

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 64

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Heavy Vehicle Safety and Productivity Program audit

Proof Hansard Page/s: 30 (16/10/12)

Senator WILLIAMS asked:

Senator WILLIAMS: Has the heavy vehicle safety and productivity program been audited to ensure it is delivering good outcomes?

Mr Mrdak: Yes, an audit of the program was undertaken as required by the legislation. I am advised that it has been tabled, and we would be happy to provide an additional copy for you.

Answer:

An additional copy is provided at Attachment A.

64 – Attachment A

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 65

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Nation Building 2 Proposals

Proof Hansard Page/s: 34 (16/10/12)

Senator RHIANNON asked:

Senator RHIANNON: Of the proposals received by the states, what percentage are devoted to the Connecting People part of the program and Urban Living?

Mr Mrdak: It would vary across individual jurisdictions. I would have to take that on notice.

Senator RHIANNON: You mean that it varies from state to state?

Mr Mrdak: Yes.

Senator RHIANNON: Okay, you can take that on notice. Thank you. What sort of community consultation would you expect the states to undertake in order to put in their submissions for the Connecting People funding?

Answer:

Submissions from State and Territory Governments have not been made public.
Infrastructure Australia publishes its National Priority List annually.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 66

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Gawler Line Modernisation: status and funding

Proof Hansard Page/s: 35 (16/10/12)

Senator EDWARDS asked:

Senator EDWARDS: Are you able to provide the committee with the original application for funding to the Building Australia Fund for the Gawler line modernisation project?

Mr Mrdak: We can take that on notice. We do not have it with us but are happy to take it on notice.

Answer:

The South Australian Government made a submission to Infrastructure Australia (IA) on a confidential basis for assessment. IA's recommendations for the project were included in its report titled '*National Infrastructure Priorities: Infrastructure for an economically, socially and environmentally sustainable future*, May 2009'.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 67

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: South Australian Government handling of funds

Proof Hansard Page/s: 36 (16/10/12)

Senator BACK asked:

Senator BACK: But, in general terms, if the Commonwealth makes an allocation of funds to a state or a territory from this particular vote, then those funds would not freely go into the general revenue accounts of that state or territory prior to works either commencing or being undertaken?

Mr Mrdak: We would expect that the funds are being held against this project, yes.

Senator EDWARDS: They should be back with you, those funds. As Senator Back rightly points out, those funds are sitting there. They should be saying, 'No problem; clear breach; we'll send the cheque back.'

Mr Mrdak: As I said, I am not as familiar with how the South Australian government is handling the funds.

Senator BACK: Perhaps you could take that on notice for us, if you would not mind.

Answer:

Australian Government funds are managed in accordance with the provisions of the National Partnership Agreement. In this instance the funds provided to South Australia are being held by its Treasury.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 68

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: South Australian Government handling of funds

Proof Hansard Page/s: 37 (16/10/12)

Senator EDWARDS asked:

Senator EDWARDS: I will come to a conclusion.

Mr Mrdak: Perhaps I could add something here. My colleague in South Australia gave some evidence to a parliamentary committee in South Australia last week, which has been reported somewhat in the media. He makes it clear in his evidence that the Commonwealth's expectation for the money is that the project will be completed, and they are working with us to see if there are alternative proposals. He is quite clear that if the proposals do not meet our requirements for the project then the money will need to be returned.

Senator EDWARDS: In the spirit of concluding, are you able to confirm to us that that is the message you have sent to them and also when you will expect that repayment? I will put the rest on notice.

Answer:

The Department has corresponded with the SA Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure on the return of unspent funds.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 69

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Great Eastern Highway Upgrade, Kooyong Road to Tonkin Highway – Traffic Modelling

Proof Hansard Page/s: 37 (16/10/12)

Senator LUDLAM asked:

Senator LUDLAM: The Commonwealth has made a contribution to widening the Great Eastern Highway in Perth. I put some questions to you last time. This is a \$686 million Commonwealth allocation.

Around traffic projections, you told us that with the volume of traffic forecast to 2031 the upgraded highway will be operating at its full capacity—in other words, we will have the same congestion we have today; it will just be wider. Can you tell us—and I will race through this pretty quickly and probably get to you to take some of this on notice—how many vehicles are expected to use the Great Eastern Highway by 2031 or provide the traffic modelling on those?

Senator Kim Carr: Before you go on we just need to correct the record on how you have summarised an answer.

Senator LUDLAM: Part of it was summarising, and some of it was editorial.

Senator Kim Carr: It was a bit of editorial. The officer would like to correct the record.

Senator LUDLAM: Go ahead.

Mr Pittar: I believe our answer to your question on notice 129 from last time said: 'With the volume of traffic forecast for 2031, the upgraded highway will be operating below its full capacity.'

Senator LUDLAM: I have 'at its full capacity'. There is an interesting typo. I will chase that. Thanks for that correction, if that is the case. Could you provide us with the traffic modelling on notice and give us an idea of how many vehicles are expected to be using that highway by 2031?

Mr Mrdak: We can certainly take that on notice.

Senator LUDLAM: Thank you. Was any demand management, whether that be better public transport, better cycling infrastructure or behaviour change, used at all for that modelling, either by the state or by you guys?

Mr Pittar: We will take that on notice. We would expect so.

Answer:

Traffic modelling undertaken by Main Roads Western Australia predicts that the Annual Average Weekday Traffic will be less than its full capacity.

The project includes bus priority lanes at key intersections and on-road cycling lanes. The traffic model used by Main Roads Western Australia considers broad usage across modes, but does not factor in changes to modal patterns.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 70

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Great Eastern Highway Upgrade, Kooyong Road to Tonkin Highway – Contact with NBN Co

Proof Hansard Page/s: 38 (16/10/12)

Senator LUDLAM asked:

Senator LUDLAM: It has made an awful mess, but I recognise that these things do make a bit of a mess. Was there any consideration given, either in this project in others, to embedding NBN infrastructure as you go? If you are going to tear up a freeway—and I am interested in this in a more general sense than just Great Eastern Highway—or a bit of road, if it is a project that is being funded by the Commonwealth, do you contact NBN Co. and let them know that there are major works underway?

Mr Mrdak: Normally the project scheduling and the works proposals are with the states and territories, but I know NBN Co. does work pretty closely with most state jurisdictions. Obviously if there is an opportunity to joint trench they will do it. I am not familiar with the circumstances in this case, but I can ask that question.

Mr Jagers: I think in these case utilities were moved, so substantial work had to be done to move utilities, and the state government would have contacted all those utility owners and potential utility owners around that. That is usually managed by the state or territory government that is delivering the project.

Senator LUDLAM: So in the instance of this you are reasonably confident NBN Co. would have been contacted and advised?

Mr Jagers: I am saying that utilities were definitely moved, and the state government would have contacted relevant utility holders.

Senator LUDLAM: You used the words 'potential utility'.

Mr Jagers: That is what they do, yes. I do not know in this particular case whether NBN Co. was contacted, but we can take that on notice.

Answer:

Main Roads Western Australia contacted NBN Co in relation to service relocations for the project.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 71

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Roads to Recovery and Black Spot Program Allocations

Proof Hansard Page/s: 39 (16/10/12)

Senator BACK asked:

Senator BACK: Because of shortness of time and out of respect for my colleagues, I wonder if it would be possible to be provided on notice the actual formula state to state. You have Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment been kind enough to tell me how the allocations are made within a state. I am interested in knowing particularly what that formula is for Roads to Recovery and for Black Spots between states.

Mr Mrdak: I would be happy to provide that.

Answer:

Roads to Recovery Program

Council allocations are calculated in a two stage process:

- the total funding for the period is divided between the jurisdictions based roughly on a 50-50 split of road length and population; then
- life of program allocations for the councils in each jurisdiction (except the ACT as it is a unitary jurisdiction) are determined on the basis of the recommendations of the Local Government Grants Commissions in each state and the Northern Territory for the roads component of the Financial Assistance Grants (FAGs) for 2008-09, which were the latest figures available when the allocations were determined.

Black Spot Program

Funding under the Program is based on each jurisdiction's percentage of population from the 2006 Census and the proportion of fatal crashes over the period 2003 to 2007.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 72

Program: Infrastructure Employment Projects program

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Three Capes Walking Track modelling

Proof Hansard Page/s: 40 (16/10/12)

Senator WHISH-WILSON asked:

Senator WHISH-WILSON: Were you involved with the modelling of the project? Did you look at the modelling and the assumptions behind the modelling? I am only asking that because, as you are probably aware, the tourism industry is in a bit of strife in Tasmania at the moment with the high dollar and tourism numbers dropping off. The assumptions include three to five per cent growth in tourism numbers every year and achieving 10,000 walkers on a new track, when our numbers are down only 3,000 for the Overland Track, for example, which is one of the world's great tracks. If you have not walked it, you should—it is fantastic. I am just wondering if you had questioned the assumptions for the modelling to underpin the economics of this project.

Mr Pittar: The modelling was undertaken by the Tasmanian government when the project was originally considered for funding under the Infrastructure Employment Projects program. So that would have been undertaken in the order of two or three years ago. In addition to that, under the program for projects that the department provided advice to the minister on, we also undertook independent viability assessments of the project. So this project would have been subject to a level of independent viability assessment prior to the project being considered and recommended for funding.

Senator WHISH-WILSON: Are those independent viability assessments available?

Mr Pittar: I would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

The independent viability assessments are not publicly available. The independent viability assessments were undertaken to provide advice to the Minister about whether projects met the program guidelines in terms of construction viability and the proponent's financial viability.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 73

Program: Infrastructure Employment Projects program

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Three Capes Walking Track funding milestones

Proof Hansard Page/s: 40 (16/10/12)

Senator WHISH-WILSON asked:

Senator WHISH-WILSON: Were there any goals or benchmarks that you entered into in terms of funding or, the funding having been provided, in terms of completion of the project?

Mr Pittar: Our funding for this project and for other projects under the IEP program is based on milestones. We pay on the achievement of milestones.

Senator WHISH-WILSON: Would they be available as well?

Mr Pittar: I believe so, but I can take that on notice.

Answer:

Milestones for the project are listed in the Implementation Plan which was agreed between the Australian and Tasmanian Governments under the National Partnership Agreement to Support Local Government and Regional Development. The Implementation Plan for the Three Capes Track project is publicly available on the Standing Council on Federal Financial Relations website.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 74

Program: 1.1: Infrastructure investment

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Regional Infrastructure Fund

Proof Hansard Page/s: 40-41 (16/10/12)

Senator MACDONALD asked:

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Yes, I have that, thank you. The Prime Minister announced on 11 July that \$6 billion would be made available for infrastructure works and that this would be done through Infrastructure Australia. It is out of the Regional Infrastructure Fund. Is that something you manage or is that something the regional department manages?

Mr Mrdak: The Regional Infrastructure Fund is with this portfolio, Senator, apart from the component of the fund which is administered by Minister Crean under the regional program arrangements, which I think is of the order of \$573 million. The balance of the fund is with this portfolio.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Have any funds been allocated through this portfolio to date?

Mr Mrdak: Yes, there have been announcements of commitments to a number of projects and also there have been four planning projects which have been committed to. I will ask Mr Jagers to take you through them.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Very quickly, but I would appreciate that.

Mr Jagers: There is the Peak Downs Highway safety works which is a \$120 million project; the Gladstone Port access road stages 2 and 3 which is a \$50 million project; the Warrego Highway and Brisbane Valley Highway interchange, which is the Blacksoil Interchange, which is a \$54 million contribution from the Australian government; the Townsville Ring Road section 4, which the Shore Road in the Mount Low area, which is a \$160 million commitment; the Yeppen Lagoon bridge and roundabout which is a \$68 million project; and also Gateway WA which is a \$480 million contribution from the Regional Infrastructure Fund.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Are there many more on the list?

Mr Jagers: That is the construction projects. There are two studies and four planning projects.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Could you give them to me on notice, please. All of those that you have mentioned, verbally, are all committed and the funds are set aside and locked in?

Mr Mrdak: Yes.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: And the work has started?

Mr Jagers: Work has started on a number of those projects.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: How many are for the current financial year and how many for the forward years?

Mr Jagers: There are four projects with funding this financial year.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: And the others?

Mr Jagers: The others are funding in future years.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Where could I find when the commitments are made to those projects in forward funding?

Mr Jagers: I believe there is information on the departmental website, but we are happy to provide that.

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Okay, could you do that.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Answer:

1. In addition to the six construction projects outlined by Mr Jagers in the Hansard answer above, there are two studies under Stream 1 of the Regional Infrastructure Fund:
 - a. the Scone Level Crossing Study—\$1.4 million; and
 - b. the Mackay Ring Road Study—\$10 million.

2. In addition, the Australian Government is funding the following Stream 2 Regional Infrastructure Fund Planning projects:
 - a. the North Queensland Resources Supply Chain project—\$1.66 million;
 - b. the Central Queensland Resources Supply Chain project—\$1.5 million;
 - c. the Hunter Economic Infrastructure plan—\$450,000; and
 - d. the Regional Mining and Infrastructure Plans across three regions in South Australia—\$1.5 million.

3. See relevant Budget papers.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 75

Program: Liveable Cities Program

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Liveable Cities Program expenditure

Proof Hansard Page/s: 56-57 (16/10/12)

Senator NASH asked:

Senator NASH: Mr Mrdak, can you help me out, given that I have missed nation building?

Mr Mrdak: Certainly. What were you after?

Senator NASH: Just the expenditure for the Liveable Cities Program.

Mr Mrdak: It is \$20 million over two years—2012-13 and 2013-14—for that program.

Senator NASH: Is anything allocated post that time? Or is it just the \$20 million for 2012-13 and 2013-14?

Mr Mrdak: The \$20 million is all that has been allocated to that program. That program is due to cease after that two years. It was only funded for two years.

Senator NASH: At the moment, how much of that expenditure has already been committed or contracted, and how much still remains?

Mr Mrdak: There is \$13 million for this year and \$7 million for next year. Here are the details of how much has been committed: 25 projects were successful; 13 projects have now had project agreements signed and are underway; two projects have been withdrawn because of the Queensland government's withdrawal of matched funding; and the remainder of the projects that have been announced are subject to further negotiation with proponents to settle funding agreements.

Senator NASH: Are you able, on notice, to give us a list of those projects, the funding allocated to each of those and the expenditure thus far?

Answer:

Since the last Estimates, the Department has received advice from the Queensland Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning that the Queensland Government is now likely to accept the offer of funding for one of the two projects it had earlier advised would not receive Queensland Government funding.

- A list of the projects can be found on the Liveable Cities website at:
www.nationbuildingprogram.gov.au/funding/liveablecities/index.aspx.
- Total expenditure as at 6 November 2012 is \$2.043 million.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 76

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building - Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Managed Motorways.

Proof Hansard Page/s: 57 (16/10/12)

Senator RHIANNON asked:

Senator RHIANNON: Could you give me examples of where the motorways are? Are you talking about the motorway projects in Sydney, for example?

Ms O'Connell: I am talking about some of the examples like the managed motorway project in Melbourne, that has delivered some good results, and I am happy to provide you with further information on that, on the results.

Senator RHIANNON: Which motorways have you been working on?

Ms O'Connell: There are a number of proposal projects in terms of managed motorways. Infrastructure Australia has rated it, I think, a project that is ready to proceed in terms of about \$6 billion worth of managed motorways projects. Within each of those projects there is information about what the specific project intends to achieve.

Senator RHIANNON: And how have you determined that this will increase transport efficiency?

Ms O'Connell: That is part of the submissions. The project proposals are about what the individual project will achieve in terms of delivering greater throughput of traffic et cetera.

Senator RHIANNON: Could you supply information? I imagine you are aware that the former head of the Roads and Traffic Authority and state rail in New South Wales has been critical of this motorway emphasis, that it is in fact not bringing the promised results in terms of more efficient transport movements, and that the induce-traffic phenomenon is becoming more real. Is the induce-traffic aspect that goes with motorways something you have looked at?

Mr Mrdak: Can I just clarify. I think the comments you are referring to refer to new motorway projects and whether they are the appropriate choice for the investment in Sydney. What Ms O'Connell is talking about, the managed motorway program, is effectively retrofitting intelligent transport systems into existing motorways to increase flow, as you know. We can certainly have a look at, and provide you with information on notice on, the forecast benefits and also, as Ms O'Connell has indicated, some of the real experience that has already happened on some of the motorways, particularly in Melbourne, where there has been very successful introduction of ITS Technologies such as ramp metering and the like, which has improved traffic flow quite markedly. I think they are separate issues.

Answer:

An analysis undertaken by VicRoads of the operation of coordinated Freeway Ramp Signals on six inbound entry ramps on 15 kilometres of the Monash Freeway has indicated that throughput in the morning and evening peaks has increased by 5% and 8% respectively and that travel time improved by 25% and 59% in the morning and evening peaks respectively.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 77

Program: Not applicable.

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment.

Topic: Australian Government funding for a new bridge at Echuca-Moama

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator McKENZIE asked:

The 2009-2010 budget removed Federal funding of \$14m for a new bridge at Echuca-Moama, where an average of 20,000 vehicles cross each day. Will the Federal Government reinstate the funding now that work has progressed on the bridge and the NSW and Victorian governments are working together to have it built?

Answer:

A bridge for Echuca-Moama was included in a submission for the next Nation Building Program by the New South Wales Government. The submission is currently under consideration by Infrastructure Australia and the Department. Victoria has not made a request to the Australian Government for funding for a bridge at Echuca-Moama.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 78

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Upgrade of South Road at Darlington

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator EDWARDS asked:

In response to Question 135 the Department stated that the Australian Government is spending \$20 million on preconstruction, including land acquisition for the upgrade of South Road at Darlington.

1. Can the Department provide a breakdown of how that \$20 million is to be spent and how much has been spent to date and on what?
2. (a) If there is any funding left from the \$20 million – who has authority over this?
(b) What does the Department anticipate the remaining funding will be used for?

Answer:

1. The Australian Government funding of \$20 million is for land acquisition for the upgrade of South Road at Darlington between the Southern Expressway and Daws Road.

As at the end of October 2012 \$6,484,125 of the Australian Government contribution has been paid against claims from the state for land acquisition.

2. The approved Australian Government funding is for land acquisition.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 79

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Liveable Cities Program – City West – Hindley Street Redevelopment Project (formally Vibrant Adelaide Project)

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator EDWARDS asked:

With reference to Written Question on Notice 137 (May Budget Estimates 2012):

1. Does the Department have any more details on the Project agreement it is settling with the South Australian government? What kind of issues are being discussed?
2. Is the Department dealing with Adelaide City council? What is being discussed?
3. With reference to part 2 of question 137, why was the budgeted/estimated amount (\$700,000) just under half of what was eventually allocated?
4. Why was the budgeted amount so different?

Answer:

1. The Project Agreement under discussion covers project scope, objectives and milestones for payment. Once agreed between the Commonwealth Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, the Hon Anthony Albanese MP and the South Australian Minister for Planning, the Hon John Rau MP, the Project Agreement will be published on the Standing Council on Federal Finance Relations website.
2. The Department is dealing directly with the South Australian Government, which is the lead proponent for the project. However, officers from this Department have met with all funding partners, including the Adelaide City Council to discuss the project scope, consider detailed plans and visit the site.
3. As per our response to part 2 of question 137 from the Budget Estimates May 2012, at the time of the 2012-13 Budget, specific projects had not been approved and, as per note (b) on page 94 of Budget paper No. 3, the amounts listed were notionally allocated across state and territories on a per capita basis.
4. See response to Question 3.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 80

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Gawler Line Modernisation: **status and funding**

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator EDWARDS asked:

With reference to Written Question on Notice 138 (May Budget Estimates 2012):

1. What is being discussed with the South Australian Government?
2. Of the \$293.5 million committed under the Building Australia Fund for the Gawler Line Modernisation project, how much was committed for the ‘modernisation’ of the track and how much was committed for the ‘electrification’ of the track?
3. Provide a full break down of the project. How much has been spent to date and what has it been spent on? Of the remaining funds what work is it allocated for? Provide an itemised list with their respective costs.
4. Of the unspent funding, who has possession of this funding?
5. If it is the South Australian Government, when are they expected to have spent it by?
6. If the South Australian Government is not going to spend it when will they return it to the Commonwealth?
7. What alternative proposals have been put to the Department by the South Australian Government to spend the money on?
8. Has the Member for Wakefield spoken with the Department about any aspect of the Gawler Line Modernisation project? If so what?
9. Provide the original application for funding to the Building Australia Fund for the Gawler Line Modernisation project.
10. Provide any reporting or evaluation undertaken by the Department, other federal agency or the South Australian Government on this project to date.
11. What has been discussed with the South Australian Government?
12. What further discussions with the South Australian Government are planned?

Answer:

The Australian Government is discussing options for timely completion of the Project or the return of the unspent funds.

Should the South Australian Government not complete the electrification of the Gawler Line, then the Department will work with the SA Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to facilitate the return of the unspent funds.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 81

Program: 1.1: Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Demand management strategies and the Nation Building Program

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator LUDLAM asked:

How are demand management strategies used for funding decisions made in the Nation Building program?

Answer:

Demand management strategies are considered during the development of options for a project. These options are usually considered by state and territory agencies for projects funded under the Nation Building Program. Such demand management mechanisms may include pricing, intelligent transport system solutions (i.e., managed motorways), alternative modes, and possible separation of freight and passenger movements (where economically viable).

The Department considers the options developed for projects as part of the project assessment process.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 82

Program: N/A

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Traffic Volumes on Perth Roads

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator LUDLAM asked:

Is the Department aware the Royal Automobile Club (RAC) predicts another 400,000 cars on Perth roads in the next ten years?

Answer:

Yes.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 83

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Great Eastern Highway Upgrade – Light Rail

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator LUDLAM asked:

Why was the funding for the Great Eastern Highway project approved without requiring a light rail corridor to the airport?

Answer:

The Government's project will improve public transport services by reducing travel times for all vehicles and by providing bus priority lanes at key intersections.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 84

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Studies into light rail network issues

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator LUDLAM asked:

In reference to light rail feasibility studies now coming before this unit, has the Department done any studies at all looking at any of the following, and if so could it please provide them:

- (a) Powering light rail by renewable energy;
- (b) The capacity to produce light rail cars locally on the basis that larger networks will be ultimately built in every major city; or
- (c) The potential housing yield along future light rail routes?

Answer:

- (a) No.
- (b) The Department has not funded any studies specifically into the capacity to produce light rail cars in Australia. However, the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education, in partnership with the Australasian Railways Association, funded a demand forecast study entitled “The Future of Australian Passenger Rollingstock: A Framework for Coordinated National Demand and Supply”.
- (c) State and territory governments are primarily responsible for statutory land-use planning, with some responsibilities delegated to local governments. The Australian Government’s National Urban Policy has productivity objectives and priorities which encourage a range of public transport initiatives to enhance planning of land use, social and economic infrastructure. The Department is funding feasibility, scoping and development studies for Perth Light Rail (known as MAX light rail) and Sunshine Coast Light Rail projects. The scope of these studies includes investigations into land use.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 85

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Cycle Infrastructure

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator LUDLAM asked:

With reference to QON 126 (attached) and the provision of bike paths on federally funded roads:

1. Were the answers to QON126 provided from the states or from this Department?
2. Could the Department please consider revising the answers as it appears some are incorrect. For example the new Perth-Bunbury Highway is listed as one of the “projects with separated or segregated paths” - and it most certainly is not. (See attached).
3. Please outline specifically which Department, or work unit is responsible for ensuring minimum standards with regard to bike infrastructure are enforced?
4. Is this Department responsible for overseeing the provision of bike paths attached to federally funded roads?
5. If not, which Department and specific unit is responsible for ensuring these standards?
6. If so,
 - (a) What standards does the Department currently apply when bike paths are built on federally funded roads?
 - (b) Is the Department familiar with the Austroads minimum standards – the “ Preferred separation of bicycles and motor vehicles” (attached, source: Austroads, 2009)
 - (c) Is the Department familiar with the Australian Bicycle Council’s guidelines on “Cycling on Higher Speed Roads - When to Provide for Bicycles on Higher Speed Roads”^[1]?

It states:

Best practice

All of the international guidelines reviewed recommend that cyclists are separated from high speed traffic, generally by providing an off road path although in some circumstances bicycle lanes are acceptable. These paths should form a complete network so that cyclists are not forced to share space with high speed vehicles.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Design guidelines from NSW, Queensland and New Zealand provide guidance about the preferred type of bicycle facility on urban roads based on the traffic speed and volume. At traffic speeds of 80 km/h and above, a bicycle path separated from the road is almost universally the recommended treatment. On 70 km/h roads with low traffic volumes, and rural roads, sealed shoulders (or bicycle lanes) are also acceptable.

7. What proportion of bike paths on federally funded roads currently comply with these standards?
8. With specific reference to the answers to QON 126 (attached) please list the paths which meet the Austroads and Bicycle Council minimum standards.
9. With reference to the attached photos of the Perth-Bunbury Highway which is listed in QON126 as a “separate or segregated bike path”, please confirm whether this indeed is classified as a separate or segregated bike path, according to the federal government.

^[1] See http://www.austroads.com.au/abc/images/pdf/ns1525_fs_one.pdf

Answer:

1. Information was provided by State and Territory Governments.
2. The new Perth-Bunbury Highway project includes a 32 kilometre Principal Shared Path from Safety Bay Road to South Yunderup Road for cyclist and pedestrian use, alongside the section of the highway constructed to freeway standard. Accordingly, the project was included in the response to QON 126 as a project with a separate or segregated bike path. An on-road cycling path is provided for the remainder of the project south of South Yunderup Road, where the highway is constructed as a rural divided highway and traffic volumes are lower.
3. The design of cycle infrastructure is the responsibility of State and Territory Governments.
4. No.
5. See answer to Question 3.
6. n/a.
7. See answer to Question 3.
8. See answer to Question 3.
9. See answer to Question 2.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 86

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Cycle Infrastructure

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator LUDLAM asked:

With reference to a lack of federal funding for bike infrastructure;

The National Cycling Strategy 2005-10 noted that spending across all three spheres of government on cycling infrastructure and facilities, coordination and planning, road safety for cyclists and cycling promotion and education was in the order of \$100m each year, and that this compared to more than \$5 billion being spent on new road infrastructure annually.

1. Does this department play any role in advising or lobbying for an annualised fund for bike infrastructure?
2. What would an annualised spend of \$80m translate to in terms of jobs in Australian regions?

Answer:

1. The *Walking, Riding and Access to Public Transport – Draft Report for discussion* publication was released on 29 October 2012 by the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. The draft report explores options to increase the mode share of walking, riding and public transport.
2. Detailed economic modelling would be required to provide a rigorous estimate of jobs likely to be created.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 87

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Long term impact of National Smart Managed Motorways on car dependency

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator RHIANNON asked:

Is there any studies conducted on the long term impact of the National Smart Managed Motorways program on car-dependency in the cities?

Answer:

The first two projects under the program are in the process of commencing and it is too early to evaluate the impacts of the program.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 88

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Liveable Cities Program

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator RHIANNON asked:

1. Most of the projects funded through the \$20 million given are only planning proposals and demonstration projects. Have there been results so far for the demonstration projects?
 - (a) For example, is the Green Square Town Centre "Trigeneration" implemented in the City of Sydney costing \$3,750,000 effective in improving energy efficiency? Has this been recorded and proven?
2. Are there benchmarks in place to assess the success of the demonstration projects and will they be public?
3. From the unit's perspective, what will the follow up be once these demonstrations and planning proposals are completed?
4. Are there steps laid down for wider implementations nationally?
5. Does the major cities unit have an estimate on the impact the Liveable Cities Program will have on congestion and emissions the Liveable Cities program, at this stage? If the projects are implemented nationally, what will be its impact?
6. Is the major cities unit well-resourced to do the necessary research and modelling to understand the impact of the projects the Liveable cities program fund if it were to be implemented across all cities in Australia? If not how will this work be funded?

Answer:

1. The demonstration projects are only beginning to commence so there have been no results as yet.
 - (a) The Green Square Town Centre "Trigeneration" project has not yet commenced.
2. All projects are subject to either a Funding Agreement or Project Agreement which sets out the project scope, objective and milestones. Finalised Project Agreements with State and Territory Governments will be published on the Standing Council on Federal Finance Relations website.
3. This will be a matter for the Government.
4. The Liveable Cities Program is a \$20 million program being implemented in 2012-13 and 2013-14.
5. No.
6. Outcomes from the program will be informed by final reports from proponents.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 89

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Nation Building 2 – Connecting People: Urban Living

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator RHIANNON asked:

1. Is the Urban Living program under the purview of the Major Cities Unit?
2. What funding is already in place for this program?
3. What expenditure has there been to date?
4. What are the steps that the Unit have taken and will take to implement this program?
5. Is the Unit well-resourced to embark on this program?
6. How much emphasis will be given to improving access to public transport?
7. Can the Unit share with us some proposed action plan?
8. Will this program also focus on improving cycling infrastructure? Will it encourage cycling as part of this program's implementations?

Answer:

1. No. The Connecting People: Urban Living program is part of the Nation Building 2 Program, which is administered by the Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment Division.
2. The Government has not announced funding levels for components of the Nation Building 2 program.
3. There has been no expenditure to date.
4. The Department is providing advice to Government on the operation of the Nation Building 2 program. The Major Cities Unit is not responsible for the implementation of the Program.
5. See answer to Question 4.
6. See answer to Question 4.
7. See answer to Question 4.
8. See answer to Question 4.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 90

Program: 1.1: Infrastructure investment

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Regional Infrastructure Fund

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

1. Please provide the financial year by financial year funding profile for each of the projects funded under Stream 1 of Regional Infrastructure Fund.
2. Please provide the financial year by financial year funding profile for each of the projects funded under Stream 2 of the Regional Infrastructure Fund.

Answer:

Funding streams for these projects are provided in the relevant Budget papers.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 91

Program: Liveable Cities program

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Liveable Cities Program forward expenditure and commitments

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

1. What is the breakdown of expenditure in the Liveable Cities program for the following financial years:
 - (a) 2012-13
 - (b) 2013-14
 - (c) 2014-15
 - (d) 2015-16
2. (a) How much expenditure under the Liveable Cities program has been committed/contracted, and (b) how much expenditure remains to be committed/contracted within the Fund?

Answer:

1. Liveable Cities Program appropriations are:

2012-13	\$13.0 million
2013-14	\$7.0 million
2014-15	Nil
2015-16	Nil
2. Commitments
 - (a) Committed and contracted - \$9.77 million
 - (b) Committed and not contracted - \$9.72 million

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 92

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Bruce Highway – Project Funding

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

Please provide a list of each project on the Bruce Highway where the contribution of the Federal Government was more than 50%.

Answer:

Information detailing funding levels in the Nation Building Program, including the Australian Government's contribution towards Bruce Highway projects can be found in the Queensland 2012-13 Program of Works on the Nation Building website.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 93

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Nation Building 2

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

I refer to the Nation Building 2 program due to commence from 1 July 2014:

- (a) Please provide a list of each project currently committed to by the Government under the Nation Building 2 program
- (b) For each of those projects, please provide the funding profile where applicable.
- (c) Please provide a financial year by financial year funding profile, where applicable for the following projects currently in the Contingency Reserve Fund:
 - Inland Rail preconstruction
 - Parramatta to Epping Rail Link
 - Moreton Bay Rail Link
 - Richmond Bridge
 - Princes Highway West
 - Great Eastern Highway
 - Tasman Highway
 - Legacy Way – Northern Link Tunnel
 - F3 to Sydney Orbital
- (d) For the projects outlined in (c) please detail the precise works that will be undertaken as part of the Federal Government's investment.
- (e) Are the following nine projects the only projects from Nation Building 2 in the Contingency Reserve fund?
 - Inland Rail preconstruction
 - Parramatta to Epping Rail Link
 - Moreton Bay Rail Link
 - Richmond Bridge
 - Princes Highway West
 - Great Eastern Highway
 - Tasman Highway
 - Legacy Way – Northern Link Tunnel
 - F3 to Sydney Orbital
- (f) If not, please provide a list of the projects from Nation Building 2 currently in the Contingency Reserve Fund?
- (g) What is the current status of negotiations with the State/Territory Governments in relation to the program?
- (h) When is it expected that they will be finalised?
- (i) What is the size of the program?
- (j) Is all of the funding for Nation Building 2 in the Contingency Reserve Fund?

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

- (k) How much in the Contingency Reserve Fund is earmarked for the Nation Building 2 program?
- (l) The Budget in May 2012 cut the Nation Building 2 program by \$2 million. How can you cut money from a program when you haven't determined its size?

Answer:

- (a-f) The Government has not finalised detailed funding levels for the Nation Building 2 Program.
- (g-h) The Department continues dialogue with all states and territories as part of the current Program.
- (i-l) Refer to a-f.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 94

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Yeppen Flood Plain Study (also known as the Fitzroy River Flood Plain Study)

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

I refer to the \$5 million Fitzroy River Floodplain Study (Yeppen Floodplain Strategy). At the previous estimates round it was advised that the Minister had written to the Queensland Government about the report.

- a) What is the current status of the report?
- b) When will the report be released?

Answer:

The Queensland Minister for Transport and Main Roads has confirmed the Queensland Government's endorsement of the outcomes of the study.

The report was released on 8 January 2013.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 95

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Bruce Highway – Cooroy to Curra

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator Nash asked:

I refer to Question on Notice answer 147 in relation to the Bruce Highway Cooroy to Curra upgrade. The answer provided did not answer the questions asked so again:

- a) In relation to Section A, the Government committed \$200 million for further planning and land acquisition. Is this the total of the Government's commitment to Section A under the Nation Building program?
- b) Has this money been paid to the Queensland Government?
- c) What is the financial year by year funding profile of the \$200 million of Federal Government funding allocated to Section A?
- d) Has the planning for Section A been complete? If not, when will it be complete? If so, when will it be released?
- e) Has the land been acquired? If not, when will this happen?
- f) When will construction on Section A commence?
- g) When will construction on Section A be complete?
- h) When will Section C be commenced? And finished?
- i) What is the current status of the Section C upgrade?
- j) When will Section D be commenced? And finished?
- k) What is the current status of the Section D upgrade?
- l) When will the whole Cooroy to Curra upgrade be finished?

Answer:

- a) The Australian Government is contributing \$200 million towards planning, design and land acquisition for the full 65 kilometre Bruce Highway – Cooroy to Curra upgrade (Sections A to D). A further \$395 million has been committed for the construction phase of Section A, with the Queensland Government also to provide \$395 million towards the \$790 million total cost.
- b) The \$200 million in planning money is being paid to the Queensland Government progressively on the basis of works undertaken, as part of the Nation Building Program, 2008-09 to 2013-14. The construction funding will be paid progressively as works are progressed.
- c) See answer a.
- d) Yes. The preliminary design for Section A was made available publicly by the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads in November 2011. The detailed design process is currently underway and expected to be completed in mid 2013.
- e) All land required for the Section A upgrade has been acquired.
- f) Construction is due to commence mid 2013.
- g) Construction is expected to be completed late 2016.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

- h) Funding and timeframes for construction of Section C will depend on future decisions by the Australian and Queensland governments.
- i) Initial planning and land acquisitions has been undertaken for Section C.
- j) Funding and timeframes for construction of Section D will depend on future decisions by the Australian and Queensland governments.
- k) Initial planning and land acquisitions has been undertaken for Section D.
- l) Funding and timeframes for construction of the remaining sections of the Cooroy to Curra upgrade will depend on future decisions by the Australian and Queensland governments.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 96

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Special Purpose Vehicle

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

I refer to the funding for the Special Purpose Vehicle announced in the 2012-13 Federal Budget.

- a) What is the current status of this funding?
- b) Can you provide detail on what the Special Purpose Vehicle will actually do?
- c) Please provide a breakdown of what the \$25 million will be used for? Establishment of an office? Payment of wages? Payment of consultants?
- d) What negotiations have been undertaken with the NSW Government for the establishment of the Special Purpose Vehicle? Please provide detail of the date and nature of negotiations.
- e) When did the Minister contact the NSW Government in relation to this Special Purpose Vehicle?
- f) Given that the SPV was intended to look at private financing options for the M5 East and the F3 to M2 project and given that the recent Infrastructure NSW report recommended the WestConnex project (including the M5 project), will the Department continue to negotiate with the NSW to establish this SPV? If not, what is the current status of the \$25 million?
- g) Given that the NSW Government has established a committee to investigate the unsolicited proposal from Transurban to construct the F3-M2 project and that financing options for the WestConnex project are being considered, are alternative options being considered for the \$25 million?
If not, why not? If so, please provide further detail.

Answer:

- a-d. The Australian Government has committed \$25 million towards the development of the Business Case for WestConnex. The WestConnex Business Case will examine appropriate mechanisms to take the project to market, including detailed consideration of the creation of a Special Purpose Vehicle.
- e. 8 May, 2012
- f-g. Refer to answer (a-d) above.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 97

Program: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Nation Building program

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

What is the current unallocated balance by financial year in the Nation Building program?

Answer:

The Nation Building Program is a six year program with funding allocated for the entire program.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 98

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Moorebank Intermodal Terminal

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

In relation to the proposed intermodal terminal at Moorebank in NSW:

- (a) What progress has been made in terms of assessing the project as a ‘whole of precinct’ site including the Qube/SIMTA site and the School of Military Engineering site?
- (b) What actions have been undertaken since the last Senate Estimates hearings to look at the ‘whole of precinct’ as a strategic asset for freight movement in Sydney?
- (c) Please provide the date and nature of actions undertaken.
- (d) What is the current progress of the establishment of the Government Business Enterprise?
- (e) What is the Department’s progress towards selecting board members?
- (f) When will board members be announced?
- (g) Can you detail the Board’s responsibilities?
- (h) What will the role of the Moorebank Project Office be after the Board is established?
- (i) Who will report to the Board?
- (j) Will the Moorebank Project Office report to the Board? If not, why not?
- (k) How many board members will there be?
- (l) What are the eligibility criteria for being selected as a board member?
- (m) What is the process for selection to the board?
- (n) What will the term of appointment be?

Answer:

- (a) In April 2012, the Commonwealth committed to development of the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal project on the site of the School of Military Engineering after reviewing the findings of a detailed business case for the facility. The Moorebank Project Office considered land uses in the surrounding area as part of the detailed business case.
- (b) The Department and the Moorebank Project Office are implementing the Government’s commitment to deliver the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal. While broad consideration is being given to the wider precinct, this will predominantly be a matter for the Government Business Enterprise within the context of a fair and open competitive tender process. Connecting infrastructure for the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal is being considered by the joint Commonwealth / New South Wales Planning Approval and Connections Enabling (PACE) Committee.
- (c) Please refer to the response provided at (b).
- (d) The Government Business Enterprise was established in late 2012.
- (e-f) Refer to the Minister’s media statement.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

- (g) The general conduct of directors is subject to the provisions of the *Corporations Act 2001*, the *Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act 1997* and the common law. A constitution will be established for the Government Business Enterprise setting out the role of directors and objects of the company. The Board will have ultimate responsibility for the performance of the Government Business Enterprise.
- (h) The role of the Moorebank Project Office will continue to provide support in implementing the project. However, as the Government Business Enterprise becomes fully operational over the first half of 2013, it is expected that the role of the Moorebank Project Office will be reviewed in mid-2013.
- (i) The Board is responsible for the structure of the company, including its staffing. The employees of the Government Business Enterprise will report to the Board.
- (j) No. The Government Business Enterprise is a separate legal entity from the Commonwealth. Moorebank Project Office officials will not be employees of the Government Business Enterprise.
- (k) The number of board members is a matter for Government consideration.
- (l-n) Refer to the Minister's media statement.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 99

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Regional Roads Productivity Package

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

I refer to the Minister's announcement on 3 August 2012 committing \$90 million to a Regional Roads Productivity Package for the Northern Territory.

- a) What negotiations have been undertaken with the NT Government in relation to this announcement?
- b) Please provide date and nature of negotiations/discussions with the NT Government.
- c) Please provide the total financial commitment for each of the following projects:
 - Roper Highway
 - Port Keats Road
 - Santa Teresa Way
 - Central Arnhem Road
 - Buntine Highway
 - Arnhem Link Road
- d) Will the total of the funding for the projects outlined in (c) come from Nation Building 2? If not, why not?
- e) Please provide a financial year by financial year funding profile for each of the following projects:
 - Roper Highway
 - Port Keats Road
 - Santa Teresa Way
 - Central Arnhem Road
 - Buntine Highway
 - Arnhem Link Road
- f) When will construction commence on each of the projects outlined in (e)?
- g) When will construction conclude on each of the projects outlined in (e)?

Answer:

- a) In June 2012, the Northern Territory (NT) Department of Lands and Planning put forward a proposal seeking funding support towards rural road projects under a Regional Roads Productivity Package.

Following negotiations with the NT, the Government announced on 3 August 2012 that it would provide \$90 million towards six priority projects through the Regional Roads Productivity Package, with the NT Government to provide a further \$16 million.

- b) Refer to answer a).
- c) The funding is to be made available in the next phase of the Nation Building Program, post 2013-14. Decisions on how the funding is to be allocated between the roads

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

identified in the announcement will be made following further negotiations with the NT Government and receipt and acceptance of formal project proposals.

Construction timelines will also be determined following receipt of formal proposals.

- d) Yes
- e) Refer to answer a).
- f) Refer to answer a).
- g) Refer to answer a).

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 100

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Building Australia Fund

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

1. What is the current uncommitted balance of the Building Australia Fund?
2. Will any of the \$1.5 billion budget surplus be invested in the Building Australia Fund?
3. How many staff in the Department are employed to administer the Building Australia Fund?

Answer:

The Building Australia Fund is managed and administered by the Department of Finance and Deregulation.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 101

Program: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Nation Building Program

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

I refer to Question on Notice Answer 142 which referred to the current Nation Building Programme. In answer to the question ‘what is the current unallocated balance in the Nation Building programme?’ The Department advised ‘no projects have been cut or delayed’ which was an answer to other questions asked but did not provide any detail on the unallocated funding balance in the programme.

1. So I’ll ask again: what is the current unallocated balance in the Nation Building programme?
2. Given the current Nation Building programme is set to end in 2013-14, is all of this funding due to be committed in the 2013-14 financial year? If not, when is it due to be spent?

Answer:

Refer to Question 97.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 102

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Nation Building 2

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator NASH asked:

I refer to Question on Notice Answer 142 in relation to specific details of the Nation Building 2 programme. A number of questions were asked on notice but limited information was provided so I just want to follow up on a few matters:

1. What is the current status of negotiations with the State/Territory Governments in relation to the programme?
2. When is it expected that they will be finalised?
3. What is the size of the programme?
4. Is the bulk of the funding still in the contingency reserve fund?
5. How much in the contingency reserve fund is earmarked for the Nation Building 2 programme?
6. The Budget in May cut the Nation Building 2 programme by \$2 million. How can you cut money from a programme when you don't know how much it is?
7. What is the status of these negotiations?

Answer:

- (1-2) The Department continues dialogue with all States and Territories as part of the current Program.
- (3-4) The Government has not finalised detailed funding levels for the Nation Building 2 Program.
- (5-6) See answer to question 4.
- (7) See answer to question 1.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 103

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Bega Bypass

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator HEFFERNAN asked:

1. Is construction of the bypass currently running on schedule?
2. To date, how much been spent on the project?
3. When is the project expected to be completed?
4. Is it still expected that costs will come within the \$60 million budgeted for the bypass?

Answer:

1. Yes.
2. \$22,789,767 (to 7 November 2012).
3. June 2014.
4. Yes.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 104

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Upgrade of the Interstate Rail Network – re-sleeper program

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator HEFFERNAN asked:

In a media release dated 22/06/2012 whereby the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport was quoted as saying that “the entire re-sleeper program will be completed on time and on budget”.

1. Is this project on budget?
2. If over budget, how much over has this project cost to date?
3. When is project expected to be completed?

Answer:

1. Yes.
2. N/A.
3. The Parkes to Broken Hill concrete re-sleeper project was completed on 30 June 2012.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 105

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Hunter Expressway

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator HEFFERNAN asked:

1. When are the three high bridges in the Sugarloaf Range to be completed?
2. How much has been spent on the project thus far?
3. Is the project expected to come under within the \$1.5 billion that was provided by the Federal Government?
4. If over budget, how much over has the project cost to date?

Answer:

1. The three high bridges are scheduled to be completed by the end of June 2013.
2. The Australian Government has provided \$1.253 billion.
3. The Australian Government is contributing \$1.45 billion towards this \$1.65 billion project.
4. n/a.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 106

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Maldon - Dombarton Rail Link - Scoping and Development

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator HEFFERNAN asked:

1. Presently, how much funding has been contributed by the Federal Government on this rail link?
2. Of the \$25.5m that was approved for the planning and design work, how much of this money has already been spent?
3. When is this project expected to be completed?
4. Is the project running on budget?
5. If over budget, how much over has the project cost to date?

Answer:

- 1-2. In 2012 the Commonwealth committed \$25,500,000 for the Maldon - Dombarton Rail Link - Scoping and Development project being implemented by Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW). As of 2 November \$385,784 has been spent by TfNSW on the project.
3. The scoping and development project is expected to be completed by mid-2014.
4. Yes.
5. n/a.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 107

Program: 1.1: Infrastructure investment

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Regional Infrastructure Fund

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator MACDONALD asked:

In July this year, the Government committed \$6 billion to developing infrastructure in Regional Australia.

1. How much of this \$6 billion has been allocated/paid so far?
2. What projects have been funded?
3. How much funding remains to be allocated?

Answer:

1. Refer to Question 74.
2. Refer to Question 74.
3. About \$4.5 billion of Regional Infrastructure (Stream 2) funding remains to be allocated. Questions about allocations under Stream 3 of the Regional Infrastructure Fund should be directed to the Minister for Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local Government.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 108

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Bruce Highway Flood Immunity

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator MACDONALD asked:

The previous Labor Government in Queensland commissioned a study from the department of Main Roads which found that flood-proofing the Bruce Highway would cost \$5.3 billion. Following the Prime Minister's statement on January 8, 2011 in Rockhampton that she would be pursuing a plan for flood-proofing the Bruce Highway, can you indicate:

1. How much of the funding has been allocated so far?
2. Where has it been allocated?
3. What sections of the Bruce Highway have been identified as priorities?
4. What contractors have been awarded projects?
5. How much work has actually been done?
6. Where has this work been done?
7. How much flood proofing will be completed before the start of the Summer wet season in November 2012?

Answer:

In her statement on 8 January 2011, made while visiting Rockhampton, the Prime Minister referred to the Australian Government's \$5 million commitment through the Nation Building Program for the Yeppen Flood Plain Study, which involved a study of alternative road and rail routes to improve the flood immunity of the Bruce Highway and North Coast Rail Line through the Rockhampton area and across the Fitzroy River Flood Plain.

The study is completed and the \$5 million has been fully paid to Queensland.

Decisions on funding towards the flood immunity works identified in the study will be made once the Australian Government has fully considered its outcomes.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 109

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Bruce Highway – Cardwell Range Realignment

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator MACDONALD asked:

When the Cardwell Range Road upgrade was announced, Minister Albanese stated that the \$115 million project would be completed by the end of 2012.

1. Is the upgrade to the Cardwell range on track for completion as planned by the end of 2012?
2. Has the upgrade remained within the \$115 million budget?
3. If not, how much has the project cost?

Answer:

1. The ongoing wet weather experienced in the region, including Cyclone Yasi, has seen the expected completion date of the Cardwell Range realignment pushed back until mid 2013.
- 2-3. The extent of any cost overruns is yet to be determined.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 110

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Nation Building Program – Bruce Highway

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator MACDONALD asked:

When the Cardwell Range Road upgrade was announced, Minister Albanese referred to \$2.6 billion that would be spent on the Bruce Highway.

1. How much has been spent to date?
2. How many flood-prone sections of the Bruce Highway in Northern Queensland have been repaired as part of this spending program?

Answer:

The Australian Government is investing \$3.2 billion in the Bruce Highway over seven years. This compares to the previous Government's spend of \$1.3 billion over 12 years. A full list of projects can be found on the Department's website.

In addition, the Australian Government is providing 75% of the cost of significant flood reconstruction works underway along the length of the Bruce Highway through the National Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements (NDRRA).

Projects that provide flood immunity improvements to the Bruce Highway include:

- Cooroy to Curra Section B;
- the New Isis River Bridge;
- Realign and raise the Highway from Sandy Corner to Collinsons Lagoon;
- Duplication from Vantassel Street to Cluden;
- Raise the southern approach to the Mulgrave River Bridge;
- The Yeppen Lagoon Bridge and Roundabout; and
- Improved flood immunity at Gairloch Floodway.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 111

Program: 1.1: Infrastructure investment

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Outback Way

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator MACDONALD asked:

In July this year the Government committed \$6 billion to developing infrastructure in Regional Australia.

1. Has any of this money been allocated so far?
2. How much of this money been spent on roads in the north?
3. (a) Has the Outback Way been earmarked for upgrade?
(b) If so, how much funding has been allocated to the Outback Way?
(c) If so, when will work commence on upgrades to the Outback Way?

Answer:

4. Refer to Question 74.
5. Refer to Question 74.
6. (a) No.
(b) n/a.
(c) n/a.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012
Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 112

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Regional Roads Productivity Package

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator MACDONALD asked:

In August this year the Government committed \$90 million to its ‘Regional Roads Productivity Package’.

1. How much of this money has been allocated so far?
2. Where has work commenced?
3. What road upgrades/remediation has been completed so far?

Answer:

Refer to Question 99.

Rural & Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

Infrastructure and Transport

Question no.: 113

Program: 1.1

Division/Agency: (NB-II) Nation Building – Infrastructure Investment

Topic: Yeppen Flood Plain Study (also known as the Fitzroy River Flood Plain Study)

Proof Hansard Page/s: Written

Senator MACDONALD asked:

Some months ago the Government received the Aecom report on the third bridge proposal at Rockhampton as part of the on-going Yeppen Crossing and Yeppen South Road project.

1. Has the report been publicly released?
2. If not, is it intended for public release and if so, when?
3. If it is not intended for public release, why not?
4. What was the cost of the report?

Answer:

Refer to Question 94.