477	CORP	LUDWIG	Departmental Rebranding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the department/Agency undergone a name change or any other form of rebranding since the leadership change in September, 2015? If so:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Please detail why this name change / rebrand were considered necessary and a justified use of departmental funds?                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Please provide a copy of any reports that were commissioned to study</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	

					<p>the benefits and costs associated with the rebranding.</p> <p>b. Please provide the total cost associated with this rebrand and then break down by amount spent replacing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Signage.</li> <li>ii. Stationery (please include details of existing stationery and how it was disposed of).</li> <li>iii. Logos</li> <li>iv. Consultancy</li> <li>v. Any relevant IT changes.</li> <li>vi. Office reconfiguration.</li> </ul> <p>c. How was the decision reached to rename and/or rebrand the department?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Who was involved in reaching this decision? ii. Please provide a copy of any communication (including but not limited to emails, letters, memos, notes etc) from within the department, or between the department and the government regarding the rename/rebranding.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Following the changes does the department share any goods/services/accommodation with other departments?</li> <li>2. What resources/services does the department share with other departments; are there plans to cease sharing the sharing of these resources/services?</li> <li>3. What were the costs to the department prior to the Machinery of Government changes for these shared resources? What are the estimated costs after the ceasing of shared resource arrangements?</li> </ul>		
06	476	CORP	LUDWIG	Staffing - employment of non-Australian citizens	<p>I refer you to section 22 (8) of the Public Service Act 1999 which says:</p> <p>"An Agency Head must not engage, as an APS employee, a person who is not an Australian citizen, unless the Agency Head considers it appropriate to do so."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the department have guidelines or similar to assist Agency Heads to assess when it is appropriate to hire non-Australian citizens? If no, do individual agencies have their own guidelines? If yes to either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please provide a copy.</li> <li>2. When did they come into effect?</li> <li>3. Can Agency Heads decide to go against the advice? If yes, under what circumstances?</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Are Agency Heads required to provide a reason to anyone for hiring non-</li> </ul>	Written	

					<p>Australian citizens? If yes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who are they required to report the reason to?</li> <li>2. Does this reporting happen before or after the hire has been made?</li> <li>3. Is this reason provided in writing? If no, how is it provided?</li> <li>4. Can you please provide a list of reasons that have been used since the Federal election in September, 2013.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Are there any provisions to over-rule a Head of Agency’s decision to hire a non-Australian citizen? If yes:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Who can over-rule this decision?</li> <li>2. Under what circumstances can it be over-ruled?</li> <li>3. How many times has this occurred since the Federal election in September, 2013.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>		
07	494	CORP	LUDWIG	Ministerial Personalised Stationery	<p>Since the leadership change in September, 2015, how much has been spent by the Ministerial office on personalised stationery for the Minister and the Minister's staff? Please provide a cost breakdown by type of stationery purchased and the quantity of each and whether it was for the Minister or for staff.</p>	Written	
08	498	CORP	BILYK	Ministerial Functions	<p>In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by current or former Ministers in the portfolio in 2015, can the following please be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of functions;</li> <li>• List of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister’s family or personal staff;</li> <li>• Function venue;</li> <li>• Itemised list of costs;</li> <li>• Details of any food served;</li> <li>• Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage; and</li> <li>• Details of any entertainment provided.</li> </ul>	Written	
09	519	CORP	BILYK	Ministerial International Travel	<p>In relation to any international travel undertaken in 2015 by current or former Ministers in the portfolio, can the following please be provided to the Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A copy of the itinerary for each overseas trip;</li> <li>• An itemised list of the costs of each trip including the class of travel for any</li> </ul>	Written	

					<p>flights;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Copies of receipts for any food or beverages that the Minister consumed at taxpayer expense during each trip;</li> <li>• Copies of receipts for any self-drive hire cars or chauffeured services utilised by the Minister during each trip;</li> <li>• Copies of receipts for any other ground transport;</li> <li>• Copies of receipts for any hotel accommodation; and</li> <li>• Details of any spouse travel.</li> </ul>		
10	520	CORP	BILYK	Secretary's Speeches to Staff	Can a copy of any speeches delivered by the Secretary of the Department at any staff meetings in 2015 please be provided	Written	
11	521	CORP	BILYK	Secretary's Office Upgrades	Have the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office been upgraded in 2015? If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided?	Written	
12	522	CORP	BILYK	Visit to Torres Strait	<p>Did any of the former or current Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries/Assistant Ministers in the portfolio , their personal staff or the Department participate in the former Prime Minister's trip to the Torres Strait?</p> <p>If so-</p> <p>What was the duration of the visit to Torres Strait?</p> <p>Which locations did the Minister/his Department travel to?</p> <p>Which communities did the Minister/his Department engage with?</p> <p>What type of activities did they undertake?</p> <p>What were the outcomes of the trip?</p> <p>Was an official report or communique or similar published in relation to the trip?</p> <p>Are you able to please provide an itinerary for the A Minister/his Department's trip?</p> <p>Which hotel or hotels did the Minister/his Department stay in?</p>	Written	

					<p>Could you please provide an itemised cost breakdown in relation to the Minister/his Department’s involvement in this trip? This should be broken down into categories such as accommodation, ground transport, meals, incidentals etc.</p> <p>How many members of the Minister’s staff participated in the trip?</p> <p>Could you please advise the number of staff, their title and staffing classification under the MOPS Enterprise Agreement?</p> <p>In terms of departmental officials from the Department, could you please advise the names and roles of each departmental official in attendance?</p> <p>Could you also please provide an itemised list of costs for departmental officials in terms of flights, accommodation, ground transport, meals and other incidentals? This should specify the officials which travelled in business class and those that travelled in economy, the hotels they stayed in and which businesses supplied ground transport.</p>		
<b>Infrastructure Investment (60)</b>							
13	457	II	GALLACHER	Departmental Contracts – Infrastructure Investment	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Mr Mrdak, can you tell us a bit about some departmental contracts. I refer to the department's list of contracts on foot at 2014-15 and on the department's website. Can you tell us a bit more about the following contracts. Hammond Street Developments is the contractor for vehicle safety standards, vehicle import solution—\$500,101. What was that one about?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I believe it is assists us in terms of the new arrangements for the implementation of our redesign of the Australian vehicle import system. Can I take that on notice. I do not have the officers with me who deal with that issue, so if I can through the course of today come back to you in relation to that one.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. Perhaps that is probably going to be the answer for the rest. I have a short sample of these. There is Parsons Brinckerhoff Australia and infrastructure corridor protection. Do you about it know off the top of your head or do you want to take it on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That relates to work we have been doing for the Infrastructure Working Group of COAG, which looks at how do we as a nation better protect some of our key corridors. As you know, one of the major issues is that in the past we have not protected long-term corridors adequately, which has added to cost in the future. This is work which, from recollection, involved an examination across the country of practices of corridor preservation, and that has resulted in some work which has gone through to the COAG Infrastructure Working Group. But I can get you some further details—</p>	14-15 19/10/15	

				<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So it is a high-level look at corridor protection. It is not specific.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It is not specific. It particularly looks at what arrangements are in each of the jurisdictions. From recollection—and I will take it on notice—that contract involved looking at what each of the jurisdictions had in place in terms of their land use planning and transport corridor preservation so that we could start to look at what was effectively better practice in the country.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> PricewaterhouseCooper's public sector WestConnex financing advice—\$330,000.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That relates to the concessional loan that we are arranging with the New South Wales government. I will ask Mr Jagers to give you some details on that one. That piece of work is essentially the Commonwealth' due diligence work in relation to the \$1.5 billion concessional loan.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> As the secretary said, we have engaged experts on the WestConnex project to do a couple of things. One of them was to look at the fundamentals of the concessional loan. We have also engaged legal expertise. We have engaged traffic modellers as well and, in this case, PricewaterhouseCoopers.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> SGS Economics and Planning, Sydney network analysis—\$110,000. What is that about?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That relates to a piece of work we are doing to look at long-term capacity of a number of our urban environments, looking at work such as traffic forecasts but also modelling effectively the growth of those major urban areas. It is work which fed into some of the work that Infrastructure Australia did but it is also what we call our network analysis, which we use to prioritise future investment for government in relation to project development.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I have a list of these here, but I will just give you this last one: 'ThinkPlace developed a strategic outlook in Office of Transport Security.' What is that one about?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will just check. I think that work fed into the future outlook document. We did effectively a 25- or 30-year scan of the changing transport security environment, out to about 2025 or beyond, and I think that work involved that process of development and also what that meant in terms of our structure and operation of the organisation to implement that. As you would appreciate, with the traffic growth projections, we have to make fundamental changes to how we operate our security regime just to handle the volumes of growth in our airports and ports in particular. So that work fed into that redesign of our Office of Transport Security.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Thank you. I will put a list of other contracts on notice. Going to road funding, is it the Commonwealth policy to still fund 80 per cent of road projects?</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

14	456	II	GALLACHER	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> In an earlier question we asked about PricewaterhouseCoopers WestConnex financing advice—that contract. So you bought that? Do you have that? Can that be tabled or disclosed?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice to check the details, if you do not mind. Provided it does not—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> That advice underpins all of your decisions in respect of this financing process.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It includes advice on some of the due diligence issues which Mr Danks has talked about. I will take that on notice, if I can.</p>	18 19/10/15	
15	455	II	BULLOCK	Heavy Vehicle Safety and Productivity Programme List of Projects	<p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Do you have a plan for how many of those 53 projects will be completed over the next 12 months?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> Of those 53 projects, 38 are under construction at the moment. I do not have details about the completion time frames for each of those projects, but usually these projects start and finish within a few months so we are confident that the program is rolling out pretty well.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> So it has been ramped up significantly in this—</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> Those projects have started and I think that is a good sign—38 of the 53. There were two projects withdrawn so there are 51 currently in the program and 38 under construction.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Do you think the 51 will be completed within the financial year?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> I might see if Mr Pittar has a better idea of when they might complete.</p> <p><b>Mr Pittars:</b> I do not have anything better than that, Mr Jagers.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> No, Senator, we do not have a completion time frame for each of those projects; but, as I said, I would expect those 38 under construction to complete within the financial year—</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> As you say, they take only a few months to do.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> Some of them may take a little bit longer, so it will be case by case. We might be able to come back to you with a bit more detail.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I suppose the only other thing I could ask is whether, in addition to the 38 currently under construction, you expect any of the remaining approved projects to commence construction within the financial year.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> I am sure that some further projects will commence construction this financial year. I do not have a schedule of when each will start, but we are working with the jurisdictions on each of those projects to make sure that they do happen and that they happen as quickly as possible.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> To the extent that you can find additional information, would you be good enough to provide it?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> Yes, I am happy to take that on notice.</p>	20-21 19/10/2015	

16	454	II	BULLOCK	Funding Profile for WA under the Investment Programme	<p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> No, I took that off. I got the 4.333 by taking the 1.412 off the 5.748, and that gave me 4.333, to which I then added the GST money and still came up short.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> If you could just give us a moment, I might come back to you on that. I think that the difference in the number that you have calculated there is that 2013-14 year. It is not the extra \$499 million that the government committed to Western Australia, because that did not run through the program; that was a payment from Treasury to the Western Australian Treasury and not part of the Infrastructure Investment Program. But we might just come back with a reconciliation between those two numbers for you.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Can I just seek a clarification of when 'we might come back' means—in the next half-hour?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> I can come back after the lunchbreak, if that is okay with you?</p>	23 19/10/2015	
17	452	II	BULLOCK	Port of Fremantle – Summary of Analysis	<p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I understand that investments have been made. You have come up with a capacity and a time line for when it might be reached. They are projections. But you must have got your pen and paper out and worked that out. I am asking for your sums and how you worked them out—not the result, but the workings.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We can certainly give you a summary of the bureau's and the Port of Fremantle's analysis.</p>	26-27 19/10/2015	
18	532	II	GALLACHER	M4 East	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What toll will be charged for this benefit from 2017?</p> <p><b>Mr Danks:</b> There is flag fall as well as a cap. The cap is \$7.35. That is for the whole scheme. To work out exactly how much for the widening part, we do not have that information. I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Do we know what toll will be charged for this benefit from 2017?</p> <p><b>Mr Danks:</b> Not at the moment. We can take that on notice and get back to you today.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Do we know what the bottom figure is?</p> <p><b>Mr Danks:</b> Sorry?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the bottom figure? What is the least possible toll?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will get that for you. We do not have that with us, because—you are right—this is just the widening of the existing M4.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So we have not calculated it? We do not know it?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We just do not have it with us, I am sorry. We can get that for you.</p>	32 19/10/2015	
19	451	II	GALLACHER	South Australia Northern Connector –	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You are saying that \$788 million will be found within the program? What size is your contingency account in these programs?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> It varies. It depends on savings realised in certain years. At the moment I do not have the details with me about contingencies, but I can take that on notice.</p>	35-36 19/10/2015	

				Size of Contingency	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is it bigger than the building?  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> It is a sizeable contingency.  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> There is nationally, if you look at all—  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps we can have that on notice—the size of the contingency.  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly.</p>		
20	450	II	GALLACHER	Regional Rail Link – List of Projects	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we have a list of the projects that the funds have been redirected to, that you know about.  <b>Mr Jagers:</b> Certainly, we will take that on notice.</p>	37 19/10/2015	
21	423	II	GALLACHER	Regional Rail Link – QLD Reprofile	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> In Queensland, \$186 million less was spent than forecast in 2014. To what projects have these funds been redirected? Will these underspends be allocated or reallocated only within Queensland? Do we know where they have been redirected?  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice. I think they largely sit within the unallocated contingency, and decisions are yet to be taken on future expenditure of those moneys. Some of them may well be reprofiles on—  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is it possible to get a summation of what has happened there?  <b>Mr Jagers:</b> Are you particularly interested in 2014-15, or are you talking—  .....  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> This serious of question is probably best taken on notice. In Queensland, \$186 million less was spent than forecast in 2014. The question is: to what projects have these funds been redirected? The supplementary question is: will these underspends be only allocated within Queensland? In WA, \$116 million less was spent than forecast in 2014. To what projects have these funds been redirected? Will they only be allocated within WA?  In South Australia it is \$112 million less than forecast. To what projects are these funds being redirected? Will the underspends be reallocated only within SA? Tasmania has \$41 million. The ACT has \$9 million.  So it is the same question with respect to all of those underspends. Can we get a summary of what has been reallocated and what is the position with respect to spending it within that state?  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly. I think the bulk of those have been reprofiled to further out years because of the spend profile of projects, but if there have been any saves to contingency, we will outline those for you.  ...</p>	37-38 19/10/2015	

22	422	II	GALLACHER	Managed Motorways Programme	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The managed motorways program—when was this program initiated?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> From recollection—and I will take that on notice—the initial managed motorways program was put in place in 2011.</p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is it possible to get a list of the projects that it completed?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> I do not have that with me now, but we can definitely provide that to you—</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will take that on notice.</p>	38 19/10/2015	
23	421	II	GALLACHER	Armadale Road Duplication - North Lake Bridge	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the scope? Does it include North Lake bridge?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I do not believe that it includes North Lake bridge. I do not have all of the details with me at my fingertips. I can take that on notice as far as the scope is concerned.</p>	39 19/10/2015	
24	420	II	LUDLAM	Perth Light Rail	<p><b>Senator LUDLAM:</b> Apparently you can go to the media and say, 'I have approached the Commonwealth for half a billion', but none of you are aware of an approach actually having been made.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> We have not received anything further on it.</p> <p><b>Senator LUDLAM:</b> That is extraordinarily deceptive. In order that I do not go out and verbal the Premier of the state of WA, could you check your records and take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will check that. We have no record but that is not to say that there have not been conversations with the Prime Minister or ministers. We cannot comment on those.</p> <p><b>Senator LUDLAM:</b> That is right. It is an important project. I do not want to get in the way if approaches are being made. I just ask you to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly.</p>	40 19/10/2015	
25	419	II	LUDLAM	Fremantle - Heavy Freight subjected to Being Tolled	<p><b>Senator LUDLAM:</b> That is a good distinction. If you were going to disaggregate that out for me further, eight per cent being heavy freight that would be subjected to the toll, what proportion of the balance of the 92 per cent would be lighter freight vehicles?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I should have that but I do not have that information. That is something we need to look at in responding to one of your questions on notice.</p>	42 19/10/2015	
26	527	II	LUDLAM	Perth Freight Link	<p><b>Senator LUDLAM:</b> Okay, if that work has been done, if you are able to do that. It is probably a bit frustrating for you guys. If this material were in the public domain I would not have to quiz you about this kind of line item but we are working a bit in the dark, unfortunately. So if you are able to disaggregate for us, what I am most interested in is three categories: heavy freight that is tolled, light freight that is not tolled and then the</p>	42 19/10/2015	

					<p>balance presumably would be passenger traffic. I am interested to know, as Senator Rice was on the East West Link case, what are the model traffic time savings for each of those three classes of vehicle when you are calculating the benefit? I am really interested in that.</p> <p>How do you model and what assumptions do you use for the fact that, in five years when this thing is a colossal traffic jam, as everywhere else is, those travel time benefits have evaporated, congestion is rising and eventually swamping the benefits that supposedly justify the project in the first place? How do you do that?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> The project has been modelled over 30-year time frames based on projected traffic growth and so on. So the expectation is that the benefits of the project would be of long-term duration.</p> <p><b>Senator LUDLAM:</b> That did not quite answer my question. Do you incorporate, when you are calculating these things, rising traffic congestion that gradually eats away at and eventually eliminates the travel time savings?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> We do. We also look at the base or the do-nothing case as well, which also has models in congestion. So you are comparing it against not having the project versus having the project. So the congestion obviously does increase on the new project over time. That is the case with every project as growth occurs. So we do have some details. I might see if we can take that on notice and get you the details.</p>		
27	418	II	McLUCAS	<p>National Partnership Agreement (Queensland) – Bruce Highway Reconciliation</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> I have got some Queensland questions. The national partnership agreement with Queensland, which is on the website, says the following with respect to the Bruce Highway. I am just trying to get some clarification. These numbers just do not add up and it is because I probably do not understand what they are for. It says total project cost is \$8,956 million. Total state contribution is \$1,730 million. And total Australian government committed funding is \$7,704 million. But the second two numbers do not add up to the first. Can you explain why that is?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Is this an individual project on the Bruce?</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> No. It refers to the national partnership agreement, which is on the website. Two figures do not add up to what I would expect the third to be.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Is this in a particular year? I am just wondering whether this is one best taken on notice and we can give you a spreadsheet—</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> All right. If you want to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, if that is okay. If you can give us any further details of the question and on <i>Hansard</i>, we will come back with a reconciliation across the Bruce Highway program.</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> It is taken off your website. It is Queensland Projects: National Partnership Agreement on Land Transport Infrastructure Projects. Did you want those figures again, Mr Jagers?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> We will reconcile that for you, Senator, and be able to provide it back to</p>	44 19/10/2015		

					you.		
28	417	II	McLUCAS	NPA QLD - Bruce Highway Projects	<p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> When were they first funded by the Commonwealth?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> We might have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> That is fine.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> It will just take me a little while to track that down. It is not something we have in front of us.</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> That is okay. Thank you. How many Bruce Highway projects has Minister Truss opened since July of this year?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> Can you also tell me if any of those projects were funded prior to the 2013 election and, if so, which ones.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly. We will take that on notice.</p>	44-45 19/10/2015	
29	526	II	McLUCAS	Edmonton to Gordonvale duplication	<p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I am just operating on memory. My understanding is that the Edmonton to Gordonvale duplication—I have just found that—is due to happen post 2019-20, so there is no specific timing for that other than that it is in the later phase of the program.</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> Has there been any request for that to be brought forward?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I do not believe that we have received any formal request for that to be brought forward, but I would potentially have to take that on notice to confirm that.</p>	45 19/10/2015	
30	416	II	McLUCAS	Indigenous Employment Outcomes - QLD	<p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> Is the wharf on that list of potential other projects?</p> <p><b>Mr Pittar:</b> I would need to take that on notice and check. I do not have that information in front of me and cannot remember specifically. I believe that it may be but I cannot remember the specifics.</p> <p><b>Senator McLUCAS:</b> Thank you.</p>	47 19/10/2015	
31	415	II	BROWN	Tasmanian Infrastructure Projects – Rail Revitalisation Programme	<p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> I want to ask a few questions about Tasmanian infrastructure projects. We will start with the Rail Revitalisation Program. It was confirmed at the last estimates that in the May budget there has been a saving of about \$60 million. That is correct, isn't it?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> I will get the details for you, but the Australian government commitment to Tas freight rail was in the order of \$119 million. It was to be matched by Tasmania and the Tasmanian government returned with a smaller scope of \$119 million for the project, so the project that is now proceeding is of the order of \$119 million, of which the Australian government is contributing half.</p>	47 19/10/2015	

32	414	II	BROWN	Midland Highway Funding	<p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> I want to ask some questions about road funding. This is quite a helpful answer that you have given me in attachment G. I just wanted to touch on the Midland Highway funding. The federal government made a commitment of \$400 million, and it is showing here that there is a saving—if that is the way you would like me to put it—making it \$360 million. Is that correct, the variance that you have on there for Midland Highway?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> We are just having a look now for you. We might have to take that on notice and clarify it for you. The Australian government commitment is \$400 million for the project—</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> You do not have attachment G?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> I do have it in front of me, but I will need to seek an explanation of—</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> Well, maybe I will ask my questions and see if you can answer, because it says there that \$40 million has been taken away from the \$400 million commitment by the federal government.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> Yes, and I suspect that is a timing issue between the budget in May 2014 and the budget in 2015—that that money had been spent in the previous year and that is why it is not showing in the May 2015 budget number. But I will just have to clarify if that is the reason or not.</p>	49 19/10/2015	
33	384	II	GALLACHER	Asset Recycling Scheme	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I go to the question on notice 28 from the May 2015 estimates, dated 6 October 2015. The lines after the Commonwealth investment expenditure have not been similarly reproduced under 2014. Do you have an update on the numbers for these missing lines—asset recycling, state investment resulting from asset recycling, and state and private sector expenditure from projects committed at MYEFO also as part of that budget. Do you get the drift of that?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I think so. Can I take that on notice and get that detail for you?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Yes. It is question on notice 28 from May 2015. We are looking for some updated numbers for the missing lines for the asset recycling initiative, state investment resulting from asset recycling initiative, state and private sector expenditure from projects committed at MYEFO, and also as part of the 2014 budget.</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> I understand that table was produced by the Treasury and provided to us, so we will talk to the Treasury about getting an update.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will get that as soon as we can.</p>	53 19/10/2015	
34	442	II	GALLACHER	National Stronger Regions Fund – List of Projects	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Six to one. Is it possible to get a list of the successful projects, the ones that are committed and contracted?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> We can take that on notice. On the website we have listed the 51 successful projects, and we can identify which ones have been contracted. By the time we do that on notice obviously there will have been more contracted.</p>	54-55 19/10/2015	

				<p><b>Funding</b></p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the total funding for the projects that have signed agreements with the department? I think you said it was 22, was it?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> Of the 22 that are under negotiation, nine have actually been contracted. So, that is the 31—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What about the ones that have signed agreements?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> I am sorry, I do not have that. I can add that up for you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So, there is \$200 million in the pool. There are 51 projects. Did you say 22 had signed agreements?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> Nine had signed agreements and 22 are currently negotiating. They are nearly ready to sign.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Do we know how many the nine have got?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> I have a complete list here. I do not have that breakdown, though, into those groups. I can provide that on notice. Of the 51 successfuls, they are being funded for \$212.3 million and total project value of \$642 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps on notice if you could give us the total funding amount for the projects that have signed agreements.</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> Certainly.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And a list of those projects.</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> As required, we list them on our website as well as soon as the funding agreement is executed.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Do you have a ballpark figure for the total funding for projects that do not have signed agreements?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> That will be the difference. I am sorry that I cannot—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> They do follow, rationally. It is fine for you to say to go to the website and have a look, but that is why we have estimates; so that we can ask you.</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> Certainly. I can provide that.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I am sure we could get a staff member to go trawling through all the websites and collating spreadsheets, but we may well end up in the same position that we were in a minute ago, where the information on the websites is so out of whack that we end up with a disjointed view of the world. That is why we are asking you. If you could give us a spreadsheet—51 projects, \$212 million. That is excellent. Nine contracted—excellent. If we could get a breakdown of that \$212 million for where they all are that would be really superb.</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> I can give you the nine individual ones now, if you like.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I would prefer if we got all of the information. On notice if you could have them total that up.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will do that.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

35	441	II	GALLACHER	CDG Programme – Contract Statistics	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> There is nowhere else they could go, because it is a decision of government. In relation to the CDG program, how many funding agreements have been signed by the department with successful applicants for round 1 and can we have a list of the projects?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will get that for you. I think we do publish it on our website.</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> And we can provide that detailed list. We have 149 contracted and in progress. We have 10 assessed and negotiating funding agreements. We have another 28 under assessment. We have 101 completed. One or two projects have been transferred to other departments, and five projects are not proceeding.</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> Some of the projects would have been previous programs that were brought in from previous government that are not proceeding.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we have a list of them so we can check them?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> Certainly.</p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the total funding amount for these projects that have signed agreements?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> We have \$239.8 million in contracted funds and \$76.5 million in uncontracted. Uncontracted being commitments made but the funding agreement is not yet executed.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How many are in that pool? How many projects selected for funding through round 1 do not yet have funding agreements with the department?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> I would have to take on notice that breakdown.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we actually get a list of these projects?</p> <p><b>Mr McCormick:</b> Certainly.</p>	58 - 59 19/10/2015	
36	440	II	PERIS	Funding under the Assets Recycling Scheme – NT	<p><b>Senator PERIS:</b> Has the Northern Territory government ever formally applied or proposed projects for consideration for funding under the Assets Recycling Scheme?</p> <p><b>Mr Jagers:</b> I will just check with Ms Hall.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We are not aware that they have approached the Department of Treasury yet, but we can take that on notice and double check for you.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Have they applied?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I do not know. I am happy to take that on notice and seek advice from Treasury.</p> <p><b>Senator PERIS:</b> Would you be able to get back to me today?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will seek advice from the Treasury, but nothing has been announced, to my knowledge.</p> <p><b>Senator PERIS:</b> For their eligibility under assets recycling?</p>	59 - 60 19/10/2015	

					<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator PERIS:</b> So, if an agreement was made—and what you are saying is that it was not—if it was sold for \$424 million, with 15 per cent being the asset recycling, that would be \$63 million?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to do the numbers, but of that order.</p> <p><b>Senator PERIS:</b> That sounds about right. The Darwin port was just recently sold for \$506 million. Are you aware of any agreement with that as well?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I am not aware of any agreement that the NT government has made for asset recycling funding, but we will ask the Treasury and come back to you.</p>		
37	525	II	PERIS	NT asset sales	<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> In the case of the ACT and New South Wales, they submitted a number of assets they proposed as part of their asset sales. They identified projects from which those proceeds would be spent which were an agreed list of infrastructure investment. The program provides that the proceeds of sale have to be reinvested in new productive infrastructure over and above what would otherwise have been delivered. A funding agreement was reached with the respective treasurers to do that.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So, 100 per cent of the sale proceeds?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Have to be reinvested.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> One hundred per cent?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is right.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So, the whole proceeds from the port?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Into new productive infrastructure or debt retirement which otherwise enables infrastructure investments. I can get the details for you. As I said, we are not the agency which administers this program, but they are the basic parameters under which it operates.</p>	61 19/10/2015	
38	439	II	PERIS	Northern Territory Infrastructure Funding	<p><b>Senator PERIS:</b> I also previously, at one of the last couple of estimates, stated that the Northern Territory government was establishing a Northern Territory infrastructure development fund, where they were putting \$200 million from the sale of TIO into this fund. Would such a fund be eligible for a Commonwealth contribution under the asset recycling scheme for the sale of the TIO and port?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I would have to ask you to take that up with Treasury. I am not as familiar with the details so as to give you advice in relation to that. I am happy to take it on notice or you may wish to put it to Treasury.</p> <p><b>Senator PERIS:</b> If you can also take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly.</p>	61 19/10/2015	

39	438	II	GALLACHER	New England Highway – Bolivia Hill Funding Profile	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I do not know anything about Bolivia Hill. What is the current funding profile for Bolivia Hill?</p> <p><b>Senator WILLIAMS:</b> It is south of Tenterfield. New England Highway, in the seat of New England.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is there a funding profile?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, there is. We will get that detail for you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the current funding profile for this project?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Bolivia Hill has a total project cost of \$60 million, with \$55 million from the Australian government. The profile for 2015-16 is \$7 million; in 2016-17, \$22 million; and, 2017-18, \$26 million.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What was the funding profile when it was originally promulgated?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I would have to take that on notice.</p>	62 19/10/2015	
40	523	II	HEFFERNAN	Port of Darwin	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> Can you take a couple of questions on notice from me. Has the Commonwealth put any money into the Port of Darwin in the recent past or the past?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I do not believe so through this portfolio.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> You can take this on notice: has the Commonwealth government put funds in? It bemuses me that, according to their own staff and data that I have here—and I am not too sure what is described as a business partner—the business partners of the Landbridge Group that is buying the port, which I presume means financiers and whatever, is a company called CNOOC and China National Petroleum, which is a large petroleum company up there who have been done over for corruption and so on under the recent crackdown. Blokes have gone to jail and so on. They are fully sovereign owned. I just wonder whether we are awake to all that sort of stuff. It bemuses me that we would develop infrastructure and then cash it to another country, given what is going on in the South China Sea. You actually say, 'Well, come down here and we'll sell you the port.'</p>	73 19/10/2015	
41	407	II	HEFFERNAN	Port of Darwin - Access	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I am aware of a project to give a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week barge access, which is funded by the Department of Defence. There was a negotiated agreement about access with the Port of Darwin. Has that Commonwealth funded asset been sold?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am not aware of that. There is a marine supply base project. I do not know whether that is part of the sale. I will take that on notice.</p>	73 19/10/2015	
42	406	II	RHIANNON	WestConnex	<p><b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> What are the legal or financial advantages of using a private company as a vehicle for the delivery of WestConnex?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to seek advice from the state government. I have not been closely involved in their rationale for the alternative structure. They were certainly</p>	74 19/10/2015	

					bringing together two delivery bodies into a single body. The choice of the governance mechanism is one by New South Wales. I am happy to seek their advice on that.		
43	405	II	RHIANNON	NSW FOI Laws	<b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> But you would be aware that the formation of the SMC puts it beyond the reach of FOI laws. Is that something that you have addressed? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am not familiar with New South Wales FOI laws, so I would have to take that on notice if I could.	74 19/10/2015	
44	404	II	RHIANNON	Assessment of AECOM	<b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> When you say you are comfortable with the traffic assessments done for the project, does that mean that your work, the department's work, has backed up the traffic predictions that AECOM has put forward? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We have questioned at great length the traffic projections for the project, and after work have been satisfied with the work that has been done to satisfy our due diligence for the concessional loan. <b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> When you say you questioned them, do you mean that some of them were wrong and they had to be done again? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> There were areas where we questioned some of the methodology and the approach and we also asked to see some of the data sets, which were made available. I can provide you with further details of the assessment that was undertaken by the Commonwealth in relation to that. <b>Senator RHIANNON:</b> If you could provide that. <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly.	75 19/10/2015	
45	531	II	GALLACHER	Inland rail	<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How much was for the corridor requisition and protection, have you any idea? <b>Mr Wood:</b> We do have that information. I would need to take that on notice.	78 19/10/2015	
46	437	II	CONROY	Major Projects	<b>Senator CONROY:</b> Are you able to list the 14 now off the top of your head? I appreciate that might be a lot but if you can give us— <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I think it is best if I give them to you on notice. <b>Senator CONROY:</b> You are not able to get them during the course	117 19/10/2015	
47	535	PAR	CONROY	National partnership agreement with WA	<b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Treasury have made the payment under that national partnership agreement. My understanding is that that funding is now being managed by the state of Western Australia. <b>Senator CONROY:</b> Yes, but it has to be acquitted. They have got to say: this is what we did with it.	117 19/10/2015	

					<b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will find out the details of the acquittal process.		
48	436	II	GALLACHER	Financial Assistance Grants	<b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Are there any shovel ready projects in the \$35 million? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes, there have been projects approved and announced. I can provide, on notice, details of those. In fact, I think the Deputy Prime Minister today announced some more projects that have been approved and are underway.	133 19/10/2015	
49	435	II	GALLACHER	Financial Assistance Grants	<b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> So that is the area and that is the amount of money. How many applications have been received and are being assessed? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice, if you do not mind. I do not have that data with me. <b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> From which councils of those eligible is the government receiving applications? You can take that on notice. How many applications since Minister Joyce's announcement on 4 October have been approved? Do you know that? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I will take that on notice. I do not have that data with me.	133 19/10/2015	
50	434	II	GALLACHER	Financial Assistance Grants	<b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Can you point to where in the guidelines this date is mentioned? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice. I think it has been a recent addition by the ministers to try to accelerate take-up of the program. <b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> So why may a council's eligibility for the DCP lapse if their application is not received by 24 December 2015, despite Mr Joyce saying that a number of regions continue to experience terrible drought? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> As I indicated, I think the government is keen to have councils put in their applications as soon as possible. <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So is there any further information you can provide regarding why a council's eligibility may lapse? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Only that factor that I have outlined: the government is very keen to see these projects taken up. <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> During the same media release Minister Joyce said that five declared councils were being assessed. Can you name those councils? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I do not have that detail with me. I will take that on notice.	134 19/10/2015	
51	433	II	GALLACHER	Financial Assistance Grants	<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So, if the government does announce future eligible councils, will those announcements be made before 24 December 2015? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to check that. I do not have details of that at this stage.	134 19/10/2015	

52	378	II	GALLACHER	Project Profiles	<p>Please provide agreed schedules for the National Partnership Agreement on Land Transport projects for the following as at December 31, 2015, <u>only if different to the version published on the Department’s website on December 31, 2015</u> [available via &lt;<a href="http://investment.infrastructure.gov.au/funding/projects/">http://investment.infrastructure.gov.au/funding/projects/</a>&gt;]:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) NSW;</li> <li>2) Victoria;</li> <li>3) Queensland;</li> <li>4) Western Australia;</li> <li>5) South Australia;</li> <li>6) Tasmania;</li> <li>7) ACT;</li> <li>8) NT.</li> </ol>	Written	
53	377	II	GALLACHER	Contingency by State	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) What amount was in the jurisdictional contingency at the signing of the October/November 2014 Land Transport National Partnership Agreements with:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) NSW;</li> <li>2) Victoria;</li> <li>3) Queensland;</li> <li>4) Western Australia;</li> <li>5) South Australia;</li> <li>6) Tasmania;</li> <li>7) ACT;</li> <li>8) NT.</li> </ol> </li> <li>(ii) What additional amount (if any) was in the contingency and not allocated to any particular jurisdiction at that time?</li> <li>(iii) What amount was in the jurisdictional contingency in the “2015/6 Program of Works” under Land Transport National Partnership Agreements with:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) NSW;</li> <li>2) Victoria;</li> <li>3) Queensland;</li> <li>4) Western Australia;</li> <li>5) South Australia;</li> <li>6) Tasmania;</li> <li>7) ACT;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	

					<p>8) NT.</p> <p>(iv) What additional amount (if any) is in the contingency and not allocated to any particular jurisdiction for 2015/6 works?</p> <p>(v) What is the total Infrastructure Investment program contingency?</p>		
54	376	II	GALLACHER	Dedicated Cycling Infrastructure	<p>(i) Which Federally funded road or rail projects include dedicated cycling infrastructure?</p> <p>(ii) What does the Government consider to be “dedicated cycling infrastructure”?</p> <p>(iii) Please list which specific projects in the eight Land Transport National Partnership Agreements include dedicated cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>(iv) What dedicated cycling infrastructure is incorporated in the following projects:</p> <p>a. Westconnex?</p> <p>b. Toowoomba Second Range Crossing?</p> <p>c. South Road – Darlington?</p> <p>d. NT Roads Package?</p> <p>e. Western Sydney Infrastructure Plan?</p>	Written	
55	375	II	GALLACHER	Northern Australia Roads Package	<p>(i) As of January 31, 2016, what roads are included in the \$600M Northern Australia Roads package?</p> <p>(ii) And for each road, what is the federal contribution?</p>	Written	
56	374	II	GALLACHER	Discretionary Grants Programs	<p>For the following programs administered by the Department, can you provide the following information: The name of the discretionary grant program;</p> <p>a) How much funding is allocated for the program in total;</p> <p>b) How much funding for the program has been committed;</p> <p>c) How much funding for the program has been contracted; and</p> <p>d) How much funding for the program is uncommitted –</p>	Written	

					<p>for each of the following financial years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) 2014-5;</li> <li>ii) 2015-6;</li> <li>iii) 2016-7;</li> <li>iv) 2017-8;</li> <li>v) 2018-9;</li> <li>vi) 2019-20 and beyond.</li> </ul> <p>These programs should specifically include grants under the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Stronger Regions Fund</li> <li>• Community Development Grants</li> </ul>		
57	373	II	GALLACHER	Bruce Highway Projects	<p>I refer to the answer to QON 13 from May 2015 Estimates, and dated October 6, 2015 – when were the two Bruce Highway projects to commence this year first funded by the Commonwealth?</p> <p><i>[It mentions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Pavement widening Caboolture to St Lawrence</i></li> <li>• <i>Pavement widening – Ingham to Cairns]</i></li> </ul>	Written	
58	372	II	GALLACHER	National Stronger Regions Fund	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In relation to the National Stronger Regions Fund (NSRF) how many funding agreements have been signed by the Department with successful applicants for round one of the Fund?</li> <li>2. Can I have a list of the projects that have been contracted and their funding amount?</li> </ol>	Written	
59	371	II	GALLACHER	National Stronger Regions Fund	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many projects that have been selected for funding through round one of the NSRF don't have funding agreements signed with the Department?</li> <li>2. Can I have a list of the projects that haven't been contracted and their funding amount?</li> </ol>	Written	

60	481	II	GALLACHER	National Stronger Regions Fund	The Government updated the guidelines for round two of funding under the Fund, specifically that \$25 million of funding would be quarantined for those projects seeking funding of \$1 million or less - Did this change result in an increase in the number of projects from smaller organisations as was intended by changing the guidelines?	Written	
61	482	II	GALLACHER	Community Development Grants	What is the process for approving funding for this programme? Which Minister will sign off and is there departmental advice on projects?	Written	
62	483	II	GALLACHER	Community Development Grants	Can you please explain how projects will be identified for funding under the additional money found for the CDG Programme. What is the process and criteria for applications?	Written	
63	484	II	GALLACHER	Stronger Communities	Did the Department or the Government make the guidelines for this program available to any MPs prior to 24 June 2015?	Written	
64	485	II	GALLACHER	Stronger Communities	Has the Department received any correspondence from MPs with concerns about the administration of the Programme?	Written	
65	486	II	GALLACHER	Stronger Communities	Did the Department take into account the proposed AEC redistributions when it produced the guidelines and eligibility for the Programme?	Written	
66	487	II	GALLACHER	Stronger Communities	Have any MPs raised concerns about the AEC redistributions specifically?	Written	
67	488	II	GALLACHER	Stronger Communities	How will this apply if the next Federal election is held before 1 July 2016, in relation to round two?	Written	

68	489	II	GALLACHER	Community Development Grants	How many projects and how much funding for this program has been contracted? Can I please have a list of all projects that have been contracted and their funding value to date?	Written	
69	490	II	GALLACHER	Roads to Recovery	Please provide a list of additional funds by Local Government area for each year of the increase in roads to recovery funding due to the agreement on the fuel excise increase.	Written	
70	491	II	GALLACHER	Tasmanian Jobs & Growth Plan	Please provide an updated list of what projects have been contracted and what is uncontracted and the relevant funding amounts	Written	
71	492	II	GALLACHER	Tasmanian Jobs & Growth Plan	Is the Department still responsible for any funds that were originally earmarked for the Caterpillar modernisation project in Burnie? If yes: What is the process for awarding any of these funds? How many companies/organisations were asked to submit proposals for funding?	Written	
72	497	II	CARR	Caterpillar Modernisation Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In relation to reports from The Advocate on 28 October 2015 that \$5 Million from monies originally set aside for the Caterpillar modernisation project in Burnie is to be awarded to the Elphinestone Group to create 100 jobs for a \$40 million project in Burnie: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What process has there been around reallocating any funds that were originally earmarked for the Caterpillar modernisation project in Burnie?</li> <li>b. How many companies/organisations were asked to submit proposals for funding?</li> <li>c. What is the process for awarding any of these funds?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Is the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development responsible for the \$18 million that was originally earmarked for Cadburys? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. If yes, what is the process for companies/organisations seeking to apply</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	

					<p>for funds, including timeframes?</p> <p>e. Will the Tasmanian State Government or the Commonwealth Government be making the final decision on what projects receive funding?</p> <p>f. When will the funds be available? In what financial year?</p>		
<b>Australian Rail Track Corporation (3)</b>							
73	409	ARTC	GALLACHER	Inland Rail Implementation Study	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What was the expenditure on consultants in the preparation of the business case and the associated material?</p> <p><b>Mr Wood:</b> There are two parts to the consultancies. There were consultancies undertaken in the preparation of the business case, which was done by the ARTC, and then separately there were some consultancies that we contracted directly from the department. I will just see what information I have in relation to those. From the department's point of view, it was a total of \$990,182 over the 2014-15 and 2015-16 years. I am not sure if I have the precise details for the others.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will take that on notice and will issue a list of consultants and prices.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So you will give us a list of consultants which were used and for what tasks?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> For the inland rail implementation study.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> There was only the one task, is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> That is right.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Were there a number of consultants in that \$990,000?</p> <p><b>Mr Wood:</b> Yes, there were. I could give you an indicative list of those now if you want.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is it four or five?</p> <p><b>Mr Wood:</b> No, about six or seven.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will give it to you on notice. We will give you a full list of them, and then also the ARTC consultants.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What was the expenditure on promotional materials associated with the 11 September 2015 inland rail announcement, like video, maps and all that sort of stuff?</p> <p><b>Mr Wood:</b> We need to take that on notice. In terms of the actual event, it was a press conference at Parliament House, and the expenditure would have been minimal. There were some printing costs for copies of the implementation report and the business case for the provision to ministers, et cetera. In terms of broader promotional material, there was no cost.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> There was production of maps in the development of the business case, but</p>	77-78 19/10/15	

					<p>there were no promotional costs.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps on notice if we can provide that?  <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly</p>		
74	408	ARTC	GALLACHER	Inland Rail – Costings	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How much is for upgrades of existing track?  <b>Mr Wood:</b> Again we can do that on notice unless Mr Fullerton can give you specific numbers.  <b>Mr Fullerton:</b> No. It has all been calculated, but we would need to take it on notice in terms of being able to break that between the new corridors and the upgrade of the existing corridor.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How much is for the new track construction? How much for loading and unloading infrastructure? What other expenditure is there, such as signalling and new stations? You say the work has been done, but you just do not have it at your fingertips?  <b>Mr Fullerton:</b> No. There is a cognitive breakdown of all the components of the work for the track from Melbourne to Brisbane.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How long will it take for us to get that breakdown?  <b>Mr Fullerton:</b> It is a part of what we do to go away and break it down into the items that you are seeking.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> All right. You are going to take it on notice, but we will get it before 4 December, will we? That is the time for the questions on notice.  <b>Mr Fullerton:</b> We will certainly attempt to do that, yes.</p>	78 19/10/2015	
75	493	ARTC	GALLACHER	Inland Rail Spending	<p>(i) How much was spent by ARTC on the Inland rail project in 2014-5?  (ii) How much has been spent so far in 2015-6?  (iii) What is the budget for Inland Rail work in 2015-6?  (iv) What is the budget for work in Inland Rail in the following years:  i. 2016-7?  ii. 2017-8?  iii. 2018-9?  iv. 2019-20?</p>	Written	
<b>Infrastructure Australia (2)</b>							
76	369	IA	GALLACHER	IA Submission – Confirmation of Submission Received	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps if I could get a date that the New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, NT and ACT lists were received.  <b>Mr Davies:</b> At this stage, no.</p>	68 19/10/15	

					<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Did they put a note in saying, 'We're progressing and don't leave us out' or they just did not respond?</p> <p><b>Mr Davies:</b> We are still waiting to receive something from them.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So, no response. Are these submissions published on the IA website?</p> <p><b>Mr Davies:</b> All of the submissions have been provided on a confidential basis at this stage. We are now busy working through those submissions, seeking further information and working closely with our state and territory colleagues to better understand some of what they have provided to us.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I am sorry to interrupt. We have time pressures and I have a list of questions. I know you have been effusive in your answers, but if they are not answering my questions—</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Can I just ask a follow-up to that?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Yes.</p>		
77	496	IA	EDWARDS	Northern Connector Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the South Australian Government applied to IA for the <i>Northern Connector</i> project, was there a rail component factored into their plan?</li> <li>• What was the rail route provided? Was it a freight or passenger transport route?</li> <li>• What site remediation would be required for this rail component?</li> </ul>	Written	
<b>Airservices Australia (12)</b>							
78	466	Airservices	GALLACHER	ATC – Age Profile	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are 30 per cent of ATCs over 55?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I will have to take that on notice. However, the demographics of the Operational Air Traffic Controllers is, in my understanding, about 48 or 49.</p>	82-83 19/10/2015	
79	465	Airservices	GALLACHER	Adelaide TCV – Business Case	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You are planning on 17 training replacements in the Adelaide TCU in the short term, almost the entire current staffing level, and in section 4.3 of the business case you have budgeted for \$7.3 million to replace the ageing workforce which numbered between seven and 14, and in section 5.1 you have only budgeted for \$6.5 million. Is there a discrepancy in your business case?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I will have to take that on notice. I do not have the detail in front of me.</p>	83 19/10/2015	
80	464	Airservices	GALLACHER	Eurocat Concole Cost	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are you buying four new Eurocat consoles to provide Adelaide Approach Services from Melbourne, or are you moving the existing consoles</p>	85 19/10/2015	

					<p>from Adelaide?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> My understanding is that we are buying four new ones to replace Adelaide, and that is to replace Adelaide and Cairns in Brisbane because when we move one of the terminal control units, those consoles at that particular location will be used for the other location. In other words, it is capacity. However, on top of that is that those four are not four extras specifically for the project. Because of the air traffic growth across the entire operation, we will need those extra four consoles to provide additional services; for example, providing new positions for Melbourne, Perth and Brisbane approach services with the introduction of the director positions.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How much will those four consoles cost?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I do not have that. I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The four console system reconfiguration and all of the associated hardware and software changes will cost a budgeted \$4.1 million; is that correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> That sounds correct, but I would need to double-check. When you talk specifically about the consoles, there are pieces of configuration work around some of those sorts of things.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You will give us on notice how much the consoles will cost, but there are software changes and there is a budgeted figure of \$4.3 million in the business case; is that correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Capex, technical, engineering and communication equipment system; the training costs to address the age profile exists regardless of whether the service is provided in Melbourne or Adelaide; there is \$7.3 million attributed to it, and that is carried across to the TCU integration project; is that a correct statement?</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> Yes.</p>		
81	463	Airservices	XENOPHON	TASWAM	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I will put some of these questions on notice. I do have some questions to ask Airservices and then I am out of here. I refer to TASWAM, something Mr Dick Smith has been commenting on in the media. Are you able to provide the original project objectives for TASWAM as well as the project risks register?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, we can provide that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> In particular, could you advise the extent of the regulatory risk identified, including the evolving risk as the project proceeded and the mitigation strategies put in place to avoid what appears to be the current impasse where you say it will do the job, but CASA will not let you use it as intended? That seems to be one of the issues that seems live on this.</p>	87 19/10/2015	

82	462	Airservices	XENOPHON	Melbourne Terminal Air Procedures	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Finally, in relation to the issue involving the separation between Essendon and Tullamarine, and also the issue of the double go-around on 5 July this year, can you give us an update as to whether there have been any changes in procedure for both incidents that caused a lot of concern amongst people in the aviation community I speak to? <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I will pass to Mr Hood to provide some detail on that.</p> <p><b>Mr Hood:</b> In relation to the Essendon issue that we discussed, there were changes in the Melbourne terminal area procedures, so we have made some changes in that space.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Could you provide those details on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Hood:</b> Certainly; we would be delighted to. In relation to LAHSO, we have had a number of meetings in relation to land and hold short operations. I consider that the land and hold short procedure in Melbourne continues to remain safe. However, we are considering further enhancements to the procedure.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> If you can provide details on that as well, that would be very welcome.</p> <p><b>Mr Hood:</b> Will do, Senator.</p>	87-88 19/10/2015	
83	461	Airservices	RICE	Airport Capacity Enhancement Project – Melbourne	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> In terms of when it commenced in Melbourne, can you tell me the date of that?</p> <p><b>Mr Hood:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Has there been community consultation with the program that has been operating in Melbourne?</p> <p><b>Mr Hood:</b> I will have to take that on notice in terms of the specific line items of the program for Melbourne.</p>	88 19/10/2015	
84	429	Airservices	RICE	Melbourne Airport – Noise Complaints	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I have been hearing from local residents raising issues with me about some increased noise from passenger aircraft over the north-west of Melbourne, and also in areas of the inner city. They were wondering whether it was connected with the runway occupancy program. Is there any other reason why there would have been flight path changes?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We will have to take that on notice, but it would not be as a result of the runway occupancy program.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Do you have any other thoughts as to why those flight path changes might have occurred?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I am not sure whether there have been actual flight path changes; that is why I need to take it on notice to see what the particular issue may or may not be.</p>	88-89 19/10/2015	

85	506	Airservices	GALLACHER	Prescribed airspace approvals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What role does Airservices Australia have with respect to prescribed airspace issues around airports?</li> <li>2. If construction is planned in prescribed airspace, what role does Airservices have?</li> <li>3. Is there a timeframe for responding to these applications by Airservices Australia?</li> <li>4. If both Airservices and CASA are involved, how does each work with the other?</li> <li>5. Is there an overall timeframe for a response/approval?</li> </ol>	Written	
86	507	Airservices	XENOPHON	Remote Terminal Control Service	Further to my questions during Estimates on Monday 19 <sup>th</sup> October, can you advise if there is another airport in Australia with anywhere near the same number of RPT movements that Adelaide airport has that uses a remote terminal control service to the surface of the airport (ie no local tower airspace)?	Written	
87	508	Airservices	XENOPHON	Remote Terminal Control Service	Further to my questions during Estimates on Monday 19 <sup>th</sup> October, is there another airport anywhere, even internationally, with anywhere near the same number of RPT movements that Adelaide airport has that uses a terminal control service to the surface of the airport (ie no local tower airspace) and that terminal control service is carried out from a location more than 100 nautical miles from the airport to which it provides a service?	Written	
88	509	Airservices	XENOPHON	Remote Terminal Control Service	For each similar airport that can be identified, please provide the distance between the airport and its remote terminal control service	Written	
89	510	Airservices	XENOPHON	TASWAM	Further to my questions during Estimates on Monday 19 <sup>th</sup> October on TASWAM, it seems to me that Airservices Australia are distinguishing surveillance technologies (like radar, ADS-B and TASWAM that tell you each aircraft's position) from how they may be used to manage air traffic and by whom. Similarly, Airservices Australia appear to be talking about OneSky simply as the management tool that integrates the surveillance data and separating it from the provision of the surveillance sensors. Can you please clarify those distinctions and provide details about how the surveillance data is used. What prevents it from being used more widely for separation of aircraft? What determines when the data is used for	Written	

					situational awareness rather than separation? Finally, what updates to surveillance sensors are planned with or without OneSky?		
<b>Civil Aviation Safety Authority (14)</b>							
90	444	CASA	FAWCETT	The Aviation Safety Regulation Review Report	<p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> The Aviation Safety Regulation Review report included 37 recommendations from memory, with 32 of those relating to CASA. In regards to the implementation of those, we are continuing to work on the recommendations. The implementation plan is incorporated in our corporate plan, and we are addressing the KPIs and the performance in regards to those and reporting back through the department to the minister on those. The overarching status of the recommendations is probably best covered by the department in regards to a departmental response, but I think CASA is still on line in regards to addressing those. I cannot say exactly which ones have already been implemented, but there are a number—HSB, MOU—we are working on the regulation development reform, as you have stated. There are 12 regulations still to be implemented or outstanding at this stage, if you want to specifically go down those. On the ASRR, I think we are tracking along in regards to meeting our recommendations.</p> <p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> Perhaps if you could take on notice with respect to the ones that are outstanding your time frame that you see to actually finish incorporating those, that would be useful?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> For the ASRR recommendations?</p> <p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> Yes. A broad comment, particularly around the statement of your regulatory philosophy, that has been broadly welcomed by most of the stakeholders I have engaged with the industry, so thank you for that. I look forward to seeing that pursued with some vigour. I will go to some detailed issues. With respect to CAO 48.1, my understanding is that several industry sectors have been engaging with CASA and particularly the EMS sector, looking to have a specific appendix drafted for them. My understanding is that most stakeholders had agreed on a form, but that seems to have been delayed in being issued. In terms of certainty, and particularly I am aware there are some who are looking to bid for contracts with state governments, the uncertainty around that is causing issues. Do you have an update on 48.1, and particularly for the EMS and air ambulance sectors?</p>	89 19/10/15	
91	473	CASA	FAWCETT	Industry Workshops – Participation	<p><b>Mr Weeks:</b> We have arranged an industry workshop that will be held in Melbourne in early November. With that workshop invitations have gone out to all operators that have expressed an interest in undertaking the trial for the fatigue risk management system. That workshop is designed to take them through the process, so it is very much what the</p>	90 19/10/2015	

					<p>trial is aimed to do and the information that they would need to provide during that trial. The purpose of the workshop in Melbourne is to take industry and provide industry with exactly that detail.</p> <p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> So, provide the detail or have industry help develop the detail? I am just wondering if an operator, for example, is based in Darwin, whether that is reasonable for the regulator to expect them to travel to Melbourne just to receive information, or is the workshop indeed a workshop for them to have input into the conduct?</p> <p><b>Mr Weeks:</b> I have not seen the final agenda yet so I do not know the exact detail that will be covered. That would be something I would need to take on notice and come back with what the agenda entails.</p> <p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> At a broad position though, if you are in charge of this process, then I would assume that you would know whether this was an information session where you are just telling operators what is required or whether your intent is that this is a co-regulatory approach where they help develop the requirements. Do you know, in a binary sense; is it information giving or is it a collaborative effort?</p> <p><b>Mr Weeks:</b> My understanding is that it will be collaborative because we have a number of speakers that are there. We have an expert coming out from New Zealand who will be presenting at the workshop as well. I do not have the detail. I would need to get that for you.</p>		
92	472	CASA	FAWCETT	<p>Revised Manual of Standards – Update</p> <p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> That is probably a fair defence for a recent appointment. My understanding is that there was supposed to be a revised manual of standards issued in September for part 61 but that is not yet on the streets. Could somebody give me an update as to what is occurring there?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> I am not sure of the exact status of the time frame for the revised manual of standards. We would have to check that and get the information back to you.</p> <p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> My understanding is Mr Crosthwaite replied in May of this year that the amendment to MOS was planned by September this year.</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> I can clarify that. The drafting structures were being written to address a number of issues and we are expecting an amendment to the part 61 MOS in December of 2015.</p> <p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> What is the corresponding time frame that you will be expecting industry to comply with the contents of the new manual of standards? My understanding is there have been some previous iterations where it was issued on Day X and Day X plus 1. Industry were being required to comply with it and we were seeing flying schools not able to conduct tests and other activities. I am interested to know what adjustment time you will be providing industry before they are expected to apply this?</p>	90 19/10/2015		

93	471	CASA	XENOPHON	145 Manual Standards – ALAEA	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> But is there a proposal, and you might get a call in the next half hour after these estimates? Has the ALAEA put forward a proposal to adopt the European regulatory provisions to do with these standards?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> I would have to take that on notice. I think they have but I would have to check in regards to the correspondence that I have received.</p>	94 19/10/2015	
94	470	CASA	XENOPHON	Australian 145 Comparison with EASA	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I will put some of these questions on notice because they are of a technical nature. Can I just ask broadly: does the Australian system of maintenance certification align or harmonise with the EASA system, which I understand is European?</p> <p><b>Mr Anastasi:</b> There are similarities, but there are differences as well.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Do the Europeans require all maintenance tasks to be overseen by persons qualified as licensed engineers before being released back to service?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> It might be easier for us to actually provide you with a comparison between our 145 and the EASA 145.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> Would that be easier?</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I think it might be more suitable to put those on notice and give answers.</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> I am more than happy to take that on notice and discuss it with you later.</p>	94 19/10/2015	
95	469	CASA	BULLOCK	REPCON	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> All right. I would like to go to question on notice 174 of the prebudget estimates. This is in the February estimates. This rates to the REPCON communications. This is about the REPCON in relation to the loss of separation or separation assurance in terms of the Melbourne airport and Essendon airport, if you are familiar with that. I was very dissatisfied with the answers given by the ATSB, which basically said that when they investigated it that CASA said, 'We relied upon the advice of Airservices' and the ATSB apparently used WebTrack. WebTrack is something that a 12-year-old goes online with to ask online where an aircraft is. I am concerned that you have been given very poor information by the ATSB in relation to what was a very serious incident. I am happy for you to take this on notice because I am very worried about this particular incident of what appears to be a loss of separation assurance between Melbourne and Essendon airports where aircraft were taking off at runways that are not parallel. They could potentially have intersected for what I think was several hours. Can you take on notice whether there has been a thorough investigation of the material that was provided to you by the ATSB, whether you are satisfied with that material, including the assertion that the ATSB relied on WebTrack, which I think in the aviation community is something that kids rely on online to see where aircraft are travelling? I put a number of questions to you back in May 2005. Mr Cromaty—and I want to put this on notice—was very helpful and did indicate that he wanted to speak to some of those air traffic</p>	94 - 95 19/10/2015	

					<p>controllers. Unfortunately at this stage they are not prepared to come forward, but could you give me some further information about whether you have dug deeper into the ATSB's answers or the information given to you as to whether you consider it adequate or not?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> I am certainly happy to do that.</p>		
96	468	CASA	BULLOCK	KPIs	<p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Back in May I foolishly assumed that you had adopted as a KPI reducing the number of accidents per flying hours. You responded that you were actually reviewing the appropriateness of your KPIs and whether it was appropriate to have a KPI reducing the number of accidents. I asked you at the time how you were going for 2014-15—this is May—and you said, 'I don't have that information directly to hand but we can certainly gather that information for you and check on it.' After I put it on notice we got an answer and the answer was, 'The data for 2014-15 year is not yet available.' Is it available now?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> Unfortunately the data for the 2014 calendar year is still not available but we have been able, based on some of the historical data, to make an assessment in regards to the actual accidents and incidents levels.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> So, you do not know how many accidents there were in the year ended 30 June and it is now October. CASA does not know how many accidents there were?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> We rely on the statistics being provided to us and we are still awaiting that information.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> From the ATSB?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> It is not just ATSB. It is also to do with the flying hours because we normalise the number of events, accidents and incidents across flying hours to be able to make an assessment from year to year.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Yes. I understand you would have to know how many hours to do the sum. Could you keep looking for me?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> I certainly will.</p>	95 19/10/2015	
97	467	CASA	DASTYARI	Drones – Engagement List Security Agencies	<p><b>Senator DASTYARI:</b> You said that you had not had a discussion recently with the Attorney-General's Department, and I appreciate that. If I was going to extend that to the security agencies, would you have the same answer?</p> <p><b>Mr Skidmore:</b> I have not had individual discussions with them. I am not sure whether anyone in my authority has so far.</p> <p><b>Senator DASTYARI:</b> Was that a no?</p> <p><b>Dr Aleck:</b> I personally have not.</p> <p><b>Senator DASTYARI:</b> If you can take that on notice. If the answer is no, if someone at</p>	96 19/10/2015	

					mid-level comes to us in the next day and says, 'Actually, we have,' then I will understand that. <b>Mr Skidmore:</b> We will take it on notice and then we will refer back any conversation.		
98	499	CASA	XENOPHON	Specialist maintenance	CASA provided advice that they “take the view” that any approval for additional Specialist Maintenance will require a legislative instrument. Where is this view reflected? Is it contained in a written policy or is this “requirement” to create an instrument also discretionary?	Written	
99	500	CASA	XENOPHON	Specialist maintenance	Are there companies operating with approvals in their Maintenance Organisations Expositions for Specialist Maintenance of the kind that was disallowed by the Senate in March 2015? How many? When were the approvals issued?	Written	
100	501	CASA	XENOPHON	Specialist maintenance	As there have been no actual changes to the Part 145 MOS in respect of the discretionary provisions for Specialist Maintenance approval since the creation of the MOS, how were the approvals for additional Specialist Maintenance for individual company’s Expositions made? Should they have been made under a legislative instrument? If so why weren’t they? What actions have CASA taken to ensure this doesn’t occur again?	Written	
101	502	CASA	XENOPHON	Specialist maintenance	In relation to the oversight of maintenance and differences between EASA and Australia – CASA indicated there were similarities and differences. Does the European Aviation Safety Regulator require a licence qualified person to take an active role in all maintenance tasks and ensure they have been completed properly and signed off properly? Is this the case in Australia, or is a non-licence qualified Specialist Maintainer permitted to sign off the maintenance?	Written	
102	503	CASA	XENOPHON	Specialist maintenance	In her speech to the Senate on 18 March 2015 in opposition to a motion to disallow the Amendments to Part 145 MOS Senator Cash, representing the Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development stated that CASA’s position in relation to specialist maintenance is consistent with that being applied in major overseas jurisdictions including Europe. Was the information being relied upon by the Minister accurate?	Written	

103	504	CASA	XENOPHON	Specialist maintenance	Can CASA supply a comparison of similarities and differences between the CASR system of certification and the EASR system, including any advice published by both EASA and CASA on their policy expectations?	Written	
<b>Aviation and Airports (8)</b>							
104	449	AAA	BROWN	Hobart Airport	<p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> On notice, can you give me details of what is required to proceed? I think there was a report in January about the tenders for the runway extension project. I am not sure whether you saw that report. There has been no announcement about the tender, has there?</p> <p><b>Mr Doherty:</b> I will get Ms Horrocks to elaborate if necessary. At this stage we understand the notice for tender has not been released by the airport. They have been working towards that. I am not sure that that will be released before they have the regulatory approval to proceed with the construction.</p>	97 19/10/2015	
105	448	AAA	BROWN	Hobart Airport	<p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> Senator Abetz was reported in the <i>Mercury</i> in March 2014 saying he expected the airport would be operational in early 2016.</p> <p><b>Mr Wilson:</b> At this stage it is not likely that an extension would be completed and operational by the end of 2016.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> By the end?</p> <p><b>Mr Wilson:</b> Not given the regulatory processes that they would need to go through and the construction time frame.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> So, you will take on notice for me the details of the works that they have to send to you?</p> <p><b>Mr Wilson:</b> Yes.</p>	98 19/10/2015	
106	447	AAA	GALLACHER	Airport disputes – DPM & Councils	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Has the deputy prime minister personally met with any council representatives in relation to this issue?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> The deputy prime minister meets with councils often. I think in relation to this specific matter he has asked that the department handle the matter, given that it comes down to a commercial negotiation between parties. As a first step he has been happy for the department to see if we can find a way forward.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Whilst I accept that the deputy prime minister will meet with whomever he chooses, including council representatives, has the deputy prime minister personally met with any council representatives in relation to this issue?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to take that on notice and check.</p>	99 19/10/2015	

107	446	AAA	GALLACHER	Airport Disputes – Departments Role	<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can we get a copy of the letter from the secretary of the department outlining their obligations as per answer to question 114.5? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes.	99 19/10/2015	
108	445	AAA	HEFFERNAN	Airport Disputes – State Law	<b>CHAIR:</b> The other thing is we have received from Mr Mrdak evidence earlier that in relation to the floodplain clause 30 of the lease regarding state laws does not apply. Only the Airports Act applies. We now have a letter that sort of contradicts that proposition, that the tenants of the lease have to comply with state law. Would you like to see that as well? <b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am happy to and we will provide advice on that, yes.	99 19/10/2015	
109	524	AAA	WILLIAMS	ILS at Gold Coast Airport	Please update me on the proposal to install the Instrument Landing System at the Gold Coast Airport.	Written	
110	511	AAA	GALLACHER	Sydney Airport Slots	(i) What role does the Department have in ensuring compliance with use of air landing slots at Sydney airport? (ii) How is compliance enforced? (iii) Is this compliance regulation robust? (iv) Is there a compliance committee? (v) How often does it meet? (vi) When did it last meet? (vii) When will it next meet?	Written	
111	512	AAA	XENOPHON	The National Airports Safeguarding Networks	A pilot association is concerned about a number of aspects of the National Airports Safeguarding Advisory Group (NASAG) Guideline B, which relates to building-induced turbulence at airports.  Accepting that creating the National Airports Safeguarding Networks (‘NASF’) was a significant achievement, are you planning to build on that process with a post-implementation review (or some other mechanism) to ensure that the Framework and Guidelines remain relevant and up to date?	Written	
<b>Australian Transport Safety Bureau (9)</b>							

112	390	ATSB	XENOPHON	MH370 – Technical Information	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> May we get a copy of that technical advice and all the other material that you relied on before you made your decision as to which search company that you went to and the equipment used?</p> <p><b>Mr Foley:</b> We can certainly provide that documentation. We have it in existence, of course. It is part of the tender assessment process. The normal, if you like, commercial-in-confidence rules apply, which do not apply here.</p>	101 19/10/2015	
113	389	ATSB	XENOPHON	MH370 – Technical Information	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> I am not interested so much as to what each of them were going to charge for it. I am interested in the technical assessment of those.</p> <p><b>Mr Foley:</b> In assessing the tender we firstly did not consider price at all. The panel was blind to the price of the bids until such time as we had actually assessed their technical merit. Once we had assessed their technical merit, taken advice on the technical merit of the various bids from an expert, we then—</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Who was that expert?</p> <p><b>Mr Foley:</b> He is currently contracted to us as our sonar expert. His name is Andrew Sherrell who worked, amongst other things, on finding Air France 447.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> So, you will provide us with that information.</p>	101 19/10/2015	
114	388	ATSB	GALLACHER	MH370 – Tender Process	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Just on MH370, could you supply on notice what you can about the tender process, the technical advice and the cost, because you may or may not be aware that there are people giving a lot of different senators—coalition, opposition and cross-bench senators—a very different view of what you are actually doing there. It is not a complimentary view, and it does not appear to be sour grapes. It appears to be a very different technical assessment, so you are going to need to justify your contract, your decisions, or at least publicly make them available to us, because we are getting an information source which is contrary to what you are saying. Are you aware of that?</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan:</b> We are aware that there is some fairly public commentary about an alternative approach to this. We have paid attention to that. Every time the question that has been asked of us as to whether our techniques are up to the necessary standards, we have provided the information. I am very happy to provide that information to the committee. I am very happy to provide a separate briefing to committee members if they wish it.</p>	102 19/10/2015	
115	387	ATSB	FAWCETT	Pel-Air Act of Grace Payment Advice	<p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> There are a couple of points that come out of this. There is one about the trust of industry in the organisations that are supposed to be having an oversight around safety and regulation, but the other is a very real impact on people. At the time, the committee were concerned about what we saw as a breakdown in the relationship between you and CASA and the inadequacies of the report. Subsequent to the Canadian peer review, which was quite scathing about the fact that there were very</p>	103-104 19/10/2015	

					<p>clear systemic issues which were not addressed, people who have been affected by this accident—being the pilot involved and potentially the nurse—have sought some remedy for the situation they find themselves in as a result of this report. In the pilot's case, correspondence I have seen from him has indicated that that report has essentially finished his aviation career. My understanding is that even after the Canadian report, when he has sought an act of grace payment from the Department of Finance, ATSB's recommendation is: 'Don't pay it. It was his fault.' Can you confirm that was the case?</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan:</b> I recall that there was some information sought from the Department of Finance in relation to an act-of-grace payment. We provided the facts as we understood them. It is not a purpose of our organisation to assign blame, and we would not have said that to the Department of Finance.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Can you provide the advice that Senator Fawcett has asked you for?</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan:</b> I beg your pardon?</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Can you table that advice?</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan:</b> I cannot see any reason why we should not, so I will obtain it and table it for the committee.</p> <p>....</p>		
116	386	ATSB	FAWCETT & XENOPHON	<p>Pel-Air Act of Grace Payment Advice Alternative Advice</p>	<p><b>Senator FAWCETT:</b> That would be very useful. I look forward to the report.</p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> So we will get a copy of that advice. Mr Dolan has been good enough to indicate that we would get a copy of that advice in this committee as to what was said and all the correspondence in relation to that. I have a couple of questions.</p>	104 19/10/2015	
117	385	ATSB	BULLOCK	<p>Statistics – Accidents</p>	<p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I have a couple of questions. How many accidents have there been in Australia in 2014-15?</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan:</b> I am afraid we will have to take that one on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> When you let us know, could you please let CASA know as well, because they have a question on notice that depends on your answer to that question and they say that they cannot get it out of you.</p>	104 19/10/2015	
118	534	ATSB	XENOPHON	<p>Double go-around at Essendon airport</p>	<p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> That is on notice. The other one on notice relates to the double go-around on 5 July. Can you tell us where the ATSB is at on that in relation to that double go-around?</p> <p><b>Mr Dolan:</b> We are currently undertaking an investigation of that double go-around.</p> <p><b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> So, it might take several weeks or months before there is a report?</p>	104 19/10/2015	

					<b>Mr Dolan:</b> Months more than weeks. <b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Thank you.		
119	370	ATSB	XENOPHON	REPCON	<b>Senator XENOPHON:</b> Just very quickly—and I am happy for you to take this on notice—I have asked about the issue of the REPCON on communications. This is about concerns about a loss of separation assurance between Essendon and Melbourne; it is a real criticism from people within the aviation community about the ATSB relying upon WebTrack, something that is publicly available that a lot of kids use to track where aircraft are. On notice, can you provide details of what has happened with respect to investigation in relation to the loss of separation assurance, whether there will be any further reports in respect of that and whether you have reconsidered your views on that. There was a concern that for several hours there was a lack of adequate communication between Melbourne and Essendon towers in respect of aircraft movements where they could have potentially intersected. <b>CHAIR:</b> That is on notice.	104 19/10/2015	
120	505	ATSB	BACK	Trainee Pilots and Air Traffic Controllers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can ATSB inform the Senator when investigations have been done whether language barriers between trainee pilots and air traffic controllers could be contributing to a higher than usual rate of near misses at Perth's Jandakot Airport?</li> <li>2. If so, can the ATSB update the Senator about the progress of these investigations?</li> <li>3. If not, when will investigations begin?</li> <li>4. If language barriers are not a safety issue, why are pilots still concerned about safety matters?</li> </ol>	Written	
<b>Office of Transport Security (4)</b>							
121	518	OTS	HEFFERNAN	Hobart Security - Security	<b>CHAIR:</b> Who are the security contractors to Hobart airport? I hope it is not Sydney Night Patrol. <b>Ms Wimmer:</b> I would have to take that on notice.	108 19/10/2015	

122	517	OTS	GALLACHER	Hobart Airport – Security	<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What day did the AFP vacate Hobart? <b>Mr Wilson:</b> I would have to take that on notice.	109 19/10/2015	
123	516	OTS	GALLACHER	Airport Security Audits	<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So in amongst all of these audits you have done, have you done one in Hobart since then? <b>Ms Wimmer:</b> I would have to take that on notice. .... <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> and your evidence is that you do not know whether you have done an audit of that yet. However, you do continual audits. <b>Ms Wimmer:</b> We do continual audits around the country. <b>Mr Wilson:</b> We took on notice the audit process around Hobart. We will come back to you with details on that.	109 19/10/2015	
124	400	OTS	WILLIAMS	ASIC & AVID	At the May estimates I raised the anomaly between the ASIC and AVID cards and the situation where some people with access behind security and on the tarmac and around aircraft have different cards and pay different fees for different periods. Mr. Mrdak said at the Estimates “ <i>I think you have raised a number of anomalies that are worth considering, particularly around the cost and time period...</i> ”. Has the Department gone back and to have a look at the anomalies to determine why there is a discrepancy?	Written	
<b>Australian Maritime Safety Authority (2)</b>							
125	394	AMSA	GALLACHER	Hong Kong International Convention Safe & Environment Sand Recycling of Ships	<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Was Australia involved in the discussions around this convention? <b>Mr Kinley:</b> We did have a representative at the convention, from my recollection. <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> AMSA had a representative? <b>Mr Kinley:</b> I would have to confirm who it was—whether it was us or Environment. <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are we considering ratifying it? Is that within your remit? <b>Mr Kinley:</b> It is not at the top of our list at the moment. I would have to check where it sits at the moment with relation to how far off it is coming into force internationally. I guess if I look at our strategic priorities at the IMO, our interests are predominantly as a coastal state and ship recycling is of prime interest to big ship owning states. ....	110 19/10/2015	

					<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What countries have ratified it? Are you able to tell us that?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I would have to take that on notice. I do not have that with me.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> In 2009, the Hong Kong Convention was established by the International Maritime Organization, which Australia is a member state. Can you provide an update on the status of the government support? Are we still supportive of it?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I can take that on notice—</p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> With ship breaking activity posing an enormous threat to health and safety of workers involved and also to the marine environments surrounding the yards, perhaps the minister can provide detail of when his government is proposing to sign this convention?</p> <p><b>Senator Colbeck:</b> I will have to take that on notice, Senator Gallagher. I do not have the detail with me of our proposal to sign it. Mr Kinley has already given you a detail of the process that we would go through if we were to sign.</p>		
126	393	AMSA	GALLACHER	Cranes at Ports	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> We have heard about some of these issues where the new cranes are picking up eight containers in a pack, and our cranes cannot do that.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Again, I would have to go away and confirm that. But not that I am aware of.</p>	111 19/10/2015	
<b>Policy and Research (9)</b>							
127	368	PAR	BULLOCK	BITRE – Freight Flow Forecast	<p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes. Mr Pittar mentioned the fact that our Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics also does forecasts of freight flows at ports, so we do have that information.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Have they done some projections?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Can we have those?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Yes. We will provide that to you on notice.</p>	63 19/10/2015	
128	367	PAR	RICE	Nation Cycling Strategy Report Update	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I want to follow up on questions I asked at the last estimates about the National Cycling Strategy. Can we have an update on any engagement and activity in the implementation of the National Cycling Strategy since May?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I think the major activity has been that the next report to ministers on the implementation of the National Cycling Strategy is due to go to the ministerial council, which is meeting in Adelaide on 6 November. That will provide the next comprehensive update of progress against the strategy. We would be happy, once that is provided to ministers, to provide you with a copy of that update report.</p>	112 19/10/2015	

					<b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay. Thank you.		
129	443	PAR	RICE	National Cycling Participations Summary	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I note the National Cycling Participation Survey results that were released in July 2015 actually noted a decrease in cycling participation between 2011 and 2015, when the goal of the National Cycling Strategy is to double participation. I am interested in knowing the federal government's response to that, because it is pretty alarming that we are seeing that trend.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I am not as familiar with that analysis. I will take on notice that analysis, and perhaps, once ministers have had an opportunity to discuss the issues at the ministerial council, we can come back to you with what options the states and territories are pursuing.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Given that that is the trend, wouldn't you expect that there should be a change of tack as to what is being done or some increased resources? That seems to be cause for alarm.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly, as I mentioned earlier, a number of jurisdictions are putting in place a mix of regulatory and infrastructure measures. I will take on notice exactly what actions are being pursued.</p>	113 19/10/2015	
130	413	PAR	RICE	Active Transport	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> There is no metric to say how much that is increasing or, in terms of the next strategy, give a baseline of how much money is being spent on active transport this year compared with five years time. You will not have the metrics to measure that?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We do not, but I will check if any jurisdictions do.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Thank you</p>	113 19/10/2015	
131	412	PAR	BULLOCK	SOAC	<p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I have made a bit of a meal of going back to the last lot of estimates today, but I am going to do it again and take you to the discussion that we had last time. Mr Collett participated in part and I was asking about the <i>State of Australian cities</i> report. Before you came in, Mr Mrdak, and helpfully answered a number of questions, I had asked Mr Collett whether the 2014 report had been not published but printed and he said:</p> <p>I would need to take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p>Then, Mr Mrdak, I asked you how much it cost and you said:</p> <p>While I am getting the final price, that was the contract amount, but it was not the final spend. I will get that for you on notice.</p> <p>Later on, I asked who from the minister's office had contacted the department to get the publication held off, and you said you would take that on notice. I asked whether it might have been the minister and you said you would take that on notice. So all of those were taken on notice, and here is your answer to all of those questions:</p>	120-121 19/10/2015	

					<p>The cost of any subsequent printing of any of the Progress in Australia's Regions suite of publications will depend on the final amount of copies to be printed.</p> <p>That was the answer that was supplied to all of those questions on notice. That is, from my perspective, extraordinarily poor.</p> <p>So I will ask the questions again. Perhaps you might take them on notice and this time answer them. What was the final cost of the printing in December 2014 of the 2014 <i>State of Australian cities</i> report? How many copies were printed? What has happened to those copies? What was the cost of printing <i>State of Australian cities 2014-2015</i>, released on 6 July this year by Minister Truss? How many copies were printed? Again from the last estimates, who from the minister's office contacted the department to tell you to hold off on the distribution of the <i>State of Australian cities</i> report that had been printed in 2014? Really, Mr Mrdak, when you undertake to answer questions on notice, it would be appreciated if you did.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Certainly. I will take those on notice and give you specific answers to each of those questions.</p>		
132	411	PAR	GALLACHER	High Speed Rail	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What HSR topics were discussed and what actions were taken?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> The discussion largely focused on continuing preparedness by state and territory jurisdictions for long-term planning for access for high-speed rail. I will take on notice the actual details of the discussion and come back to you.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And actions taken from it?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will get you an indication of those.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is there an agreed work plan with responsibilities and due dates?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I believe there is. I will take that on notice.</p>	122 19/10/2015	
133	410	PAR	GALLACHER	High Speed Rail	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> In May you told us that the meeting would identify the specific areas along the route that need early action to reserve them, for example tunnel outlets near built-up areas. Have those sites been identified, and where are they?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I think the work is just starting on those arrangements. On notice I will come back to you with details of where the work is at.</p>	122 19/10/2015	
134	430	PAR	GALLACHER	National Industry Data	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Mr Mrdak, can I put a question on notice to the group that we just let go—what financial year will we see national injury data?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice and get you an answer.</p>	128 19/10/2015	

135	514	PAR	GALLACHER	High Speed Rail	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the senior officials meeting scheduled for July to discuss HSR occur? [flagged at May Estimates]</li> <li>2. What HSR topics were discussed?</li> <li>3. What actions were taken?</li> <li>4. Is there an agreed workplan, with responsibilities and due by dates? Is it that formal, or just a loose discussion?</li> <li>5. Which States/Territories were present for the HSR discussion – NSW? Victoria? Queensland? ACT?</li> <li>6. What new developments are there in development of high speed rail since the last Estimates? Since the July 2014 Senior Officials meeting?</li> <li>7. In May you told us that the meeting would identify the specific areas along the route that need early action to reserve them – for example tunnel outlets near built-up areas.</li> <li>8. Have these sites been identified?</li> <li>9. Where are they?</li> <li>10. What action is being taken to protect these sites?</li> </ol>	Written	
<b>Surface Transport Policy (11)</b>							
136	432	STP	HEFFERNAN	Emissions Standards	<p>...</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> How much is it? Take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> It has to do with noxious emissions; it is not CO<sub>2</sub>. There is a particle limit that needs to be met. We will take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p>	126 19/10/2015	
137	431	STP	HEFFERNAN	Emissions Standards and Dealer Recourse	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> You can bet half a pound of peanuts, like the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, that if Volkswagen are doing it then others are doing it too. My question is: what recourse does the poor bloody Volkswagen dealer have? Can you imagine the impact on all the Volkswagen dealers—all their cars are not for sale.</p> <p><b>Ms Zielke:</b> I am aware that there are contractual arrangements between Volkswagen and their dealers. I can only assume that there is some commercial arrangement there, but I am not aware of that detail.</p>	128 19/10/2015	

138	397	STP	GALLACHER	Emissions	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> If you are looking at the carbon's emission standards or emissions target for motor vehicles, it is a very long preamble here but bear with me, the issues paper released in March this year by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet referred to activities that would need to be undertaken:          ...supplementary to the Emissions Reduction Fund and its safeguard mechanism. These could include fuel efficiency standards for light and heavy vehicles...          That is on page 7. More recently in an interview on <i>Lateline</i> on 6 October 2014, the Minister for the Environment, Greg Hunt, when questioned by Emma Alberici about whether the target could be achieved within the government's policy settings referred to work that the government will be doing on vehicle efficiency. He said:          The minus 26 to minus 28 is challenging. But the combination of, I think, the world's most effective, the world's best emissions reduction policy with an emissions reduction fund that's just produced in its first auction alone 47 million tonnes of reduction; the safeguards mechanism; the work that we'll be doing on vehicle efficiency, a national energy efficiency program; these things together, as well as the storage and technology developments, mean that Australia will meet and beat not just our 2020 targets but, in my judgment, our 2030 targets.          What was the minister referring to when he talked about work being done on vehicle efficiency?  <b>CHAIR:</b> Take it on notice.</p>	128 19/10/2015	
139	396	STP	GALLACHER	Safety Standards – Vehicle Width	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Have you received representation about trialling wider buses?  <b>Mr Hogan:</b> Not that I can recollect, Senator. I will take that on notice.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> If you take it on notice, please tell me who it was from.          ...  <b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Would that not be maintaining safety standards?  <b>Ms Zielke:</b> You would be, yes. But—  <b>CHAIR:</b> Just cut to the chase. The maximum width for a vehicle on the road before you put a wide load sign on it is what?  <b>Mr Hogan:</b> It is 2.5 metres.  <b>CHAIR:</b> Eight feet?  <b>Ms Zielke:</b> No, it is not quite that.  <b>Senator Colbeck:</b> Senator, 2.5 metres is a bit more than eight feet.  <b>CHAIR:</b> Is that what it is?  <b>Mr Hogan:</b> Yes.  <b>CHAIR:</b> Sure?  <b>Mr Hogan:</b> Yes, 2.5 metres.  <b>CHAIR:</b> Are you sure it is 2.5 metres? All I am saying is that if that is the width that is the bloody width. If a bus is going to be registered on the road without a wide-load sign, so that it scrapes every other bus on a two-line highway, get with it.</p>	129 - 130 19/10/2015	

					<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> They are going to give us the answer on notice. I am happy to go to Tasmanian freight, if you are happy, Chair.		
140	395	STP	GALLACHER	TAS Freight	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> With respect to the top 10 recipients of the TFS subsidies, what additional amounts were estimated that these companies receive from the new scheme?</p> <p><b>Mr Sutton:</b> I would have to take that on notice. I do not think we have done that analysis down to the level of individual companies.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You have given us a chart of the top 10 users to 2011-12. It is from the Productivity Commission's report on the Tasmanian shipping and freight. It lists Simplot, Norske, Net Sea, J Boag, Cadbury, McCain, Monson Shipping, Cascade, Ertler Trading and Murray Goulburn Co-op Co Ltd.</p> <p><b>Mr Sutton:</b> Correct.</p> <p><b>Senator Colbeck:</b> That would have been very much on those that are exports, and not a lot of those are exporters. I think the data on that is yet to develop.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR (Senator Gallacher):</b> Is that a question to take on notice, or do you not have that data yet?</p> <p><b>Mr Sutton:</b> As Senator Colbeck has indicated, we would have to take it on notice, but there would be a limited amount that we could say, because it does depend on the actual take-up of the expanded component of the scheme.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> If you could take that on notice it would be appreciated.</p> <p><b>Senator Colbeck:</b> I have to say that I think the market will change and develop with the change to the scheme. Some people who were not exporting may now be in the market to export, which was one of the rationales behind it: to help grow the economy.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> If the mix did not change, the change in approach would not be justified.</p> <p><b>Senator Colbeck:</b> I would hope that some of those manufacturers that are not exporting would start exporting.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> I will leave that on notice and you can provide whatever information you have that is relevant.</p>	130-131 19/10/2015	
141	399	STP	WILLIAMS	ABS on motorcycles	I read a report that anti-lock braking systems could help in 93% of motorcycle crashes. How did you arrive at this conclusion?	Written	

142	398	STP	WILLIAMS	ABS on motorcycles	Did you do any research or modelling on what additional cost would be placed on the purchase price of a motorcycle if ABS was mandatory?	Written	
143	383	STP	WILLIAMS	ABS on motorcycles	What form will the consultation take with motorcycle groups and manufacturers?	Written	
144	382	STP	WILLIAMS	ABS on motorcycles	Will dealers be invited to have input?	Written	
145	513	STP	GALLACHER	Carbon emissions target – motor vehicles	<p>I would like to ask some questions about work the department is doing in preparation for the Paris Climate Change Conference in November/December this year.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the Department have a role in the work of the taskforce that was run out of the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet that lead to Government setting its Paris target – ie that greenhouse gas emissions would be reduced by 26-28% from 2005 levels by 2030?</li> <li>2. Were transport emissions factored into this target?</li> <li>3. Is any work underway at the moment to further refine how the target will be met between now and 2030?</li> <li>4. The issues paper released in March this year by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet referred to activities that would need to be undertaken <i>“supplementary to the Emissions Reduction Fund and its safeguard mechanism. These <u>could</u> include fuel efficiency standards for light and heavy vehicles”</i> (page 7). More recently, in an interview on Lateline on 6 October 2014, Environment Minister Greg Hunt, when questioned by Emma Alberici about whether the target could be achieved within the Government’s current policy settings referred to work that the government <u>will</u> be doing on vehicle efficiency:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>“The minus 26-28 is challenging but the combination of I think the world's most effective, the world's best emissions reduction policy – with an Emissions Reductions Fund that's just produced in its first auction alone 47</i> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Written	

					<p><i>million tonnes of reduction – the safeguards mechanism, <u>the work that we will be doing on vehicle efficiency, a national energy efficiency program – these things together as well as the storage and technology developments mean that Australia will meet and beat not just our 2020 targets, but in my judgement, our 2030 targets.</u></i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. What was Minister Hunt referring to when he talked about work being done on vehicle efficiency? Is the Department doing any work in relation to CO2 emissions standards for light vehicles?</li> <li>6. If so, who is involved in this work? Have any stakeholders been engaged in discussions?</li> <li>7. What process would be used to determine the appropriate standard?</li> <li>8. How would an emissions standard be applied to:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) New vehicles</li> <li>b) The existing passenger transport fleet</li> </ol> </li> <li>9. Who would bear the cost of a CO2 standard? Would there be any access to the Emissions Reduction Fund or other government incentives, or would the cost be passed on to vehicle owners through financial penalties or fines to vehicle manufacturers?</li> <li>10. Have any other transport issues been factored into modelling on how the Paris target will be achieved?</li> <li>11. When will you be talking with stakeholders and the broader community about how transport emissions will be factored into the strategy for meeting the Paris targets?</li> </ol>		
146	495	STP	EDWARDS	Agricultural Vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What progress has been made by the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator? What are their key priorities?</li> <li>• What have the preliminary findings been for the 12 month trial for oversize vehicles in Queensland you mentioned at the last estimates, is that underway?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will this be replicated in other states in the short term?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What other outcomes are being sought for large agricultural vehicles? What emphasis does the NHVR place on keeping road transport practices updated</li> </ul>	Written	

					to accommodate the new, larger agricultural equipment?		
<b>Local Government and Territories (5)</b>							
147	428	LGT	GALLACHER	Financial Assistance Grants	<p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Is it possible to get a list of the councils or LGAs who have contacted the Deputy Prime Minister about this issue?</p> <p><b>Mr Wilson:</b> Yes. We will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Is it possible to get information about the amount each council nominated that they will be losing through this correspondence?</p> <p><b>Mr Wilson:</b> We can provide the details of what the councils indicated that they viewed would be the case.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Did the amounts generally match the department's estimations?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> As we have discussed at length previously, it is very difficult to determine what the implications are, because of the nature of the financial assistance grants process. As we have discussed previously, a number of councils—I think over 40 per cent of councils—had an increase in their financial assistance grants payments in 2015-16, because of the way in which the population estimates do initial allocations. So it is not clear cut that all councils are disadvantaged by the indexation pause.</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Can the department provide details of how many government MPs have corresponded with the minister about the cuts to the FAGs.</p> <p><b>Mr Wilson:</b> Again, we will take that on notice again and provide you with the details.</p> <p>....</p> <p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> Finally on this matter, has the department received any correspondence relating to local governments having to increase their rates due to the indexation pause on FAGs?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> We will check whether any of the correspondence raises that particular issue. Again, it depends on decisions made by the local government.</p>	131&133 19/10/2015	
148	427	LGT	BULLOCK & GALLACHER	Financial Assistance Grants	<p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I am not going to persist with this too much, but the variables that were applied in a given year that caused that fluctuation up or down are objective. You know what they were because they are events that have happened.</p> <p><b>Ms Fleming:</b> In fact, Senator, each grants commission takes the 13 principles—they have their own formulas and they vary each year based on a range of priorities, and it is actually very difficult to predict. We can take on notice some analysis about how those numbers, for an individual council, have actually gone up and down over the time frame. It demonstrates the fact that there is no base for some councils; it actually incrementally increases each year. It is more like a zig-zag pattern. I know it does not make logic sense but that is actually how it happens.</p>	132 19/10/2015	

					<p><b>ACTING CHAIR:</b> So the council of Elliston is one of those council that you mentioned, which is 1,200 ratepayers and many hundreds of kilometres of roads to maintain. Could I have a snapshot of their situation?</p> <p><b>Ms Fleming:</b> I would have to take that on notice, but yes, we could do that.</p>		
149	426	LGT	GALLAGHER	Mr Fluffy Agreement	<p><b>Senator GALLAGHER:</b> What interest has been charged since that agreement was finalised—which was post my time, so I guess it was over the last financial year?</p> <p><b>Ms Fleming:</b> There is an interest payment at the end of each financial year and capital repayments commence from 2028, I think it is. I do not have my papers with me. Can I take that on notice?</p>	141 19/10/2015	
150	425	LGT	GALLAGHER	Mr Fluffy – Interest Payment	<p><b>Senator GALLAGHER:</b> Those interest payments are due right at the end of the financial year—that is the date it is due every year?</p> <p><b>Ms Fleming:</b> I believe so, but I will take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLAGHER:</b> Okay. On notice also, could you just outline the prospective payments? I do not want to create too much work, so if you have an indicative figure of how that is to be phased—</p>	141 19/10/2015	
151	424	LGT	HEFFERNAN	Mr Fluffy – Interest Rate	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> Thank you very much for that. Could I just ask a very basic question with regard to that: is the interest rate tied to the bond rate? What interest rate are they paying?</p> <p><b>Ms Fleming:</b> The interest rate is tied to the bond rate. I would have to take that on notice.</p>	141 19/10/2015	
<b>Western Sydney Unit (2)</b>							
152	515	WSU	GALLACHER	Western Sydney Airport	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that the Commonwealth will lease the Badgery’s Creek site to a private sector operator, is there an understood split between what the Commonwealth will own and develop, and what the operator will develop as part of the lease?</li> <li>Is there a standard asset split for airports between lessor and lessee, or is this the subject of case-by-case commercial negotiation?</li> <li>For instance, is the planned airstrip the property of the Commonwealth or the lessee?</li> </ol>	Written	
153	474	WSU	GALLACHER	Airport Rail Line	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a cost estimate been determined for the extension of the rail line from Leppington through the new airport and to the main Western Line (near St Mary’s)? If yes, what is the estimate? If no, is there a rule of thumb that might apply?</li> </ol>	Written	

					<p>2. Has work been done on the additional cost of retrofitting a line around an operational airport? What is the additional cost of deferring the building of the rail line?</p> <p>3. There are some media reports of a \$500M cost estimate for this rail line. What does the \$500 million cost estimate for the rail line include? Is this estimate agreed with the NSW Government? What are the intergovernmental arrangements around cost apportionment for this – now and into the future?</p>		
<b>National Capital Authority (5)</b>							
154	392	NCA	BULLOCK	Revenue	<p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> You will remember that at the last estimates I raised a question that I had raised at the previous estimates where I had been looking at the budget papers and trying to work out whether the paid parking arrangements showed a profit and to see the year-by-year capital works cost, administration cost and revenue. Now I have got your answer to that here somewhere, and it suggests to me that through the additional forward estimates your revenue is going to be \$7 million. I do not know how that breaks down year by year but the revenue is \$7 million over the forward estimates. You say you have received funding over the forward estimates through administration capital works of \$10.8 million in 2013-14 and \$20 million in 2014-15 and that is \$30.8 million. I cannot break down the difference between administration and capital works. You are going to make \$7 million over the forward estimates, and it is going to cost you \$30.8 million. Except when I read on it says, 'The difference between the administered revenue of \$108 million and the revenue returned to the government of \$69.2 million reflects the cost of installing and operating the scheme.' And when I take \$69.2 million off \$108 million I get \$38.8 million so the cost of installing and administering the scheme could be \$38.8 million. Although, you have received funding for \$30.8 million so there is \$8 million difference there against the \$7 million in revenue over the forward estimates. Mr Snow, could you please set out for me year by year over those years that were in question—2013-14 through to 2017-18—the capital works cost, the budget for each year, the actual and foreseen administrative costs for each year and the actual and foreseen revenue for each year, so I can get my question answered. Three times, Mr Snow—I will pursue this until I find out whether or not this is a profitable exercise, what the capital costs are year by year, what the administrative costs are year by year and what the revenue is year by year. And, by golly, you will answer this question!</p> <p><b>Mr Snow:</b> I will ask Ms Badger to provide some information. You are asking for some further information, which I am very happy to take on notice—</p>	137 - 138 19/10/2015	

					<p>...</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I want it broken down each year: capital cost, administrative cost and revenue.</p> <p><b>Ms Badger:</b> Yes, we can do that. I can tell you what it is now or we can send it through to you, but without referring—</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I will take it in writing because I want it to be crystal clear.</p> <p><b>Ms Badger:</b> Sorry?</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I would rather have it in writing both in the interests of the expedition and so that I have got it to frame!</p> <p><b>Ms Badger:</b> I will take it on notice. Can I correct you on the first one where you said we only made \$7 million. We put the first sentence on the answer there. The estimated administered revenue is \$108 million. That \$7 million that is generated through the additional car parks is what is relevant when you are looking at this interim measure from this document.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I took it that \$108 million was all of your—</p> <p><b>Ms Badger:</b> Yes, it is \$108 million over the forward estimates.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> I was only looking at your car parking revenue. I am only interested in your car parking revenue.</p> <p><b>Ms Badger:</b> No. You want the whole lot. You want the car parking, infringement revenue—everything?</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Ms Badger:</b> Just the tickets? Okay. Infringement revenue is a significant part of the scheme. You get ticket sales as well as the infringement revenue.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Don't tell me that the infringement revenue out-polls the ticket sales by 101 to seven?</p> <p><b>Ms Badger:</b> No, it does not out-do it by that much. But you have to look at both, because it is a scheme in its entirety.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> If you would like to break the revenue down for me, that would be giving me more than I asked for. Perhaps it would be just reward after the wait.</p> <p><b>Ms Badger:</b> Okay. I will do that.</p>		
155	391	NCA	GALLACHER	Enlighten – Cost	<p><b>Senator GALLAGHER:</b> So what is the cost for Enlighten?</p> <p><b>Mr Smith:</b> We would have to take that question on notice.</p>	140 19/10/2015	
156	480	NCA	GALLAGHER	Capital Metro Light Rail	The National Capital Authority has expressed concerns about the image of the Northbourne Avenue Boulevard when construction begins on the Capital Metro Light Rail project, and there has been subsequent reporting that your agency's views	Written	

					have softened. What is the NCA’s current position on this issue?		
157	479	NCA	GALLAGHER	Capital Metro Light Rail	Does the National Capital Authority see merit in Capital Metro extending past its current stage of Gungahlin to the City and extending to Russell or other parts of the Parliamentary Triangle?	Written	
158	478	NCA	GALLAGHER	Capital Metro Light Rail	Would it be a requirement of the project, in order to gain NCA approval to have no overhead power lines like what has recently been reported in the Canberra Times? If so, why is that a requirement?	Written	
<b>National Transport Commission (3)</b>							
159	403	NTC	GALLACHER	Heavy Vehicle Charging	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the total quantum of over-recovered charges from the heavy vehicle industry resulting from the two-year delay in implementing your original recommendation—with your NTC hat on?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> In fact, the over-recovery only occurs with the application of the new methodology. I can get some advice for you in relation to that, but, essentially, with the adoption of the new methodology there have been annual adjustments taking place through that period. I will take on notice the quantum involved.</p> <p><b>Senator BULLOCK:</b> Just to be clear on the question: had the new methodology been implemented at the time that it was first recommended, what would the difference have been between the amount recovered and the amount that would otherwise have been recovered?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice and get you those numbers.</p>	143 19/10/2015	
160	402	NTC	GALLACHER	Heavy Vehicle Charging	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Option 2 would result in a further recovery of \$335.8 million over-recovery, a cumulative total of \$771.9 million since the original NTC recommendation. Does that make sense?</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I would have to look at the numbers. I am not familiar with those specific numbers. But, certainly, that phase-in would involve some over-recovery continuing.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Option 3 will continue overcharging well into the mid-2020s and will easily exceed \$1.5 billion.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> Again, I would need to look at the numbers to affirm the quantum involved and whether that is the case.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The delay in implementing the NTC's recommendation was meant to protect road service and funding commitments. What are the current projections for road services expenditure across all governments from 2015-16?</p>	143 19/10/2015	

					<b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice and get that detail for you.		
161	401	NTC	GALLACHER	Heavy Vehicle Charging	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What would the total cost to the industry of these delays be? You can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Mrdak:</b> I will take that on notice.</p>	143 19/10/2015	