

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee  
 Questions on Notice  
 Budget 2018-19  
Monday 21 and Tuesday 22 2018

Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities Portfolio

QoN No.	PDR No.	Division	Senator	Broad topic	Question	Hansard page and hearing date or Written	Comments
<b>Inland Rail and Rail Policy (13)</b>							
1	151	IRRP	STERLE	BUSINESS CASE COSTINGS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Thanks, Chair, and good morning, Minister, Dr Kennedy and crew. I want to go to a few questions around the faster rail program, if we could, thanks. Could you tell the committee, please, if the department provided advice or a specific recommendation on the joint ACT-New South Wales submission to fund a business case for a faster Canberra to Sydney rail line?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> We certainly assessed all of the applications, including the application from the New South Wales government, for the Sydney to Canberra faster rail proposal along with, obviously, all of the others.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Great, thank you. Can you tell us what your recommendation was.</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> We came up with a matrix and ranked them according to the criteria published in the faster rail prospectus, and we provided, obviously, advice to government about how each of those proposals ranked against that criteria.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell us what the funding break-up was for New South Wales in your recommendation and for the ACT—both of them?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> They were only seeking—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sorry, 'they' being who?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> The New South Wales government. Each of the proponents put forward information about how much they thought their business case would cost.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And that was how much?</p>	4-5 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> For the purpose of expediency, surely there is someone from the department who could flick a page now and let us know now.</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> We could get you that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Please, for both ACT and New South Wales. How long would you need?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Hopefully, only 10 or 15 minutes.</p>		
2	152	IRRP	STERLE	CONSULTATIONS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> ... Can you tell us what other agencies, if any, the department consulted with in forming a recommendation to the minister?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> We consulted with a number of Commonwealth government agencies. Obviously, we consulted with IPFA, Infrastructure Australia—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What was the first one you said?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> The Infrastructure and Project Financing Agency. We consulted Treasury and the critical infrastructure unit as well. I could get you a list of those as well.</p>	5 21/05/18	
3	153	IRRP	STERLE	ASSESSMENT FACTORS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That'd be good, thanks. While we're at it, was there any internal assessment of the BCR of various projects and did this form part of advice to government?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> There weren't BCRs as such. It was an initial sounding from proponents about their interest in undertaking a business case. Obviously, the business case itself would develop the benefit-cost assessments.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So at the moment we've got soundings. That's fine—and we'll work towards getting that info. Could you tell us if commuter or passenger uptake formed part of those assessments?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Obviously, the criteria for the faster rail prospectus were published. It included a range of elements, including linkages to communities and those sort of things. In terms of the potential for those projects to be successful, I think that they were part of it.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is that clearly outlined? Is that information about where we're talking, passengers, commuters and freight available—is it all broken up?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> The focus was on passengers, it being about connecting the surrounding regions to the capital cities. In terms of the information, do you mean statistics to underpin that or—</p>	5 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, that and from where to where. Was it all part of the soundings and assessments?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Certainly the proposals talked in detail about information about population, future growth patterns and those sort of things. They were included in the—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Could you could provide that for us too?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. I think a number of these are commercial-in-confidence. Some proponents are still continuing to push for these, even though they may not have been selected, so we'd have to take on notice.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Excuse me, Senator, to clarify, it's not our commercial-in-confidence information. We just need to consult with the proponents themselves and let them know we'd be passing on their information to the committee.</p>		
4	154	IRRP	MCCARTHY	<p>INTEREST FROM FIRMS REGARDING HIGH SPEED RAIL NETWORK</p>	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> In the past 12 months—and I can take it, in my words, that things aren't progressing very quickly so far on that conversation—has the Commonwealth had any contact with overseas firms interested in being involved in building a high-speed rail network for Australia?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> We've certainly had firms visit us, more about the technology as opposed to having an active interest in building a line per se.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Just so we're clear, Mr Hyles, that's in terms of technology, like what?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Rolling stock.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So building and supplying the rolling stock, but not contributing to the rail or any of the infrastructure? Is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> More generally, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Chair, I can talk about this in one way without referring to the inquiry you and I did on rail and rolling stock and all sorts of stuff. Are there still ongoing conversations or did international firms put forward a request to come and put a quote in? Did we say 'Thank you very much, but we'd like to do our own here in Australia rather than bringing it in from India and having to do it all up again?'</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Probably not to that extent. As the infrastructure department, we have people coming through who talk to us about the things they're doing in other countries and the kinds of technology they're deploying in those countries. They generally talk up the benefits that they could one day deliver to Australia. But to</p>	8 21/05/18	

					<p>my knowledge we haven't had any direct approaches putting forward a proposal to fund a project in Australia.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So they're just dropping a note, saying, 'Hey, if you're going to spend all this money, we want to be able to offer our product'?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Correct.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So that's just people coming, visiting you and dropping off a business card—nothing is set in concrete. There is still a chance to be made in Australia.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Are you able to identify those firms?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Yes, but we would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can you take that on notice in terms of the firms and their locations?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> In terms of countries, yes.</p>		
5	155	IRRP	WATT	PROPOSAL RANKINGS	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Can I go back to the high-speed rail issues. I'll try not to go over any ground that Senator Sterle has already covered. You have already said that all up there has been \$20 million allocated towards the development of business cases for various legs of the high-speed rail, and I think you said you were hopeful that the amount that would actually be spent would certainly come within that. Can we go back to the process of short-listing and selling on these three. I didn't quite catch the number, but was it 26 applications that were originally submitted?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> And they went through an initial filtering process against first-stage criteria.</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> I think you said roughly half went to the second stage assessment?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Thirteen were assessed as part of stage 2, but two dropped out, so 11 were considered.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> I've seen the assessment criteria. You mentioned them yourselves: funding request, value for money, financing risk assessment and capacity to deliver. Were they the same criteria used at each stage, or were there different criteria used?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Different criteria were used in stage 1 and stage 2. Effectively, the stage 2 criteria built on the stage 1 criteria.</p>	9-10 21/05/18	

				<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> And the ones I just read out were the stage 2 criteria?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> And the stage 1 criteria were a bit looser?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> The stage 1 criteria were transport infrastructure problem and policy challenge identification; proposed solution and outcomes; impact on access to and supply of housing; impact on employment accessibility; and impact on regional economic activity and development.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> So by the time the second stage assessment concluded there were 11 proposals in the mix.</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> And the department ranked those proposals according to those four criteria, and provided advise to government.</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> You have been clear that it was the government's decision to settle on these three. I'm not going to ask you what cabinet decided, but were the three that were ultimately selected, the top three as ranked by the department?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> They were certainly at the top of the list, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Were they the top three?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> They were at the top of the list.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Maybe I can help. Our projects fell into groups, and they were part of the top group. It becomes very hard to split these projects quite finely.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> So it didn't go one, two, three, four, five, down to 11. There was a better group, if you like, and a not so good group. How many groups were there?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> They were ranked according to a numerical ranking, and there were a number that were in bands of the same ranking.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> They got the same number.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> The same score sheet. Was it a score out of 100 or something like that?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> I'd have to go back and have a look.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> How many groups were there?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> We'd have to go back and have a look. Certainly there were a number of proposals that were in the same band. I think the score was out of 20.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> And when you made your recommendation to government, there</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>was a better group and a not so good group. Was there a third group or a fourth group?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> There was a group at the top, and then there were proposals underneath with different or lower scores.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> How many proposals were in that top group?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> I'd have to go back and have a look. I believe—</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> I think it was in the order of five to six. I may be one off there, but I think it was five to six.</p>		
6	156	IRRP	WATT	CLARA'S APPLICATION	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Okay. We'll come back to that. Did the department receive any representations from the member for Murray, Mr Damian Drum, supporting CLARA's application for funding?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> There's been no letter written on behalf of, or written by, Mr Drum, supporting this proposal?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Not directly to the department.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> No, not to my knowledge.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> What about to the minister or the minister's office?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Not to my knowledge. We can take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> And no verbal support or meetings involving Mr Drum about this proposal?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Not to my knowledge. There have been no representations that I'm aware of, but we can take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Minister, you're not aware of anything?</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> No, I'm not. You asked whether verbal assertions have been put to the minister. I think that would be very hard for the department to know, in any event. I think they have been very clear about that.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Have any other members of parliament made representations, verbal or otherwise, that you're aware of, on behalf of the CLARA proposal?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Not to my knowledge.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Not to us at the table, but of course we'll take it on notice to determine nowhere else in the department has.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Could you take on notice whether any representations were made</p>	14-15 21/05/18	

					<p>to the minister or the minister's office?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Yes, but, to be clear, not to anyone at this table have those representations been made.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Was it Minister Fletcher who signed off on the funding, who ultimately gave approval?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> The funding hasn't yet been confirmed.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Sorry, yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> He is the minister responsible.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> It was a cabinet decision to choose these three proposals, but Minister Fletcher's the relevant minister. Do you know the date that the decision was made to choose these three proposals?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> We'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> To go back to my question, did the minister or the minister's office ever express a view of the CLARA proposal to the department?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Obviously, we had a range of conversations about all of the proposals. In the course of those conversations, CLARA was raised, as were a number of other proposals as well.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Just focusing on the CLARA one, in those discussions that you had, did the minister or the minister's office express a positive view about the CLARA bid?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We would have to go back and check but, from memory, it was a fairly broad conversation about the pros and cons of all the projects attached. I don't remember a particularly strong view coming out on that particular project above and beyond any other. We had a general discussion around it.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> That's your memory. Maybe you could take that on notice and go back just to clarify that. Have we got those documents? There were multiple copies in the pack that I handed over.</p>		
7	157	IRRP	WATT	BOARD MEMBERS	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Okay. Out of what we've established today, your department is proposing to hand several million dollars in taxpayers' funds to a company that has a market value of about \$400,000, and which has land options that require it to pay millions of dollars annually to landholders, so that it one day might buy the land. Some of that land, I am told, is on floodplains. This company is run by a discharged</p>	17 21/05/18	

					<p>bankrupt who's a former National Party candidate.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Any one of these factors on its own—the low company value; the fact that it's being run by a discharged bankrupt who's a former National Party candidate—doesn't disqualify someone from getting government funding. I accept that. But, surely, when you've got this series of factors, it raises questions about how this company should be given money at all?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Senator Watt, let's tighten this up. First of all, you haven't established that it's Mr Cleary who is this discharged bankrupt and you haven't established that we've got floodplains, so let's red-line them. The other two are relevant. The market capitalisation of the company is relevant, and I think Mr Yeaman has responded to you on that with the consortium answer, and it's established that Mr Cleary is a member of a political party. You can probe them as hard as you like as to whether that has influenced them or could influence them or, if they didn't know about it, did it influence them? But we're going to tighten up a little bit on the bankruptcy and the floodplain thing.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> Perhaps because we are talking about the board—and we've indicated to the senator the most recent quote that Mr Cleary runs it rather than actually being the chairman of that board—what I'll do to assist the board is gather a list along with the credentials of the actual board, which includes, I understand, former New South Wales Premier Barry O'Farrell, former Victoria Premier Steve Bracks and the former United States transport secretary Ray LaHood. I think in that context it would be useful, as this is being painted as a two bob watch company with a discharged bankrupt—I think it's more than that. I think it may be useful if I ask the department to try to provide a full list of this organisation for the benefit of the committee.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Sure.</p>		
8	158	IRRP	MCCARTHY	<p>TRACK ALIGNMENT BETWEEN NARROMINE AND NARRABRI</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could I take you to the track alignment between Narromine and Narrabri. Has the minister for infrastructure, or his office, ever sought advice from the ARTC about the number of affected landholders and whether alternative routes could minimise the number of affected landholders along the Narromine to Narrabri section of the Inland Rail project?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> The corridor for the Narromine to Narrabri section of Inland Rail was determined, initially, back in 2010. There was a preferred alignment back in 2010.</p>	20-21 21/05/18		

				<p>When the government then announced the \$300 million preconstruction activities, back in 2014, we did further work on that alignment. We looked at, I think, multiple variants of that alignment that were based on the 2010 alignment, and that led to a decision by government in February last year to determine the alignment that was recommended.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Going back to the question—and there were quite a few questions, I know—has the minister, or his office, sought advice from you about the number of affected landholders and whether alternative routes could minimise the number of affected landholders?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Has the department sought advice in relation to that?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> Not specific advice, no. When we've looked at alignments we've looked at the impact on landowners, and that was a deciding factor when we chose the preferred alignment. That was part of the selection process, which was undertaken through community consultation and the multicriteria analysis that was undertaken to look at those social factors in choosing that alignment. There was a factor around landowner impact, and I think the best example of where that influenced decision-making is the northern part of the Narromine to Narrabri area, where we chose, based on that community feedback, to reroute the corridor through the Pilliga Forest to minimise the impact on landowners. The number of landowners affected has always been an important factor in looking at that preferred alignment; however, the key criteria have always been meeting the service offering for Inland Rail between Melbourne and Brisbane and also the cost of construction.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Senator, you mentioned the department. I wanted to add that the department has provided a number of briefings to the minister around—</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> The department has provided—</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> The department—not the ARTC but the department—has provided to the minister a number of briefings in relation to the route and the impacts on landholders and the community.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> In relation to the Narromine to Narrabri section and in relation to landholders?</p> <p><b>Mr P Smith:</b> Yes. As part of the assessment of that, as Mr Fullerton outlined, the MCA did include the impact on landholders and the community. That information was obviously relayed to the office as part of a formal briefing so the government</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>could make its decision on the final study corridor.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When did the briefings take place?</p> <p><b>Mr P Smith:</b> It would've been in the lead-up to the decision, which I think was around November last year. I could take on notice the exact dates of the briefings.</p>		
9	239	IRRP	STERLE	MONASH RAIL	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> All right. I'm going to go through them all now because the chair doesn't want me to take a short cut.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> It will be quicker.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Most of the projects actually have business cases being finalised or are in early state development. We can come back with a comprehensive answer.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I just sat here agreeing. If you can tell me if something's finished. This is what Mr Hyles is going to do. Chair, just go back to reading or drawing. It's in good hands here. So you're not going to tell me that the government's come up with any money yet, have they, Mr Hyles?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> For Frankston to Baxter?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> The business case hasn't been completed.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> They haven't come up with any dough yet—the state?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> For the state, not that I understand.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. So you'll take all those other questions on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Yes.</p>	116 21/05/18	
10	240	IRRP	RICE	EAST ALBION MONORAIL	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> If the monorail was going to be considered as part of that, is there a particular period of time it would be needed? Say it came up and somebody was suggesting looking at including it, and it was August and obviously it might be a bit late.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> I'm personally not aware. It may be that the Victorians already have access to that information and are starting to draw on that assessment. I'm just not personally aware of how much that's been considered in the process to date. We can take that on notice and have a look at it. It may already be in discussion and I'm just not aware of it.</p>	121 21/05/18	
11	241	IRRP	RICE	EAST ALBION PROJECT ASSESSMENTS	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> The objectives for the study were pretty broad. Can you give me any more details about what parameters for assessment are going to be used to</p>	122 21/05/18	

					<p>determine which of these options would proceed through as the preferred option?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> There's a process that's involved in refining those assessment criteria. That's obviously work that we've done in cooperation with Victoria. We'd need to take that on notice, because I'm not sure whether that's been fully completed at this stage.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So you haven't yet started assessing the projects against each other, then?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Certainly the broad overarching assessment sort of criteria—obviously there are certain chapters of the document that have been written already, such as the underlying data and assumptions and those sorts of things.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> No, but I'm interested in the parameters by which each of the options will be compared against each other—the selection criteria, essentially.</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Yes. Other than the broad objectives that we've provided in response to the question on notice, we'd have to take that additional one on notice as well.</p>		
12	243	IRRP	CHISHOLM	ELECTRIFY THE FRANKSTON TO BAXTER LINE	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Mr Smith, I'm just trying to get a sense of how it appears in the budget press release and budget papers. Was the funding you identified from the budget papers?</p> <p><b>Mr P Smith:</b> That's the profile over the budget and forward estimates, as well as the total for the entire project.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Did it feature in the minister's budget press release as well?</p> <p><b>Mr P Smith:</b> I'll just turn to his release. I believe it was mentioned. Under 'Budget—Infrastructure: Busting Congestion, Connecting Our Regions, Improving Safety and Creating Jobs' the \$225 million to electrify the Frankston to Baxter line in Melbourne was mentioned.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> So the profile of funding beyond the forward estimates is the \$165 million? Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr P Smith:</b> Yes, that's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> And that features in the—so where is that located, the \$165 million?</p> <p><b>Mr P Smith:</b> That's in the program. If you're wanting a detailed breakdown, we'll need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Yes.</p>	36 22/05/18	

					<b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We don't, as a matter of course, traditionally publish profiles beyond the forward estimates in the budget papers themselves on a project-by-project basis. We're providing information to you based on our internal information.		
13	244	IRRP	CHISHOLM	FRANKSTON TO BAXTER LINE BUSINESS CASE	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> The business case is currently underway—is that correct?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> And how long do you expect that to take?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> I think our current estimates are suggesting that it will be completed in early 2019.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Is it the case that they're producing an interim report?</p> <p><b>Mr Hyles:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. We will certainly be given a draft report that we will comment on and provide feedback to.</p>	38 22/05/18	
<b>Australian Rail Track Corporation (3)</b>							
14	159	ARTC	MCCARTHY	PREFERRED CORRIDOR	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So, to answer the question, that is the advice that was provided either through the department or directly to the minister from ARTC?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> The advice that came from ARTC was, first of all, the 2010 alignment study. That was quite specific. The next piece of work that was undertaken was the 2015 business case and the updated alignment study. That did make some changes. It was on that basis that we were asked to then proceed with the preconstruction works that looked at, more definitively—particularly around those greenfields alignments—what the preferred corridor should be. And it was when the work was completed that we then provided recommendations to the minister on the preferred alignment, based on that work.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay. You've mentioned 2010 and 2015 in relation to those studies. Were both those reports provided to the minister?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can any of that advice be made public? Or is it public?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> It is public.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Thank you. On how many occasions and when did the ARTC brief the minister for infrastructure about the preferred corridor? Perhaps you would like to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> Yes, I'd need to take that on notice.</p>	22 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> And also, if briefing material was prepared for these meetings, can that be made available to the committee?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> I'd need to take that on notice.</p>		
15	160	ARTC	MCCARHTY	ALBURY TO MELBOURNE TRACK	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Thanks, Mr Fullerton. Now I'm going to take you to Albury and Melbourne. There's been a bit of discussion about the rail corridor between Albury and Melbourne lately. The Victorian government argues the track should be upgraded to a class 2 standard, and the federal government has now agreed. Does this mean the track will be comparable to that of New South Wales across the border?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> It's not a comparison. Across the border is an ARTC network. Our 8½ thousand kilometres of network is maintained to the ARTC freight standard, which is clearly built into our asset management plan. We don't recognise the terms 'class 1' or 'class 2' track. In the discussions between Victoria and the federal government, it was agreed to invest the \$235 million of funding that was made available through the budget to raise the Melbourne to Albury track to a Victorian class 2 passenger standard, but the rest of our network will continue to be the freight standard that ARTC maintains the network to.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What is the time frame for those works to be completed with regard to the \$235 million?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> It's still to be finalised, but we would expect it to be over about a three-year period. Of course, the earlier we can do it, the better. We're currently working with the Victorian government on the final scope, and we've had discussions with the federal government around the scope. We're about to go into community consultation this week to explain what we plan to do to get their feedback. Once all that's been done, we'll be going out to tender for specific parcels of work. We expect it to be done over the next three years.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many kilometres of track between Albury and Melbourne are controlled by the ARTC?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> I'll have to come back to you. It's around 500 kilometres. Its dual track from Seymour to Albury—Seymour being north of Melbourne—and then its single track from Seymour to Melbourne. It's probably about 500 kilometres.</p>	23-24 21/05/18	

16	161	ARTC	MCCARTHY	ALBURY TO MELBOURNE BUDGET	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What was the ARTC maintenance budget for the Melbourne to Albury corridor in 2017-18, and how much of this has been spent?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Sure. You may want to take the next couple of questions—</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> It's significant.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Apart from the recently announced \$235 million to upgrade the track to a class 2 standard, how much money will the ARTC spend on proactive maintenance in 2018-19?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> I'd need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many freight passenger cancellations or delays have been caused in the 2017-18 financial year due to copper wire theft?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> A lot.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> A lot. So—</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> I'd need to take that on notice and, as a point of interest, the \$235 million does include some replacement of the copper wire. We have an ongoing issue with copper wire theft, and we're using some of those funds to eliminate that as a potential risk, which will improve the reliability of the passenger service.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You say 'some of' the \$235 million. Can you give a figure?</p> <p><b>Mr Fullerton:</b> I'd need to take that on notice. There's an element that will be—</p>	24-25 21/05/18	
<b>Surface Transport Policy (31)</b>							
17	162	STP	GALLACHER	DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION FOR ROAD SAFETY	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The 2018-19 Portfolio Budget Statement showed department appropriation for road safety is expected to fall by an estimated actual amount of \$19.797 million in 2017-18, to \$17.547 in 2018-19 and to \$16.134 in 2020-21. What areas of the road safety program will be cut over the forward estimates?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I'd have to take that on notice in terms of the specifics.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> You don't know? Someone must have constructed the budget.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> When we indicate we will take something on notice, that's exactly what it means.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> The budget's just come out. Through you, Minister, surely—</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> I'm just saying, through the chair, that if you give the officer an opportunity to answer that question before you fire another one, it will be a lot</p>	28 21/05/18	

					<p>easier to get information.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I'll ask a separate question: is there anybody who constructed the forward estimate amounts in the room or available to give evidence about the decline in spending on road safety?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I think it'd be better if we took that question on notice. We can try and get back to you later this afternoon.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Sorry, what's happening this afternoon?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> If we can take it on notice, we'll try to come back to you later this afternoon with an explanation.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> We're taking the question on notice with an indication that we will get back to you this afternoon.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Are you aware of any areas of the road safety program that have finished, been made redundant or completed that would attribute to a decline in spend?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> As I said, we'll take the question on notice and get back to you this afternoon if we can.</p>		
18	163	STP	GALLACHER	<p>NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY 2011-2020 INQUIRY SECRETARIAT SUPPORT</p>	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can the department please provide an estimate of the value of the secretariat supporting the National Road Safety Strategy inquiry by number of staff and what levels are dedicated to the secretariat over that period?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How is the inquiry progressing?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We were expecting to get a report this month. We don't have a specific date from the panel yet as to when we'll receive it.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> When you say you need to take the number of staff on notice, is that because it's more than 10 or less than one or—</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> It's because people do multiple things, and so trying to say how many staff are specifically supporting that would be quite difficult. I'll take the number on notice.</p>	29 21/05/18	
19	164	STP	GALLACHER	<p>NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY ACTION PLAN – WILLINGNESS TO PAY VALUES</p>	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The National Road Safety Action Plan 2015-17 had the following target to achieve by the end of 2017: Initial implementation of willingness-to-pay values based on available estimates and possible commencement of a comprehensive Australian study to produce</p>	29 21/05/18	

					<p>updated values.            Can you explain why this target has not been met?  <b>Ms Spence:</b> I'm sorry, we'll have to take that on notice. I don't know if one of my colleagues—  <b>Ms Werner:</b> Could I ask you to repeat the question?  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The National Road Safety Action Plan 2015-17 had the following target:            Initial implementation of willingness-to-pay values based on available estimates and possible commencement of a comprehensive Australian study to produce updated values.            Can the department please explain why this target has not been met?  <b>Senator Scullion:</b> I think they're going to take that on notice.</p>		
20	166	STP	GALLACHER	ROAD SAFETY EMPLOYEES	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How many full-time employees? How many full-time equivalents?  <b>Ms Werner:</b> It's 5.5 full-time equivalents.  <b>Ms Spence:</b> Although, as I think we've explained previously, there are other areas within the department whose work contributes to road safety outcomes: the work that the bureau does, and the work that our infrastructure investment division does in terms of funding decisions to support safer outcomes as well. That's the full-time dedicated staff on road safety matters but they're not the only staff in the department that deal—  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So how many full-time equivalents do you have dedicated to road safety?  <b>Ms Spence:</b> We've got the 5.5 full-time equivalents dedicated to road safety but there are a number of other areas in the department whose work contributes to road safety outcomes as part of the general work.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> I thought that would be the question. If full-time equivalent is a measure of hours, not people, why can't you say 10 or five or six?  <b>Ms Spence:</b> It's very difficult, as it goes to the discussion around who's supporting the panel as well. People are doing multiple things. I don't have a breakdown but I do know there are a number of areas within the department that contribute to the road safety outcomes.  <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. So, perhaps on notice, could you give me a breakdown</p>	30-31 21/05/18	

					<p>of the 5.5 and any ancillary work that's done—</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> so that we can have a chart that says, 'Road safety is 5½ people in the Commonwealth, and this is what they're responsible for.'</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> We can do that, because that includes the vehicle safety standards branch and the 57 FTEs that work there who deal with working through the design regulations that we were talking about earlier. Perhaps I could just talk to you about heavy vehicles. During the consultation for ESC on trucks, the amount of regulation would cover more vehicle types—rigid trucks as well as prime movers— but the RIS concluded that the net benefits would potentially fall under it if every vehicle was involved. So, the proposal is that some rigid vehicles are included in the ESC. But, as I said, it's still subject to government decision.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> So, can we have that answer on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Yes.</p>		
21	167	STP	GALLCHER	HEAVY VEHICLE SAFETY – PHONE LINE	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Drilling down into that, what concrete steps are being taken to address the problems of truck drivers cutting corners and/or using drugs to stay awake to meet unrealistic deadlines, or simply to make a living? You're saying you've got a 'dob a company in' line or something? Did you say someone could dob in their company? Is that what you said?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> Yes, that's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Do you have any stats for that? Do we know how that's working?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> I do not have any statistics for that, I'm afraid.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is it a 1800 number?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> I don't have any further information on that with me here, but if I could speak to what we're doing on heavy vehicle—</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Sorry, can I just pursue that point. You mentioned that there's the ability for someone in the industry to report untoward behaviour by their company.</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How do they actually do that?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> They ring a phone line.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> And that's manned 24 hours a day?</p>	33 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Ms Werner:</b> I would have to take that on notice. It's not administered by the Commonwealth government.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is it an insourced provision of service or is it an outsourced provision of service?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> It's administered by the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator, so I'm afraid I don't have the answers to your questions. I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Thank you. If you could take these on notice: how does it actually work; is it 24 hours a day, seven days a week; do they speak to a physical person or do they leave a message; how many calls has it had, and some feedback; how long has it been in place; how much does it cost—those sorts of generic questions.</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> Certainly.</p>		
22	168	STP	GALLACHER	MINISTERIAL FORUM ON VEHICLE EMISSIONS MEETINGS	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> We've got some questions about the Ministerial Forum on Vehicle Emissions. Has anybody got any answers on that?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Yes, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> How many times has the forum met?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> I don't know how many times the forum has met. It met most recently in March of this year.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps we could get that on notice: when was the last meeting, and is there a published meeting schedule—sorry, you said it met in March of 2018?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> Yes.</p>	33	21/05/18
23	169	STP	GALLACHER	MINISTERIAL FORUM ON VEHICLE EMISSIONS STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is the Ministerial Forum on Vehicle Emissions committed to undertaking a single cost-benefit analysis that assesses the package of fuel quality, CO2 and Euro 6 as a single regulatory measure?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> Yes, we have committed to that.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What would be the time line for the government's decision on Euro 6 emission regulations?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> Again, that's a matter for government. It remains our expectation that that would be this year.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> The draft regulatory impact statement on Euro 6 was</p>	34	21/05/18

					<p>released in December 2016. Can you advise the committee what options are currently being considered and the time lines for implementation?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> I think one of the complexities that have arisen with this work is feedback from a number of stakeholders that the three different measures needed to be considered more closely together. Working out how they relate to each other, and the trade-offs that different stakeholders may be asked to accept in putting forward a combined package, has taken some time. As I say, we continue to expect that a decision on all three measures will be taken this year.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Can you put on the <i>Hansard</i> who the stakeholders are?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> There are a broad range of peak bodies who are involved from the automobile side, the health side and the general environmental side.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Perhaps on notice if we could have—</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We can take that on notice—the people who we've been engaging with and who Environment's been engaging with.</p>		
24	170	STP	GALLACHER	ATTENDANCE AT 2017 AUSTRALASIAN ROAD SAFETY CONFERENCE	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Will you be attending the road safety conference in Sydney this year?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Will I personally?</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Road safety—you get 700 professionals from all around the country convening at the road safety conference. Does the department get represented there?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Certainly, we will have representatives at a senior level at that conference.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Were you in Perth last year?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I wasn't actually responsible for road safety when that conference was on, and I'd have to take on notice who from the department attended.</p>	35 21/05/18	
25	171	STP	GALLACHER	VEHICLE CHARGE ON IMPORTED VEHICLES	<p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Okay. And I think you've taken on notice how you're going to explain further what the department does in areas of road safety and where the resources are allocated. Is there any proposed increase in the vehicle charge on imported vehicles? What is it currently—\$10, or something?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> We'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Not that I'm aware of, but I'm happy to take it on notice.</p>	36 21/05/18	

26	172	STP	RICE	<p>MINISTERIAL CONSULTATION ON DRAFT MODEL FUEL EFFICIENCY STANDARD</p>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> In fact, in response to my question on notice it was described as a detailed draft model for an Australian light vehicle fuel efficiency standard. Again, my question on notice gave us the information that this draft model was released for stakeholder consultation between 10 July and 4 August 2017.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> The department is aware, I'm sure, of the exclusive story that was then in the <i>Daily Telegraph</i> from 12 July—two days after the release of that—to stakeholders entitled 'Carbon carnage', which had direct quotes from both the Australian Automobile Association and the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries, which begins: 'A carbon tax on all new vehicles sold in Australia which will push up the cost of our most popular cars by thousands of dollars has been proposed by the Turnbull government.' So we asked questions about it in estimates. And then there was Minister Frydenberg in a radio interview with Fran Kelly on 12 July, the same day, saying, 'The government has no plans to introduce a carbon tax on the family car. It's about as likely as Elvis coming back. There's been no government decision.' This was two days after this detailed draft model was introduced. Did the department consult with Minister Frydenberg or ministers Fletcher or Chester about the details of the draft model before beginning stakeholder consultation?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I'm not sure if anyone at the table was involved at that time, so I think we'll probably have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We'll take the precise nature of the consultation, but it would be standard practice for us to consult with the relevant minister before we released the document that you're talking about.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> That's what I would have thought. So there's no-one at the table who would know whether that was the case? Minister Scullion, you wouldn't know whether it was the case?</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> I don't have any knowledge of that right at the moment, but I think it's a reasonable assumption to make. If this is leading somewhere, we can check on that assumption if it's necessary. I have no personal knowledge of that conversation.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But it's a reasonable assumption. And it's a reasonable assumption that the minister in fact would have signed off on that final draft model. Do we know which minister?</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> We can possibly find that out.</p>	<p>39 21/05/18</p>	
----	-----	-----	------	---	--	------------------------	--

27	173	STP	RICE	<p>MINISTERIAL CONSULTATION ON DRAFT MODEL FUEL EFFICIENCY STANDARD</p>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Yes, take it on notice. But for our discussion today, it's a reasonable assumption that Minister Frydenberg would have signed off on it. Who would have signed off on it?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> It's in Minister Fletcher's responsibilities. Just in terms of this language of 'was it signed off', it's most certainly the case that the minister was aware we were releasing a model for consultation. It's often left to us to determine exactly what that model is to go out, but of course we make ministers aware of the model before we go out to do the consultation.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So it's a reasonable assumption the minister would have known some of the details of that model?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Did this approval include having as part of that model a \$100 per gram of CO2 penalty for noncompliance with the emission standard?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> As I said, while it's reasonable to assume that the ministers would have been aware, I don't know what the level of detail would have been. I would assume that that's the sort of level of detail, but I would have to take it on notice because I just don't know what information was provided.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> That penalty, as you are aware, was designed in that model to be an encourager for people to comply, not in any way a revenue gainer. It was designed to be at such a level that it's worth more to you as a company to actually comply with the standard than it is to pay a penalty. But the penalty is not a revenue raiser. The purpose of it, its design, is to encourage compliance.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> And do you believe that that \$100 per gram of CO2 penalty is what the media were referring to as the carbon tax?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We're not going to presume what those parties nor the media thought of in that case. As Mr Foulds said, it was not a taxation arrangement; it was a compliance arrangement. It was not intended specifically to raise any amount of revenue. It was for compliance with a regulation, the type of regulation that's in place in North America and Europe.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But in terms of the media characterisation of something in that draft model as a carbon tax, given this was two days after the model had been released to stakeholders, do you believe it was that 100 grams per CO2 penalty that was being characterised as a carbon tax?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We don't want to speculate on what the media may or may not have thought of the manner in which we released that consultation.</p>	40 21/05/18	
----	-----	-----	------	---	---	----------------	--

					<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Is it your understanding that Minister Frydenberg would have been aware of the details of the draft model when he did that radio interview with Radio National?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> That's a matter you should put to him directly, or to his department, I think.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Minister Fletcher is my minister on these issues.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Your belief is that Minister Fletcher would have known about it, yet it was Minister Frydenberg who was doing the media. So, yes, if you could take on notice what consultation occurred...</p>		
28	174	STP	RICE	<p>STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION ON DRAFT MODEL FUEL EFFICIENCY STANDARD</p>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> We were talking before about things that were reasonable to assume. It seems to me that it is reasonable to assume that the pushback from stakeholders like the AAA and the federated chamber has led to this significant delay in the release of a final model. Everything has gone quiet since that consultation was completed in August last year, some nine months ago.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The final timing for policy decisions on this is a matter for the government.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So can you tell me exactly what further work the department is now doing on the draft model? Is there a continuation of refinement of the draft model, or is there a new model being considered in terms of the implementation of the light vehicle fuel emission standard?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I think the most accurate representation is ongoing refinement of advice, variations of different models that could be used to achieve the same ends—for example, there are differences between the European model and the North American model. We have also been doing further modelling and analysis to understand the implications of issues raised by the stakeholders that you mentioned beforehand.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Is there a current draft model, a specific model, that is in development?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> As Ms Spence mentioned earlier, we don't have just one model; we develop a number of options.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But you had a draft model that went out to stakeholders. I am wondering if you have got a specific draft model now, or are you back to the drawing board with a range of models?</p>	41-42 21/05/18	

				<p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> A model was developed to go out and consult with stakeholders, and we've certainly received that feedback. We typically find the decision the government subsequently makes around a model is helped by being able to consider a range of models, so we develop a range of models because that's a standard and sensible way to advise a government on options that it has. And there are many options within this policy area.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> You talk about a range of models. Do you have a specific number? Have you got three options that are going to be presented to the minister?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We're still finalising our advice on that.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> When do you expect to finalise your advice to the minister?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> As my colleague mentioned earlier: it's entirely a matter for government, but our expectation is that decisions will be taken this year.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> You're saying a decision will be taken this year—yes?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We're saying it's our expectation that a decision will be taken this year, but it is ultimately a matter for government.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Yes. But in terms of the expectation of your time line for providing advice to government, what's your expectation for that?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We're regularly providing advice on this matter, as Dr Kennedy said, including looking at the different models to explain the different impacts depending on what assumptions are actually made.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Are you intending to give to the minister a final draft model, or will you be giving the minister a range of options? Will you have a recommended model? You might have a range of options, but will your advice include a recommended model to go to the minister?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The department's usual practice is to recommend an option to government and it is up to the government to make that decision.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So that would be your expectation, that you will have a recommended model?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We recommend a position to a minister. A minister takes a cabinet submission forward to cabinet, and that submission is the minister's submission. There are steps in this process, and it's entirely up to the minister as to how they take the issue forward to cabinet.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> If you're expecting a decision by government by the end of the year, I think you would be wanting to get a final recommendation to your minister in the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>not-too-distant future given how slowly the wheels of government can take to turn.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We feel well placed to be able to provide a recommendation to the minister.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Right. So is it your expectation that with that recommended model there would be substantial differences to that from the draft model that was put out for consultation?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We haven't finalised our position yet.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But is it your expectation that there would be substantial differences?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> As I said, we haven't finalised our position yet.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Are you able to provide me a list of the stakeholders that were sent copies of the draft model as part of the consultation in July and August?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Yes, although we'll have to take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I will just confirm the department provided the draft model to stakeholders on 10 July.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> That's correct.</p>		
29	175	STP	RICE	CIRCULATION OF DRAFT MODEL FUEL EFFICIENCY STANDARD TO STAKEHOLDERS	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So the draft model was provided to stakeholders in confidence?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I will have to check, but my recollection is that they were provided to a targeted group of stakeholders.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Was there an understanding that it was in confidence?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> That I would have to check.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We would have to check. I'm not aware of any confidentiality arrangements in place where stakeholders were required to do that. Sometimes in consultation around matters of commercial importance, confidentiality arrangements are sought in that. I don't think there were in this case, but we will take on notice the precise conditions or expected outcome in the provision of that to stakeholders.</p>	42-43 21/05/18	
30	176	STP	RICE	PUBLICATION OF DRAFT MODEL FUEL EFFICIENCY STANDARD AND	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Given that the details of that draft model were clearly given to the media only two days after you gave them to various stakeholders and there are media people who have those details, will the department now release that draft model to the rest of us?</p>	43 21/05/18	

				STAKEHOLDER SUBMISSIONS	<p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The release of the model in a general sense would be a matter for government, but I will take it on notice and confirm an outcome for that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> You'll take that on notice as to whether it could be released?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I'll ask the minister about the public release in the form that you're now talking about.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> As I said, clearly the media got it. The details are out there, but only to the people who are associated with those stakeholders. Similarly, it would be good to see those stakeholders' submissions. Would it be possible for us to see those stakeholders' submissions?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Certainly, we can take that on notice.</p>		
31	177	STP	RICE	EURO 6/VI CONSULTATION	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So we had an RIS on the Euro 6, but now it has all been brought together. Has there been any further consultation with stakeholders by the department—as opposed to the ministerial forum—with regard to the implementation of Euro 6 standards?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We have been speaking to stakeholders. We haven't had a formal consultation process, but when we've been talking to stakeholders we talk about all the elements of the package, not just fuel efficiency or the Euro 6; we're talking about all the elements of it. There have been conversations with various stakeholders over the—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What conversations and when? With whom?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I think you asked previously for advice on who we've consulted with. It's the same people.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But that was the formal process with the light vehicle fuel emissions standard, for that formal consultation in July-August last year.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Again, I can take on notice the specifics of who we've spoken to since then as well.</p>	44 21/05/18	
32	178	STP	RICE	EURO 6/VI CONSULTATION	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can I clarify: in terms of that consultation process, that was just on the light vehicle fuel emission standards draft model?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Yes. As I was saying, the group of people who have been interested in one element tend to be interested in all three. I think the stakeholder group is consistent across the three elements of the package.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I know you have taken on notice the stakeholders, but can you</p>	45 21/05/18	

					<p>outline some specifics of who those stakeholders are that you are—</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I think Ms Werner—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> —that you are consulting with on Euro 6? Are there additional ones you are consulting with on Euro 6, as opposed to the light vehicle fuel efficiency standards?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I don't think so.</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> The heavy vehicle industry, on noxious emissions, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Are you consulting with any community organisations or residents' groups?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We can take that on notice. I think Ms Werner ran through quite a long list of people who we were engaging with on fuel efficiency. As I said, it's consistent across the three elements. If we're talking to a stakeholder on one element, then we're talking to them about all three.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But I'm interested in particular stakeholders. Do you know whether there are any community organisations you have been consulting with on the Euro 6 standards?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> As was mentioned before, we are consulting with the peak bodies, so we wouldn't necessarily negotiate with or consult individual community organisations. But we would consult with advocates of different interest groups.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Which of those interest groups?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> As I said, we will take it on notice. I don't have the list in front of me, I'm sorry.</p>		
33	179	STP	RICE	EURO 5/V AND EURO 6/VI STANDARDS	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Does the department know what percentage of new vehicles being sold into Australian markets, both if light vehicles and heavy vehicles, are currently Euro 6 compliant?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> We could take that on notice and see if the vehicle standards people have that.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Across the whole fleet, both in light vehicles and heavy vehicles, does the department know how many of them are Euro 5 compliant—the various categories?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Euro 5 compliance is already mandated. New vehicles are supplied—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> That is new vehicles.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Yes.</p>	46 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But you have the turnover of the fleet?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I don't know if we could provide that, but we will have a look and see. We have the new vehicles, but I'm not sure how far back we could go to develop that model you're after.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We will see what we can find.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> We will have a look and see what we can find out for you.</p>		
34	180	STP	STERLE	<p>REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL HEAVY VEHICLE DRIVER COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> You will be aware that the National Heavy Vehicle Registration Scheme will be in place from 1 July 2018, allowing us to build a national picture of data from heavy vehicles, which should allow further analysis of various different aspects—not only fatigue; safety productivity, access permit arrangements. We have also through Austroads reviewed the National Heavy Vehicle Driver Competency Framework, which looks at the licensing and training requirements both for heavy vehicle drivers and the people who assess them.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Tell us a bit more about what you're doing. This committee uncovered exploitation of foreign workers under the student visa nonsense. Is this following a recommendation of this committee's report?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> I couldn't say where the work began. I'm familiar with your report, but I'm not sure if that was the direct driver for this particular work. It was decided to pursue this in 2016, then the Austroads Registration and Licensing Task Force agreed to undertake a review of the National Heavy Vehicle Driver Competency Framework and make recommendations to improve the current arrangements.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So we are waiting for feedback from this mob?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> That has been completed and the report has been provided. The next question is how we implement that. That will go forward to the Transport and Infrastructure Council in November of this year.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Obviously that document isn't yet public? That is just within the department and cabinet?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> All member jurisdictions of Austroads have access, but it's not a publicly available document.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is it something we can get up on the machine thingy?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We can take on notice whether we can get a copy to the committee.</p>	47-48 21/05/18		

35	181	STP	STERLE	SPEED CAMERAS	<p><b>Ms Werner:</b> It's about \$300,000 for each camera, so they are being rolled out gradually. There are eight at the moment. There'll be another four by the end of this financial year and another two shortly after that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you know where they'll be? You can take it on notice. There's no stress.</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> I'll have to take it on notice. I don't have that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> While we're at it, can you take on notice whether there have been any prosecutions from the use of these cameras. If so, take it on notice. Could you provide these things to the committee: When? Where? Who? What was the fine? What was the drama? Did we chuck them in jail or did we let them go?</p> <p><b>Ms Werner:</b> I'll have to take that on notice.</p>	50 21/05/18	
36	304	STP	STERLE	IMPROVEMENT ON HEAVY VEHICLE SAFETY OUTCOMES	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What other safety measures have we seen land?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Senator, could I just jump in there and make the point that a lot of the issues that Ms Werner has been talking about are things that are being driven through the Transport and Infrastructure Council and the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. The states are doing a lot of things individually in terms of trying to improve heavy vehicle safety outcomes. I'm sure we can get you a more consolidated list of what individual states and territories are doing in this space.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That would help as well.</p>	50-51 21/05/18	
37	184	STP	O'SULLIVAN	WIDE LOADS	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> Whilst we're looking at wide loads, I have been given an indication that, if I'm taking a harvester that's a wide load and we come to dusk, the truck can no longer continue with the harvester on the wide load. But the harvester can come off the truck, go around and tow the truck and they can continue at night-time. I just need to know whether this is a bit of legend from the bush. Is that even possible?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I haven't heard that one, but I'm certainly willing to—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> They were credible people and they weren't trying—</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> No, I understand that.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> to share a joke with me. These were carriers. Could you look into that— could you take that question on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We should be able to give an answer on that point, if it is.</p>	53 21/05/18	

38	310	STP	GALLACHER	GAPS IN ROAD SAFETY	Where does the Department see gaps to be in Road Safety? Is it in technology adoption? Is in Infrastructure?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
39	311	STP	GALLACHER	LEADERSHIP WITH STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT WITH ROAD SAFETY	Why isn't the Government taking more leadership with the States and Local Government in regards to Road Safety?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
40	312	STP	GALLACHER	ENGAGEMENT WITH HEALTH/LGA'S	How is the department engaging with health/LGA's, etc to maximise engagement and best outcomes?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
41	313	STP	GALLACHER	ANCAP FUNDING	In the next budget can we give assurances to ANCAP that they will be funded beyond the forward estimates?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
42	314	STP	GALLACHER	DRIVER DISTRACTIONS	What efforts are being made to address the issue of driver distractions from a national level?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
43	315	STP	GALLACHER	ROADSIDE DRUG TESTING	What work has been done in regards to "best practice" approaches to roadside drug testing?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
44	316	STP	GALLACHER	NRSS ROAD TRAUMA REDUCTION	What is the federal government's allocation to oversee the NRSS to expedite road trauma reduction? Is this amount commensurate with the economic and societal cost?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
45	317	STP	GALLACHER	REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY TRAUMA FROM CRASHES	Given that the death and injury reduction targets are not being met, apart from the Independent Ministerial Inquiry (and the small projects on distractions and drugs), what new projects/efficiencies/ resources/initiatives have been undertaken/planned now to reduce so much unnecessary trauma from crashes?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	

46	318	STP	GALLACHER	WORKPLACE ROAD SAFETY	Is the Government looking at increasing the level of focus on the issue of workplace road safety?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
47	365	STP	RICE	REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the status of the inquiry into the National Road Safety Strategy 2011–2020?</li> <li>2. Noting the expected reporting date of the inquiry was foreshadowed originally as ‘early 2018’, can you please note more specifically when a report is expected?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
<b>CITIES (18)</b>							
48	206	CITIES	MCCARTHY	CITY DEALS PROGRAM FUNDING	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So how much money has been allocated to the department for the administration of the City Deals program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> Over the forward estimates we've got \$23.5 million, which has been allocated to support the delivery of the national cities agenda.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> And how much has been spent on advertising, marketing and consultants for City Deals since the last Senate estimates?</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. I believe just under \$18,000 had been spent in the printing of City Deals material and promotional material was an answer to a question on notice from the last estimates. Since then—I would have to take that on notice. We don't normally do promotional activities or advertising for City Deals. Normally the costs are in the delivery of the city deal document that is signed between three levels of government. We try to have everything available online, but we do have some demand for hard copy brochures.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You say there's \$18,000 unspent?</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> No, \$18,000 is what had been spent. It was just over that. I'd have to check, but it was a recent question on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you also give a breakdown of how that was spent?</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> Yes, we can do that.</p>	56 21/05/18	
49	207	CITIES	MCCARTHY	DARWIN CITY DEAL MOU	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> In terms of the Darwin situation, why is the MOU, which was signed on 26 May 2017, not available on the website?</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> I would have to take that on notice and find out.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Is it simply an oversight, given that the MOU for every other</p>	57 21/05/18	

					<p>city deal is publically available?  <b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> It's possible. I will need to take that on notice.</p>		
50	208	CITIES	MCCARTHY	STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Will the government contribute federal funding to the University of Tasmania's STEM development project under the deal?  <b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> I'll go back to my previous response: the commitments will be known from all three levels of government once we've signed the deal.                  ...  <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Who are the stakeholders involved in these discussions?  <b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> We have a government structure that's been set up to help negotiate the city deal. We have all three levels of government working at a ministerial level but also at officials level, and then, underneath that, we have key working groups which cover most of the areas of focus that Ms Lynch has just talked about. In those working groups, if they need to engage particular stakeholders during the course of their work, they will, and that could include people from the private sector or community groups. I might hand over to Ms Lynch again if there's anything further.  <b>Ms Lynch:</b> There's nothing further at this stage other than to reiterate that, in the course of discussions toward the Hobart City Deal, we are meeting and discussing potential initiatives with a very wide range of stakeholders. I can go through some of those stakeholders with you, if you'd like, or provide them on notice.  <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> If you can provide them on notice, that would be good...</p>	62 21/05/18	
51	209	CITIES	BUSHBY	LAUNCESTON CITY DEAL VALUE	<p><b>Senator BUSHBY:</b> I won't take too long. One of the City Deals that you have mentioned on a couple of occasions as having already been completed is the Launceston City Deal. I was just wondering if you could give an update. Obviously, the negotiations were concluded, the deal was put in place. Presumably we're in the implementation stage—so an update on where we are at with the key projects on that deal.  <b>Ms Lynch:</b> As you know, the Launceston City Deal is a five-year city deal and will run between 2017 and 2022 and position Launceston as one of Australia's most liveable and innovative regional cities. The Commonwealth is providing a total of \$195.33 million to support projects that will ensure Launceston experiences better education and job opportunities and a growing economy. That includes the funding</p>	64 21/05/18	

					<p>that was committed at the time that the city deal was signed, which was \$141 million, and additional funding committed since the signing, which was \$54.33 million. So all of the commitments for the Launceston City Deal are being implemented at the moment and are on track. The deal was signed at the end of April in 2017, so we're now nearing the phase for the finalisation and release of the first annual progress report for the Launceston City Deal. We would expect that to be released this financial year, so before the end of June is the target, so in the next couple of months.</p> <p><b>Senator BUSHBY:</b> That will compare the stage at each of the projects and the parts of the deal against KPIs, or is it just a general observation—are there things that have to be reached by a certain time?</p> <p><b>Ms Lynch:</b> Yes. Each of the commitments under the city deal has a series of milestones that are expected to be implemented. The annual report will report against those milestones and also give some visibility on upcoming next steps for each of the commitments. It's a fairly significant coordination exercise because a number of commitments are implemented by different agencies across the Commonwealth, the state government and the local council.</p> <p><b>Senator BUSHBY:</b> Which is why it's a complex negotiation process putting them together in the first place, as we heard from Ms Wiley-Smith. You mentioned the total figure that was committed by the federal government. That's how much money—the numbers you mentioned is the amount of money the federal government is putting in?</p> <p><b>Ms Lynch:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator BUSHBY:</b> How much is the total value of the deal? How much is it leveraged in addition to that in effect?</p> <p><b>Ms Lynch:</b> That's a good question; I might have to take that on notice to get the most accurate current figures.</p>		
52	210	CITIES	MCCARTHY	WESTERN SYDNEY CITY DEAL	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I want to take you to the Western Sydney City Deal. How much funding has the Commonwealth allocated to this City Deal?</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> New funding that was announced in the City Deal when it was signed is \$125 million, which includes \$60 million for the Western Parkland City Livability Program, \$50 million for the North-South Rail Link business case and \$15 million for the Western Sydney housing package. But this funding is part of a much larger contribution by the Commonwealth to the region, including the</p>	67-68 21/05/18	

				<p>development of government land, establishment of new government offices and services for the region, and the key commitment between the Australian government and the New South Wales government, which are to be equal partners in funding for the first stage of the North-South Rail Link.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay. How much will each council receive from this part of the City Deal which includes the \$150 million for the Western Parkland Livability Program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> All three levels of government are contributing to different elements of this City Deal. While the Commonwealth's put in \$60 million, I think the New South Wales government has also put in \$60 million, and the councils are also putting in their own money. Once it's divided between the councils, then, depending on how this program rolls out, they could be getting around \$15 million each, I believe. But I'm just looking at my colleague Ms Howlett to confirm.</p> <p><b>Ms Howlett:</b> Yes, there was a commitment in the City Deal that the funding would be split equally between the councils.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you detail the process that will be undertaken to determine the projects, including the time line?</p> <p><b>Ms Howlett:</b> The commitment is that the successful projects will be announced this calendar year.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Any particular time in this calendar year?</p> <p><b>Ms Howlett:</b> That's not yet settled. The program will be delivered by the New South Wales government on our behalf, and we are currently working with the New South Wales government to develop merit criteria for the program. So, councils will need to put in project proposals, and those proposals will need to be assessed against the merit criteria. That work is underway now to develop those criteria, and there will be consultation with local government once those criteria are developed.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many councils are you working with here?</p> <p><b>Ms Howlett:</b> Eight.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How exactly will the allocated \$15 million accelerate planning and zoning reforms to support housing supply in Western Sydney as is stated in the budget?</p> <p><b>Ms Howlett:</b> Councils' experience of densification is that in order for densification to be successful it's absolutely critical that the social infrastructure and amenity</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>investments that go with good-quality densification are absolutely essential to make that acceptable to the community. So, the idea of this funding program is to enable councils to invest in those sorts of programs that will assist in accelerating the capacity to bring density into those communities in Western Sydney.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Will there be any specific targets, though, to improve housing affordability?</p> <p><b>Ms Howlett:</b> Not through the Livability Program. There are a number of measures related to housing in the Western Sydney City Deal, and the New South Wales government has committed to delivering 184,500 homes in the next 20 years.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> As part of—</p> <p><b>Ms Howlett:</b> The City Deal, and through the Greater Sydney Commission's Western Sydney District Plan.</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> There is a section in the Western Sydney City Deal on planning and housing, which is on page 18 and 19, which goes through all of the commitments to support housing in Western Sydney, including greenfields, to bring supply on board. One of the key issues that were raised during the negotiations with local government was this real barrier that they're experiencing to be able to bring on new supply quickly.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You are mentioned earlier the investment each council's receiving, which you're saying is possibly around \$15 million each.</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> That is just under the Liveability Program. There's separate funding for the housing.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How much direct additional investment is there for each council overall?</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> For the City Deal?</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Wiley-Smith:</b> I'll have to take that on notice. There are just under 40 commitments for a City Deal. As I've mentioned before, commitments around funding are just one element. Of course the councils are a key contributor to the City Deal, so they are bringing in their own funding and their own contributions, including resources with staffing to support the City Deal. We will have to go through and break that down.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

53	211	CITIES	KETTER	LAUNCESTON SEWERAGE IMPROVEMENT PLAN	<p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> What about the anticipated time frame for work to begin on the Tamar River improvement plan?</p> <p><b>Ms Lynch:</b> There are a range of activities underway in relation to the Tamar estuary. TasWater has an existing program of capital works that are underway. If you are referring to the new announcements made by the Commonwealth and Tasmanian governments to provide \$95 million in funding jointly to implement recommendations of the Tamar Estuary Management Taskforce report, that work is expected to start in 2019. It will run over a period of approximately five years.</p> <p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> When will the tenders be sought for that?</p> <p><b>Ms Lynch:</b> Essentially, we would go to the state government to get further information on that. We don't expect that there'll be tenders commissioned in the immediate future if the first of that work is to commence in financial year 2019-20.</p> <p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> I'm not sure if we're talking about the same project. Does this form any part of the Launceston Sewerage Improvement Plan?</p> <p><b>Ms Lynch:</b> Yes, it's related to that. The Tamar Estuary Management Taskforce released a report in February this year that outlined a series of recommendations to improve the health of the Tamar estuary. A number of those recommendations were for upgrades to the combined sewerage and stormwater system. There were a number of recommendations that amounted to around \$84.6 million, and there were also some recommendations about catchment management action further upstream.</p> <p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> Is that figure you just gave the cost of delivery of the Launceston Sewerage Improvement Plan?</p> <p><b>Ms Lynch:</b> I'm not aware if there may be a separate Launceston sewerage upgrade plan that, for example, is owned by or managed by Launceston city council. I can take that on notice if you like and clarify it for you.</p> <p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> Okay. Perhaps you could just tell me if there have been any revised estimates provided as to the cost of that Launceston Sewerage Improvement Plan, taking into account this funding under the Tamar River improvement plan.</p> <p><b>Ms Lynch:</b> I will take that on notice for you.</p> <p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> Thank you very much.</p>	72 21/05/18	
----	-----	--------	--------	--------------------------------------	---	----------------	--

54	331	CITIES	STERLE	CITY DEALS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please provide an organisational chart for the cities division, including who is responsible for what city deals.</li> <li>• How precisely will the \$23.5 million over the forwards support the national cities agenda?</li> <li>• How much has been spent on advertising, marketing and consultants for City Deals since the last Senate estimates?</li> <li>• Are there any guidelines that are publicly available for local councils to develop city deal applications additional to the five criteria: 1. A shared vision for growth, reform and improvement 2. A negotiated and customised approach, across the whole of government 3. Transformative investment 4. Institutional and governance reforms for sustained improvement 5. Innovative financing and value capture?</li> <li>• What support is given to local councils wishing to develop city deal applications?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
55	334	CITIES	STERLE	TOWNSVILLE CITY DEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beyond the funding already committed, what ongoing support is the Government providing for the Townsville City Deal?</li> <li>• What is the purpose of the \$38.8 million in the budget for 2018-19 for the TEARC, given the Queensland Government has decided to not proceed with this project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What will this money be spent on?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Please provide the past and future meeting schedule for the Board overseeing the Townsville City Deal.</li> <li>• Was the Local Partnership Forum held in March this year? What were the outcomes?</li> <li>• What contribution has the Government made to the following commitments? Please provide an implementation timeline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More work packages for the North Queensland Stadium to be released and awarded to Townsville-based businesses, creating local employment opportunities;</li> <li>○ Preliminary evaluation of the Townsville Entertainment, Exhibition and Convention Centre;</li> <li>○ Establishment of the Townsville Industrial Development Board;</li> <li>○ Finalise a Smart City Strategy for Townsville;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Progressing the Port Channel Capacity Upgrade Project</li> <li>○ Consideration of the detailed business case for the Townsville Eastern Access Rail Corridor;</li> <li>○ Acquisition of land to accelerate the Townsville State Development Area;</li> <li>○ Building the duplicate Haughton to Ross River Dam pipeline;</li> <li>○ Implementing the Community Water Transition Package and preparation of the Townsville Water Security Taskforce Final Report due in September 2018</li> <li>○ An energy strategy to prioritise short, medium and long term measures including on ground projects and possible financing mechanisms.</li> </ul>		
56	335	CITIES	STERLE	LAUNCESTON CITY DEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are there any revised estimates as to the cost of the Launceston Sewerage Improvement Plan, taking into account funding under the Tamar River improvement plan?</li> <li>● Does the Launceston City Deal have a progress report? If so, when will it be published and how regularly?</li> <li>● What are the Government's key deliverables for 2018? Is there an implementation plan? Please provide.</li> <li>● How regularly does the Launceston City Deal Executive Board meet? Please provide a past and future meeting schedule.</li> <li>● Please detail how many occasions the Community and Business Advisory Group has met, the dates of these meetings and the agenda.</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
57	336	CITIES	STERLE	GEELONG CITY DEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● When will the Geelong City Deal be finalised?</li> <li>● What progress has been made on this since the last estimates?</li> <li>● What meetings have been held: with state and local governments, stakeholders, community? And what were the outcomes of these meetings?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
58	337	CITIES	STERLE	HOBART CITY DEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● When will the Hobart City Deal be finalised?</li> <li>● What progress has been made on this since the last estimates?</li> <li>● What meetings have been held: with state and local governments, stakeholders, community? And what were the outcomes of these meetings?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What progress has been made on the following: examining options to facilitate an Antarctic and science precinct at Macquarie Point; guiding a coordinated approach to transport planning; providing a strategic framework for local councils and the state government to working together on strategic planning outcomes; examining options to facilitate the University of Tasmania's STEM presence in the city; and supporting affordable housing? How will these be achieved?</li> </ul>		
59	338	CITIES	STERLE	DARWIN CITY DEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When will the Darwin City Deal be finalised?</li> <li>• Why has it been delayed?</li> <li>• What were the outcomes from the Minister’s visit in May to Darwin? Who did he meet with?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
60	339	CITIES	STERLE	PERTH CITY DEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the timeline for advancing the Perth City Deal?</li> <li>• What progress has been made on this city deal since its announcement in April?</li> <li>• How much funding will it receive?</li> <li>• What meetings have been held: with state and local governments, stakeholders, community? And what were the outcomes of these meetings?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
61	340	CITIES	STERLE	GOAL 11 - SUSTAINABLE CITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please detail the work the department is doing to lead the development of a chapter for Australia’s Voluntary National Review on progress towards sustainable development goal 11. What will be the end result?</li> <li>• How has Australia progressed with Goal 11? In what areas can more work be done?</li> <li>• Will this review be publicly available?</li> <li>• Will targets be set by the Cities Division to help Australia achieve this goal following the work that has gone into developing this chapter? What further opportunities exist for Australian cities to become more sustainable?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
62	341	CITIES	STERLE	FUTURE-READY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What were the learning outcomes of the Future Ready smart cities incubator series?</li> <li>• How many councils were involved in the Future Ready smart cities incubator series?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How were the partners who delivered webinars chosen? How were the materials developed?</li> <li>• Is formal feedback from the series being collated and what changes to program delivery will be made as a result?</li> </ul>		
63	343	CITIES	STERLE	CITIES REFERENCE GROUP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many times has the Cities Reference Group met since the Hon. Paul Fletcher became the relevant Minister? On which dates?</li> <li>• What are the outcomes of these meetings? How have they impacted policy development?</li> <li>• In what ways does it ‘foster new thinking’ and ‘test ideas’?</li> <li>• Please provide an updated membership list.</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
64	344	CITIES	STERLE	SMART CITIES AND SUBURBS PROGRAM	Will the Smart Cities & Suburbs program continue beyond Round 2? If yes, how much funding will it receive?	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
65	345	CITIES	STERLE	ACTIVE TRANSPORT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What role does the Cities Division play in considering and developing policy for active transport?</li> <li>• Has the Cities Division participated in any meetings on this topic?</li> <li>• Have there been any discussions with the Minister about investing in active transport?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
<b>Regional Development and Local Government (32)</b>							
66	212	RDLG	STERLE	DECENTRALISATION BUSINESS CASES	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Great. I'm aware of Mr McCormack, who's just got his feet under the table. I've got all that too. Can you tell us how many business cases have been received by your department from government agencies who wish to decentralise?</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Great. So how many do you have?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Would it be helpful if I actually told you a little about the process that's been undertaken, and I can lead you up to where we're at with that?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You can. It's just that we're an hour and a half behind. If it helps the committee, okay, but if it's just longwinded and we don't need to—it's entirely your call, Ms Taylor, but, if our eyebrows go up and down, it's probably time.</p>	73-75 21/05/18	

				<p>Perhaps you can just throw out how many agencies have actually said they want to decentralise.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Essentially, all government departments have analysed all of their functions for suitability for decentralisation. All of that process occurred in 2017. As a result of that, some opportunities were identified for, if you like, near-term decentralisation, and those were announced in the budget. A further list of opportunities to go through business case processes was identified.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How many of them?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> There are more than a handful. I don't think it's helpful for me to actually be very specific.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I think it would be very helpful to this committee if you could tell us or if you could answer the question—a very simple question—that I asked you, which was: how many agencies have said, 'We're up for it; we're moving'? That was my original question.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> There are seven underway at the moment.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How many?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Seven.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sorry?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Seven.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Who are they?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> I don't think it's appropriate for me to announce. This is part of the—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> One moment, Ms Taylor. To guide you, I'm not sure that you can exercise discretion about not answering that question in detail. If there are grounds—and there are only three grounds on which you can decline to answer questions at budget estimates—all of them require the support of the minister at the table for you to make a claim. I know you're not even going there with public interest immunity. Otherwise, you have an obligation to answer the questions in as much detail as you can or call upon other officers of your department to do the same.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> Or take it on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I want to clarify the process around the centralisation. At this stage, subsequent to the announcements in the budget, the department is really only going through that process to work across agencies to develop its advice for government, so a final list has not yet been settled—not only by the department</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>but nor, in any sense, by the government at this stage. And I mean even in an early sense of taking such consideration to an actual list that the cabinet would make a decision on subsequently. So, even the number noted by Ms Taylor earlier is a very preliminary number. That number my grow or rise, because the advice is in an early phase of development.</p> <p>Senator Sterle, I very much appreciate the importance and directness of your questions. It will be some time before we'd be able to answer precisely how many are under consideration and what they are, because those considerations, I would characterise, are at a very early stage—even in the sense of our advice to government.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Would you be able to take Senator Sterle's direct question—that is, at that point where you are able to identify the agencies—as a contingent question on notice?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> So, if you are in a position to do so, you might respond to Senator Sterle on notice before the next estimates. Otherwise, we will have to revisit it at a later time.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I'm very happy to do that, and also to report back at the next committee about the process that follows this conversation we've had.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> It was early 2018, and here we are nearly in mid-2018. I take it from our conversation that the process is still open—it hasn't been completed.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> If you can do that—if you can come up with anything before the next round of estimates—and take it on notice that would be greatly appreciated. When we get closer to knowing which departments are considering decentralisation and that is set in stone—and we understand that there are employees involved here and all sorts of other things—my questioning will go to how many jobs will be involved in the moves. Because the last thing we want to see—although I can't speak for the government—is a repeat of the APVMA situation, though that is still working it's way through...</p>		
67	213	RDLG	STERLE	DECENTRALISATION	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b>... In the budget there has been an announcement of a couple of agencies that are decentralising. Can we go to them?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Yes, we can.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations one of</p>	75 21/05/18	

					<p>them?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> I can take you through the list that was announced in the budget.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Let's go through the list, and then I'll put some questions around each agency.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> There was an announcement of nearly 100 positions—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> 100 positions at the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> No, nearly 100—in fact, 98 was the total—and I will take you through the list. There were 98 in total.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Oh, 98 in total. Okay.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> It was 10 positions from the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations moving from Canberra to Darwin; seven positions from the Indigenous Affairs Group Regional Network Melbourne CBD office moving to Shepparton; 25 positions moving from the Indigenous Affairs Group Regional Network Sydney CBD office moving to Parramatta; 40 positions from the Unique Student Identifier Registrar moving from Canberra to Adelaide; four positions from the Office of the National Rural Health Commissioner to be located in Adelaide; three positions from the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities Indian Ocean Territories function moving from Canberra to Perth; and nine positions from the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities Inland Rail Unit moving to Toowoomba, Dubbo and Wodonga.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Thank you. I don't bother with shorthand, but let me just have a go at this. Have we got the time frame for that? Are those people well aware of when they are expected to be relocated or not?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> The time lines will vary according to each of the individual agency's plans for those relocations. I don't have the detail on the individual time lines to hand, but I could take that on notice.</p>		
68	216	RDLG	MCCARTHY	REGIONAL MINISTERIAL TASKFORCE	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Does the regional ministerial task force chaired by the Prime Minister and announced on 15 March last year still exist?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> I'm aware the regional ministerial task force has met on two separate occasions.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When were they and where were they?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> I'm not sure that I've got the dates with me. I might need to take that</p>	76 21/05/18	

					<p>on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> No-one has got those details with them?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> No, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When did it last meet? How many meetings has it held in total? And where did it meet?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> We'll come back on notice. I believe it has met twice, but we'll come back with the detail on notice.</p>		
69	217	RDLG	MCCARTHY	CDG PROGRAM	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can you explain the policy objective of the Community Development Grants Program?</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> The guidelines state: The Outcome of the Community Development Grants Programme is to construct and upgrade facilities to provide long term improvements in social and economic viability of local communities.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Is the purpose still to fund government election commitments, though?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> That's certainly the vehicle that election commitments have been funded from, yes, but other announcements of government have also been funded under that program.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can you confirm if the new Armidale regional airport terminal funding of \$3.5 million was a grant from the Community Development Grants Program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> It will take me a little while to check for that. I may have to take that on notice. Sorry, was that the Armidale Airport upgrade?</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes, the Armidale regional airport terminal funding of \$3.5 million.</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> Yes, that's correct. That was a 2013 election commitment.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> And that was a grant from the Community Development Grants Program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How was this project identified for funding, do you know?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> What happens with election commitments is that they're announced in the election. Once the government is in place then an assessment of individual</p>	77 21/05/18	

					<p>projects is undertaken against each of the guidelines and a decision is taken by government to fund or not fund that project.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Why was Armidale Airport selected for an upgrade?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Essentially these are decisions of government. Most of them are made in the context of an election commitment. What Ms Wieland's explaining is, after the commitment, effectively Ms Wieland's team seeks the relevant information from the proponents so that we can then go through and assess value for relevant money for the project.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Which other regional airports have been given funding under this program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. It's quite a long list of projects and to go through that would take up too much of the committee's time at this point.</p>		
70	218	RDLG	MCCARTHY	CDG NEW ENGLAND PROJECTS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> According to some analysis done by Fairfax Media—and I do have a media clip here—recently two projects were announced in New England from this program, including \$2 million for a new landing system at Tamworth airport and \$8.5 million for a new athletic, cycling and equestrian centre. Can you confirm this?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I would have to take that on notice. I have no record of that here.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you also take this on notice: if that is the case, have these projects been contracted yet?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> Certainly I'll take that on notice.</p>	77-78 21/05/18	
71	219	RDLG	MCCARTHY	ALBURY-WODONGA CDG FUNDING	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What was the rationale for awarding \$300,000 to the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation that was disbanded in 2014?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> We would need to take that question on notice because we don't have the detail before us. As you would appreciate, there are a very large number of election commitment projects under the CDG Program.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you also take on notice that question around what this funding was granted for.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Yes.</p>	78 21/05/18	
72	220	RDLG	MCCARTHY	RJIP NOMINEES	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I was initially but I have moved to this. I will make that much clearer for you, because it has, obviously, caused a bit of confusion. The department wrote to all relevant MPs inviting them to nominate members of the</p>	81 21/05/18	

					<p>panel for this program. Did all MPs respond?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> I will have to take that on notice. I have to admit that was some time ago. My notes don't have the detail. I do know that those local planning committees were established and their role was basically to do, if you like, a local investment plan to identify priorities for the regions. Once that was done, effectively competitive grant programs were done for those regions, which were assessed against the priorities in the plan. But, I must confess, I don't have before me the process that was undertaken to set-up those committees.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You will provide that on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Can do.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you provide a list of the nominees from each MP for each RJIP?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I will look into that for you. I'm not sure whether that information is available.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Who made the decision about which nominees from MPs to accept and which to reject?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> I think that would have been made by the minister but I will confirm that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Thank you very much.</p>		
73	221	RDLG	BARTLETT	FEASIBILITY STUDY	<p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> I'm told this is the right area with regard to the National Water Infrastructure Development Fund? That's your gig?</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> I understand part of the fund was provided to the Southern Downs Regional Council last year to conduct a feasibility study for the Emu Swamp Dam around Stanthorpe?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> Yes, that's correct. There was funding, which provided for a feasibility study into Emu Swamp Dam.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> That was provided to the Southern Downs Regional Council, the local government authority there?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> The process is that these feasibility studies are nominated by the Queensland government and the funding goes to the Queensland government. The Queensland government contracted the Southern Downs Regional Council.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> And that council conducted an initial study, as I understand it,</p>	81-82 21/05/18	

				<p>through a group called GHD, is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> That's right. The council began the study and contracted GHD to undertake the first part of the study.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> They provided that?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> We have a copy of that initial report, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> Everybody was happy with all that? There were no problems with that original part of the study?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> The report was accepted by the Queensland government and the Commonwealth has accepted that report, yes.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> The Australian government advised Queensland—Queensland sought advice from us, and we advised them that our preference was for the study to be completed as agreed, at which time they identified that there was an alternative to delivering the study.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> It was roughly \$3 million, as I understand it?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> The full value of the feasibility study was \$3.97 million.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> About \$4 million. And the first part was conducted by GHD through a public tender process, as I understand it? They conducted the first part. What was the first part?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> They did an initial feasibility study of options to secure the regional water supply.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> And that study found that—</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> In summary, it found that there were three or four options, including Emu Swamp Dam as one of the options. Emu Swamp Dam was not the cheapest in terms of achieving a water supply for Stanthorpe and therefore the council wanted to seek an examination of other options.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> The feasible study that said the Emu Swamp Dam wasn't the cheapest option?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> For urban supply.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> Why was there a need to continue handing more money over to the chamber of commerce locally?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> The GHD report went on to say that to secure a long-term ongoing supply for the region, it would be necessary to build Emu Swamp Dam or another dam—and I'd have to provide you the name of the alternative dam on notice.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

74	222	RDLG	BARTLETT	<p>EMU SWAMP DAM FEASIBILITY STUDY – MILESTONE 1 PAYMENT</p>	<p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> The GHD original report said there are cheaper options than the dam to provide supply for the local residents in terms of not agricultural but for council—</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> That's right. For only part of the purpose of the project, there were alternative options to be considered.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> You're saying the council went, 'We don't want any more of this. We're out of this.' You're saying, 'We want to keep having some more studies happening'—is that what you're saying.</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> From the correspondence that we received from the council, they indicated they wanted to consider a range of broader options. A number of those were solely focused on urban supply. The primary purpose of the fund is not urban supply. Projects that are solely looking at urban supply are actually outside of the remit of the fund.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> Is that confidential correspondence? Are you able to provide that?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> It's worth making the point that we're a little bit at distance around the management of these individual projects. Effectively, we fund the states—we give the money to the states and then they manage the projects, so we're not directly involved in the feasibility studies. I think there have been something like 39 feasibility studies funded under the fund. We're happy to take any of those questions on notice, but we don't always have the detail on each of them.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> And we would simply consult the council before making the correspondence available. That's all.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> I appreciate that. So, it was \$4 million originally, and the original study through the council, GHD—that was \$1 million, or a bit less or something?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> No, I think it was less than that, but I'd have to take it on notice.</p>	83 21/05/18	
75	223	RDLG	BARTLETT	<p>EMU SWAMP DAM FEASIBILITY STUDY – CORRESPONDENCE</p>	<p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> The Queensland government have contracted the local chamber of commerce to complete the study as submitted.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> So, it was a Queensland government decision? There was no involvement from the federal level at all in deciding to give that money to—</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> The Australian government advised that it was happy with Queensland's choice to contract the chamber of commerce to complete the study</p>	83-84 21/05/18	

				<p>as approved.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> So, it was a Queensland government choice; it was nothing to do with the federal government.</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> At the end of the day yes, it's the Queensland government that has to issue that contract.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> I appreciate that it's the Queensland government, but did the federal government—I recall and have been shown nice big pictures in the local paper with the then minister, Barnaby Joyce, and others there celebrating, saying, 'Hoorah! Extra money to this local chamber of commerce'—who, to be frank, have been major proponents of building this dam and have just been handed \$3 million. They're a quite-small organisation to be given \$3 million to run a feasibility study to build a dam that they've always supported. You're saying that was totally done by the Queensland government, and the federal government had no role in it and the then minister had no role in it. That's what you're telling us?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> Yes. So, the Queensland government wrote to the minister seeking our support for their choice.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> So, it was their choice to go with the chamber of commerce?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> That's what the communication was, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> Right. So, the federal government was saying, 'We have no role in this.' The minister just happened to be in town and just happened to say, 'How wonderful it is that the Queensland government has given this to the local chamber of commerce, which has always supported this dam'?</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> I think there was much publicity and there was much media at that time around how the feasibility study might be completed.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The Commonwealth still has to agree to it. It doesn't just take the Queensland government's recommendation in this case and say, 'Do whatever you like.' There is an active step on the Commonwealth side to agree that, as far as I understand, with the Queensland proposal—</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> My colleague has advised: we sign and agree schedules with each of the states which would identify the particular projects that the Commonwealth has funded. In this instance, my understanding is that the actual proponent that was doing the study wasn't identified in the schedule.</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> No proponents were identified in the schedule.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> That would mean, technically speaking, that the Commonwealth would not have to agree with a change in the proponent. But I expect that the</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>Queensland government would have written to the Commonwealth and advised, and we would have had an opportunity to identify if we were not comfortable with that. But we will take that on notice for you to confirm that that's how national partnership agreements would tend to work.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> Are you able to provide, obviously subject to checking with the Queensland government, of all the relevant people, correspondence backwards and forwards—</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> We'll take it on notice to seek advice from those people, those correspondents.</p>		
76	224	RDLG	BARTLETT	EMU SWAMP DAM FEASIBILITY STUDY – MINISTERIAL CORRESPONDENCE	<p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> Coming back to the GHD report, the GHD report identified a number of recommendations, and I'm happy to provide those on notice and list them out. A number of those recommendations were alternative water provision options, primarily around achieving an urban supply, which isn't consistent with the criteria for the guidelines and the purpose of the fund. The GHD report identified that to secure the long-term water security for the region a major dam would need building and Emu Swamp was one of the dams identified.</p> <p><b>Senator BARTLETT:</b> If you can provide all the correspondence from the then minister, Mr Joyce, backwards and forwards about that, prior to that announcement, about how that decision was made, that would be very much appreciated.</p> <p><b>Mr Edwards:</b> I will take that on notice.</p>	84 21/05/18	
77	225	RDLG	GEORGIU	BBRF APPLICATIONS	<p><b>Senator GEORGIU:</b> Then we'll move along to my next question. The federal government is continuing the Building Better Regions Fund to the tune of \$200 million. Can you please tell me which regions or country towns are able to apply for this funding?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> The program guidelines for the Building Better Regions Fund are on our website. The announced money that you've just spoken about, the \$200 million, will be for a further round of the BBRF. We're currently assessing the applications for the existing round. A whole range of people have applied for that. We expect that the new round of the new money will be open for applications later this year. And there will be program guidelines that talk about all of the details for who is eligible. It's not a government region-by-region pick, it's a competitive, merit based project for all of Australia for eligible applicants.</p>	86 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> It might be worth advising the senator about geography and who was able to apply under past rounds so that the senator has an understanding of where the government will be headed and about who could apply under the new round. We'll just get that for you, Senator.</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> Under round 1, the ABS's <i>Significant Urban Areas</i> of the major cities in Australia was used to determine geographic eligibility. This provided a consistent and objective means of identifying the boundaries for the major capital cities. And, as with all grant programs, BBRF was reviewed after round 1. The eligible geographic boundaries were expanded and projects located outside the eligible geographic boundaries became eligible for funding where the project was in a benefit-eligible region.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> In lay person's terms: anyone outside of the capital cities could apply. But it was, as my colleague was indicating, that if someone could show that a project which perhaps didn't quite meet that criteria had a significant positive effect for a region, they could put it in. I will just check with my colleague, but—</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> But, in broad terms, anyone outside of capital cities could apply.</p> <p><b>Senator GEORGIU:</b> Okay, that answered my second question. Do you know which regional towns or cities in Western Australia have previously applied for the funding and received it, and which have applied and been knocked back?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p>		
78	226	RDLG	WATT	DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST	<p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Let me clarify—the members of the local planning committee were asked to declare conflicts and did.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> At what point?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> At the time that they were appointed.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Yes, at the appointment point. In terms of an applicant for a grant under the program, they were not required to submit any conflict of interest at that point because, of course, any applicant applying for money has a direct interest in the outcome of that application round.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Was there any stage that grant recipients or applicants needed to disclose any conflicts of interest involving the assessment process or those who were making decisions about grants?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I'm not sure that there is a conflict of interest there. They're going to benefit from the grant and they're not the decision maker, so they're not conflicted</p>	88 21/05/18	

					<p>in that regard; they're putting in an application.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> If there were a potential conflict involving those who were making decisions about the awarding of grants—</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> They would be the people that would declare that conflict.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> They are bureaucrats in a government agency somewhere here in Canberra.</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> I think what you were just talking about was that the members of the local committees who are not bureaucrats needed to disclose any conflicts as well.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> That's right.</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> They did.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> What sorts of conflicts were they required to disclose? What kinds of conflicts would they have that needed to be disclosed?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> It was a standard declaration of conflicts of interest. I'd have to take the details of that on notice. I don't have them in front of me.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Could you take on notice to provide a copy of the form that they needed to fill out. I suppose I'm just trying to get at whether they were required to disclose a potential conflict of interest in relation to any applicants for grants.</p>		
79	227	RDLG	WATT	<p>TROPICAL NORTH QUEENSLAND LOCAL COMMITTEE</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> You've taken on notice both my question and Senator McCarthy's questions about the process for the selection of chairs and members of the different committees. Turning to the Tropical North Queensland local committee, which was effectively based around the electorate of Leichhardt, did the department suggest the names of the members and chair of that particular local committee?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> Sorry, could you repeat the question?</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> I'll give you the heads-up when you need to refer to something, if that makes it easier for you.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> I think as we've indicated, we both were not involved in the program at the time. I think I indicated earlier that it would be commonplace for the department to recommend in the first instance people that could be on a committee. But in that instance the minister made the appointment. I haven't got anything further I can add at the moment. I can take it on notice.</p>	94-95 21/05/18		

					<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> But, in short, you don't know yourself whether the department suggested the names of either the chair or the members of this particular committee.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> You'll take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Do you know whether the local member—the member for Leichhardt—made any suggestions or was consulted about the membership of this committee?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> That would be a matter for the minister at the time. I'm not aware. We'll take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> You don't know and you'll take that on notice. The first document I've given to you there is a press release from the member for Leichhardt, Mr Entsch, dated 19 January 2017. This was prior to the appointment of the chair and members. You'll notice that down the bottom of the first page he says, 'I've been working with the Minister for Regional Development, Senator Fiona Nash, over the past couple of months and have recommended a number of local people who could contribute a wealth of local knowledge to the panel.' I suppose that makes me think that the local member has been involved in at least suggesting members, if not appointing them. But you'll take that on notice as to whether that occurred.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We'll take on notice exactly our role in that process.</p>		
80	228	RDLG	WATT	CHAIR APPOINTMENT	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Do you know whether the department suggested that Mr Trent Twomey be appointed as a member or the chair of the Tropical North Queensland committee?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> No. We will take that on notice</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Do you know whether Mr Entsch, the member for Leichhardt, suggested that Mr Trent Twomey be appointed as a member or chair?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> You don't know?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> I don't know.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We'll work that out.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Take that on notice. Because you'll see that the next document, which is a press release from Minister Nash, who was the minister at the time,</p>	95-96 21/05/18	

					<p>dated 30 January 2017, notes that Mr Trent Twomey has been appointed as the chair of the committee. Then it goes on to mention the names of the other members. Was the department aware at the time Mr Twomey was appointed as the chair of this committee that he had been the campaign manager for the member for Leichhardt, Mr Entsch?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I would have to take that on notice. Obviously when I came into this job I saw the media that was available at the time. That was the first time I became aware of it.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> You will see there that I have an article dated 22 March from the <i>Cairns Post</i>. You're saying that was the first time you became aware that Mr Twomey, who was the chair of the local committee, had been Mr Entsch's campaign manager.</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Neither Ms Wieland nor I were actually in these roles at the time. We have seen the articles as they appeared in the press.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> But I do think it is appropriate for us to take on notice to ask whether the department was aware, and to examine our own correspondence.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> It would be helpful. I don't know whether there is anyone back at the office watching in who would know—who had some personal involvement—but it would be helpful if we could get some answers on some of those things even this evening, if that's possible.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We will try, but it will involve us digging through correspondence.</p>		
81	229	RDLG	WATT	MR TWOMEY'S INTREST IN PHARMACIES	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> ... Is the department aware that Mr Twomey, in addition to being the chair of the local committee, has extensive business interests in pharmacies in North Queensland? I've got a copy of Mr Twomey's bio, which says that he and his wife are both pharmacists and, together, they are partners in a group of seven pharmacies. Was the department aware of that before now?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> Again, we'll have to take that on notice.</p>	96 21/05/18	
82	230	RDLG	WATT	QRX GROUP 1 PTY LTD GRANT	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> In relation to this particular grant, you've said that there was an article in the <i>Cairns Post</i> on 22 March which raised all these concerns about a particular grant that had been approved. That was a grant announced on 22 February. It was a grant of \$2.4 million to a company called QRX Group 1 Pty Ltd, essentially to establish a pharmaceutical distribution centre in Cairns. Are you aware of that grant?</p>	96 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> Yes. I'm also aware of that newspaper article. That's how I became aware of this issue.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Did your department recommend that grant be made?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I'm not sure. I'll have to look into that.</p>		
83	231	RDLG	WATT	REPRESENTATION FROM MR ENTSCHE	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Can you take on notice from your department's point of view, though, whether you received any representations from the Mr Entsch on behalf of QRX.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I'm very happy to do that.</p>	97 21/05/18	
84	232	RDLG	WATT	QRX GRANT	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Are you aware that QRX, which received a \$2.4 million grant, is one-third owned by the wife of Mr Twomey, who chaired the committee in the area in which this grant was made?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I was not aware of that until the allegations were made.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> In the media?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Are you aware that one of the other owners of QRX, which received the grant, is Mr Twomey's business partner, Mr Leo Maltam?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I wasn't aware of that.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Right now is the first time you've become aware of that? Okay. Again, you'll see there are company searches there that demonstrate that. I see that Mr Maltam and Mr Twomey are shareholders and partners in a number of companies, including FNQ INV, which presumably means Investments Pty Ltd, and Twaltam Pty Ltd, which seems to be a combination of their two surnames. But you weren't aware that Mr Twomey's business partner was also an owner of this company that got a grant?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> No. As I said earlier, the assessment of the grants in a merit-based process was undertaken by the grants hub.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Are you aware that Mr Entsch's own son works for QRX, the company that received this \$2½ million grant?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> No, I'm not aware of that.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> That's in that article dated 22 March as well. So, putting all this together, if these allegations are correct—that a \$2½ million grant has been made to a company which is part-owned by the wife and business partner of the local</p>	97-98 21/05/18	

					<p>committee involved in these grants—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> I'm sorry, Senator. We're going to have to be careful with the language. This committee was not involved in the grants. The witnesses have been at great pains to explain that.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Okay. I'll put it another way.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> I don't think you should refer to them as allegations, because they are facts. They are undisputed facts.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> I'm happy for you to put it that way. The facts seem to be that a \$2½ million grant has been made to a company which is part-owned by the wife and business partner of Mr Entsch's former campaign manager who chaired the committee in the area in which this grant occurred. Further, the recipient of the grant employs Mr Entsch's own son. Does any of that suggest to you that the department's policies for conflicts of interest have been breached?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> That's a complex set of questions. I'd have to take them on notice. But, to go back to the earlier point, our focus is on interference with the merit-based process or conflicts that would arise in the merit-based process or inappropriate influence over officials. I'm not aware of any of that occurring in this case. But, in light of your questions, and in light of your questioning of our processes, I'm more than happy to look at our processes in more detail.</p>		
85	233	RDLG	O'SULLIVAN	QRX GRANT 2	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> No, we're going to get to that. I'm sorry, Dr Kennedy, but we need to unpack this. It's been built with elements. I need to unpack them, one element at a time. So, the burden of my question is: based on everything you've heard and asserted here this evening on this subject matter, is there anything that disturbs you or would have enlivened your department to do something different in relation to the appointment of this individual to the local area committee?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Not in my view. If you have a look at Professor Twomey's qualifications, he was, as you said, chairman of Advance Cairns, obviously very prominent in the local region, with a good understanding of the local economics. So, on its face, he would seem to be a reasonably good choice for chairing a local planning committee of that nature.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Sure. So, if you were looking on the papers—the recommendations that were made with respect to the categories by this Advance committee—do those categories look reasonably generic? Would you find duplication in that, with these committees in other places? Would they have recommended defence and health</p>	99	21/05/18

					<p>and sport, or something?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> They are a wide-ranging set of categories that appear regularly in all of the panels.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Sure. So far, nothing would have triggered, even with all of the knowledge that you've been provided with tonight. Nothing so far has triggered.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> That's right.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Mr Twomey and six or seven others—we have to put them all in the one boat here—have signed off on this area plan and it goes in the mail. We've heard no assertion, but do you believe that it would be—I'll get you to take it on notice. Is there any prospect that Mr Twomey would have had any dealings with the grants committee? Was there any mechanism there, pathways, obligations or opportunities?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> Not to our knowledge.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> None that we're aware of.</p>		
86	234	RDLG	O'SULLIVAN	ADVICE ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> Let me bundle all this together. We've done a lot of talking. We've provided a lot of documents. You be as adventurous as you like in your answer on this. Can you think of one thing, one sheet, one paragraph, one line, one assertion, one allegation, one exchange here, that would cause you to say Mr Twomey had a conflict of interest and he should have declared it? If so, what is that perceived conflict of interest? The vibe I pick up is it can only be that somewhere he, with seven other people around the table who know exactly what his business interests are in the community, had collectively agreed to put health in with Defence and tourism and half a dozen other things. You can be as adventurous as you like. Would you say to Mr Twomey, 'I think you probably have a little conflict here and you should have dealt with it'? Anything—the whole expansion of what we've heard here tonight. Let's go one at a time.</p> <p>I'll start with you, Ms Wieland. Can you think of anything that you would tell Mr Twomey to do differently because he may have had a little conflict?</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Or the applicant, for funding.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> We can go there next, if you want. We can work through every resident of Cairns until we get there. This focus has been on—</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> I'll just stick with Mr Twomey and his wife.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> With respect, I didn't interrupt you. Ms Wieland, do you have any advice</p>	99-100 21/05/18	

					<p>for Mr Twomey?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> You're getting to the heart of what it is that you ask people to declare in a conflict-of-interest form. Essentially, if you wanted to be totally transparent, you would want them to list any relationships with any government members.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Well, okay; all right. Well, he—</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> That's what we're talking about.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> If he tried to conceal that, given that he was Warren Entsch's campaign director, he hasn't done a good job. But on the circumstance that you have—</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Perhaps if—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> No, sorry, Dr Kennedy—and I don't mean to interrupt you—I'm going for a trifecta here, if I can. I'm asking Ms Wieland whether she has any advice for Professor Twomey—her conflicts.</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> I can't give advice—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> On the evidence you've got in front of you—nothing; all right. Ms Taylor, do you have any advice for Professor Twomey?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> On the basis that the job of the committee was to identify broad areas of priority for the Far North Queensland region—and that's quite a significant region—if it were the case perhaps that the committee was required to identify particular projects then clearly he should have declared a conflict of interest in relation to his business interests. But because basically the job they were asked to do is identify broad sectoral priorities, I think it's reasonable that Mr Twomey didn't actually identify his particular business interests in that process.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Wow.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Good. And he's not on his own either, of course. He and six others are at the table. Do you have any advice for him, Ms Taylor, about what he may have done differently in form of a conflict? It's a genuine question. This is an important issue. We've got a man's reputation here, again, on full display, national display—a live broadcast. I want to be sure that we're all on the same page.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We have to take it on notice, because we don't have the precise details of what was in the—is that correct?</p>		
87	235	RDLG	WATT	AUDIT OF RJIP	<p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Why is it then, according to <i>The Cairns Post</i> of 4 May, that Australia's Auditor-General has detailed plans to order an independent investigation into the entire Regional Jobs and Investment Packages program rolled</p>	102 21/05/18	

					<p>out across 10 pilot regions from Far North Queensland to Tasmania?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> It's entirely appropriate for the ANAO to work through and audit all of our programs, which it does.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> According to this article, the Auditor-General has told how his decision to audit the entire program follows concerns about a potential conflict of interest and shortfalls in a project awarded \$2.4 million—this project. It doesn't seem to be a general audit.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We can't comment on a <i>Cairns Post</i> article. What we can say is that, should the Auditor-General and the ANAO choose to audit the program, I regard that as entirely appropriate and reasonable. As it should, it works through all of the programs in the department. If it has chosen to audit that program—I don't know the basis upon which it has chosen to do that—that's entirely appropriate.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> Has the Auditor-General had any communication with you about this audit?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> All we know is that this program is on the work program for the next financial year. We've known that for some time. I can't comment on what factors were taken into account by the Auditor-General, other than I do know that it's quite common for the ANAO to audit our programs.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> But, aside from this ordinary process of reviews by the Auditor-General, they haven't made any contact with you about an audit of this program?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> In terms of the audit of the broader program, not in relation to this particular grant, no. The department has been made aware of the broader communication about auditing the RJIP program. It's also on the ANAO's website.</p> <p><b>Senator WATT:</b> How long ago did that happen—that you were told?</p> <p><b>Ms Wieland:</b> As part of their consultation on their work program for the upcoming year.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I think the senator is seeking the timing on when that consultation—</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> We can take that on notice. I know we were consulted some time ago on a draft work program from the ANAO, but I can't recall the exact date.</p>		
88	296	RDLG	RICE	INDEXATION FREEZE	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay. You noted in your answer to my question on notice that the federal financial assistance grants to local government are what you see as a funding stream for active transport. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Ms Geiger:</b> They are able to use that, should they choose to, towards active</p>	146	21/05/18

					<p>transport infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Firstly, those grants have effectively been reduced, haven't they, because we've had an indexation freeze on them? Is that the case?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We'll take this on notice and double-check, but my understanding is that the indexation freeze was lifted, I think, a year or two ago. We'll double-check for you, but my understanding is that, yes, it was lifted.</p>		
89	295	RDLG	MCCARTHY	<p>MYALUP-WELLINGTON WATER PROJECT</p>	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Let's have a look at the Myalup-Wellington water project. I refer to a media release issued by Infrastructure Australia on 30 November 2017. After concluding its evaluation of the water project business case, it stated: "While we are confident that the project would have net benefits, they would mostly be private benefits accruing to Collie Water and the agricultural producers," Mr Davies said.</p> <p>"Funding this project through a government grant would therefore be inconsistent with the National Water Initiative and the National Water Initiative Pricing Principles."</p> <p>Why did the government reject this advice from IA and provide \$140 million in government funding to this project—grant funding—plus a \$50 million concessional loan to this project?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> That's a water project. Our regional colleagues from the department, who were here yesterday, cover regional policy and water policy as well. We don't have the officers here who are able to answer the question in detail. We are very happy to take it on notice and come back to you, but we don't have the officers here today.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Are you able to answer it?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Sorry. It's not an area I've been involved in.</p>	32 22/05/18	
90	321	RDLG	STERLE	<p>DAMS THAT HAVE BEEN FUNDED SINCE 2010</p>	<p>Can the department provide a breakdown of dams that have been funded by the Federal government since 2010? Can the information include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding provided and program that funding was provided from</li> <li>• Year the proposal started (e.g. feasibility study)</li> <li>• Year the business case was initiated and completed</li> <li>• Year that construction started</li> <li>• Year that construction was completed</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 6/06/18	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(if relevant) expected completion date</li> </ul>		
91	322	RDLG	STERLE	NATIONAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT FUND	Can the department please provide the budget including expenditure and planned expenditure from the National Water Infrastructure Development Fund? For all years the fund has been budgeted (past and future).	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
92	323	RDLG	STERLE	LOANS PROVIDED THROUGH THE NATIONAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE LOAN FACILITY	Can the Department provide detailed information on all loans provided through the National Water Infrastructure Loan Facility?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
93	324	RDLG	STERLE	DECENTRALISATION POLICY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the timeframe to take business cases to Cabinet for consideration as part of the Decentralisation policy?</li> <li>What were the costs identified by the Department for each of the agencies to decentralise jobs, as announced by Minister McVeigh in the Budget and referred to by Ms Taylor at Senate Estimates on 21 May 2018: <b>Ms Taylor:</b> It was 10 positions from the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations moving from Canberra to Darwin; seven positions from the Indigenous Affairs Group Regional Network Melbourne CBD office moving to Shepparton; 25 positions moving from the Indigenous Affairs Group Regional Network Sydney CBD office moving to Parramatta; 40 positions from the Unique Student Identifier Registrar moving from Canberra to Adelaide; four positions from the Office of the National Rural Health Commissioner to be located in Adelaide; three positions from the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities Indian Ocean Territories function moving from Canberra to Perth; and nine positions from the Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities Inland Rail Unit moving to Toowoomba, Dubbo and Wodonga.</li> <li>What is the timeframe for each of these jobs to be operational from the regional location identified?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 7/06/18	
94	326	RDLG	STERLE	REGIONAL MINISTERIAL TASKFORCE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apart from the first meeting on 15 March 2017, what are the other dates and places that the Regional Ministerial Taskforce has met?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 7/06/18	

					2. What is the date of the next meeting?		
95	327	RDLG	STERLE	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GRANTS PROGRAM	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the funding provided for the Community Development Grants Program in 2018-19 and the forward estimates?</li> <li>2. Ms Wieland told Senate Estimates on 21/5/18 that the Community Development Grants Program has a line item in the Budget papers over the forward estimates. Please provide a page reference detail to identify that line item in the Budget papers and the amount of funding for the 2018-19 year and forward estimates.</li> <li>3. How much funding has been provided to the electorate of New England from the Community Development Grants Program? Please provide a breakdown for each year of the past five years and details of all projects funded.</li> <li>4. What are the selection criteria for the Community Development Grants Program?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 7/06/18	
96	328	RDLG	STERLE	REGIONAL JOBS AND INVESTMENT PACKAGES	Were all relevant MPs with electorates covered by the regions in the RJIP program invited to the announcement of the outcomes of the program? How were they contacted? Please provide a list of all MPs and Senators invited to the announcement of each package and the date the invitation was issued.	WRITTEN 7/06/18	
97	378	RDLG	MCKIM	SOUTH COAST TRACKS HUTS	<p>Noting Maria Island Walks has been granted almost half its \$6 million project funding to develop huts on Tasmania's South Coast Track Huts Walk under the Regional Jobs and Investment package (Dept. of Industry, Innovation and Science):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can you confirm if this money has been paid?</li> <li>2. Can you advise whether this money is for project development assessments and approvals? If yes, given that the project likely breaches the EPBC Act, will the proponent reimburse the funding to the taxpayer if the project does not proceed?</li> <li>3. Can you confirm if this money is only available for construction once approved under Tasmanian and Federal legislation?</li> <li>4. If the funding is for none of these things, can you detail what the funding will be used for?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	

Infrastructure Australia (4)								
98	250	IA	SINGH	BRIDGEWATER BRIDGE – TASMANIA	<p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Thank you, Acting Chair. I would like to ask some questions in relation to the Bridgewater Bridge in Tasmania. No surprise. I do understand that the business case for the Bridgewater Bridge was provided to Infrastructure Australia in January. Can that be confirmed? And when it was provided, did it come with detailed costings, as a business case usually does?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Infrastructure Australia was on earlier, so that question may need to go on notice. But the department certainly has a copy of the draft business case.</p>	117 21/05/18		
99	253	IA	MCCARTHY	GAWLER LINE ELECTRIFICATION	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I want to go to South Australia and the Gawler line electrification. Has the business case with detailed costings been finalised?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> The business case is currently under assessment by Infrastructure Australia.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Currently under assessment?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When will that process be completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll need to double-check that with Infrastructure Australia.</p>	135 21/05/18		
100	320	IA	GALLACHER	ROAD SAFETY DECISIONS	When infrastructure Australia makes decisions into road funding, how much consideration is taken into road safety?	WRITTEN 6/06/18		
101	329	IA	CHISHOLM	BRISBANE METRO BUSINESS CASE STUDY	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Options Analysis of the Brisbane Metro Business Case Study, 23 options were originally shortlisted, this was then refined to 6 and finally to 4 viable options however only 3 options are detailed: (1) Subway Metro (Paris Style), (2) Buses and (3) BaT option – What was the 4<sup>th</sup> option?</li> <li>If the 4<sup>th</sup> option was light rail why was it not considered given Brisbane's busway network is designed to be converted to a light rail system?</li> <li>Can the Options Analysis submitted to Infrastructure Australia be tabled?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 8/06/18		
Infrastructure Investment (48)								
102	182	II	RICE	NATIONAL CYCLING STRATEGY	<b>Senator RICE:</b> As I indicated, I would like to ask about walking and cycling, and I have some follow-up on my questions that I put on notice at our last estimates.	51-52 21/05/18		

					<p>Firstly, with the completion of the National Cycling Strategy, my question on notice was: 'What were the main reasons as to why the National Cycling Strategy failed to reach its objective of doubling cycling participation over the life of the strategy?' The answer, rather unhelpfully, was, 'There is no single reason the strategy fell short of achieving its aspirational target.' What were the multiple reasons then?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I might have to turn to one of my colleagues. I don't think we were trying to be cute in our response to your question on notice. I don't think it is as easy as identifying even a multitude of issues that contributed to the failure to deliver.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> The department has done a review of the strategy?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Sorry, Senator, I don't know if we've done a review.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> You don't even know whether you've done a review of the strategy?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I'll have to take that on notice, I'm sorry, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> If you could take that on notice, if we can receive them in another four months, as to the multiple reasons why this strategy failed to reach its targets.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Yes.</p>		
103	183	II	RICE	<p>CYCLING AND WALKING AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I asked about the establishment of the new cycling and walking body—Cycling and Walking Australia and New Zealand—and what the timing of establishing that body was. Do you know whether that body has been established?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I'm sorry, I really don't know. We'll try to get some answers to you this afternoon. We'll go back to the department and see if we can find someone who can—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So there's no-one here, even though this is Surface Transport, and walking and cycling fits within Surface Transport?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> That's right.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Do you have staff with some expertise in walking and cycling?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We do. They're not present at estimates. We hadn't anticipated that line of questioning. We'll certainly get them up and make them available to answer some of your questions.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Or at least provide something in writing. We are sorry, Senator.</p>	52 21/05/18		

104	300	II	ANNING	<p>INVESTMENT IN REGIONAL ROADS IN QUEENSLAND AND NORTHERN AUSTRALIA</p>	<p><b>Senator ANNING:</b> On regional development: again at the Western Queensland local government conference, I spoke to a lot of mayors there about their problems. One of their major ones is connectivity, their roads in particular. For decades, the Dawson Development Road between Tambo and Springsure has needed to be sealed. This road services a huge crop of cattle there. There are herds of around 225,000 cattle. More than that, there are up to a quarter of a million cattle every three months coming up and down that road. That road for a lot of the year is impassable with bulldust and mud and stuff like that. There's 203 kilometres that needs sealing. There are several creek crossings and all sorts of other problems that they have. It appears to me that these roads are a direct link between two substantial towns, therefore the road should be sealed and maintained by the Commonwealth government. Is that your understanding of it?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Road funding is going to be covered in the infrastructure investment division. There is a new program announced at budget called Roads of Strategic Importance. That is \$3½ billion that the government has announced including, from memory, \$1½ billion for northern Australia. I will have to confirm that when my colleagues come in. The intent of that program is to look at key freight corridors and corridors that have significant safety concerns. We would have a process, which my colleagues should be able to identify, where we would go to the states and say, 'What are your key road corridors that you need to invest in?' Rather than having seven projects for bridges or culverts, or whatever the case may be, what's the best way to invest that money that's put to that corridor in that corridor. That group of people—apologies for this—will appear at this stage, on the current schedule, after dinner. But, if you're not able to be here, we could certainly provide more information on that program, and if you are meeting with people who are interested in how that program will work and how they could be part of it then we could provide that information as well.</p> <p><b>Senator ANNING:</b> Thank you. I'd like to know the criteria for roads to be maintained and sealed by the Commonwealth government. As I understood it, it was between two major areas. I know that maybe Springsure and Tambo, in some people's view, may not be major centres, but definitely Emerald and the hub there, the inland port that they're building there and getting those cattle to market, does make them major areas in my view. I've been informed by local governments that they have been waiting for 20 years for these roads. Are you aware of the many requests, and how long have they been going on for?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I haven't got to hand how many requests and how long. The minister</p>	<p>85 21/05/18</p>	
-----	-----	----	--------	--	--	------------------------	--

					<p>will know of some recent investments the government made in northern Australia along roads of exactly this type.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> Indeed. I understand the nature of your questioning. As I've indicated, it'll be later. We'll make sure that we give your office a ring. It should be just after dinner. I think the infrastructure process is on then.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> We've got him on the list, so he'll be notified when we come back.</p> <p>Senator Scullion: If for some reason you're not able to attend, I'll ensure that that question is taken as a question on notice and an answer will be provided in that way.</p>		
105	257	II	STERLE	FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT FUNDING DECLINE	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Thank you. Would you agree that Budget Paper No. 3 pages 46 to 53 confirm that federal infrastructure grant funding will decline by 80 per cent? I haven't read that wrong? You have just said that anyway. You might want to check if it is 80 per cent—just check the calculation.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> I would have to take that on notice with regard to working out what the actual percentage is.</p>	107 21/05/18	
106	258	II	STERLE	NORTHERN TERRITORY NEW MONEY	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. My calculator says that's a decline of 75 per cent. Let's go to the Northern Territory. It's pretty repetitive, but let's go through it—the spend for 2018-19?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> For 2018-19, it is \$221.5 million.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. And the 2021-22 spend?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> \$60.6 million.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's an 80 per cent decline over the years. I want to talk about the claim of new funding if I may, please. There is, I'm led to believe, 'new funding of \$24.5 billion for projects and initiatives which will improve Australians' lives across every state and territory'. That was in a press release from Minister McCormack on budget night. Is it correct, Ms Hall, that the \$24½ billion referred to in the minister's media statement is not new money but in fact money that was already in the budget, albeit beyond the forwards?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> No, it is new money, in that the government announced last year in its budget that it would move towards a 10-year rolling infrastructure program. So, while it's an allocation that was decided last year, it is actually new money.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So it's new money. The answer to question 26 from last May's budget estimates—which I don't know if you've got there—says, 'Hearings confirm</p>	107 21/05/18	

				<p>that, going into this year's budget, there was about \$24 billion in funding allocated to specific projects and programs in the period between 2017-18 and 2026-27.' Isn't that \$24 billion the same \$24 billion that Minister McCormack is referring to?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> I'd have to go back and check in regards to that, so I will take that on notice. But the allocation was made last year, and the projects have been announced this year.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Right—hence my impression that it's not new money. This was the money announced last year. But you said you would take that on notice. You're going to come back and tell me, 'No, it's an additional \$24 billion,' so there should be a \$48 billion spend. Is that right?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> I'd have to have a look and see how it was written up last year.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sure. I'm enjoying this, where we go straight into it and get moving. That's great. Can you tell us how much of the \$24½ billion referred to in the minister's media statement has been allocated in the year 2018-19?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Yes. In the year 2018-19, it's \$249.5 million.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I'm being a bit cheeky here, but do you know what percentage of the \$24½ billion that would be?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Sorry, Senator. If you could just give us a moment, we are trying to confirm that figure.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sure.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Sorry, Senator; I just might change that. I think it's \$214.6 million in 2018-19.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you have a percentage of what that is of the \$24.5 billion?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> No, I'd have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's fine. So would you be able to tell us how much of the \$24.5 billion referred to in the minister's media statement has been allocated to the four years that make up the budget forward estimates? Do you have that?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Yes, I can get that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Great.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> It's \$3.701 billion.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You wouldn't have the percentage figure of that? No, okay. All right.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

107	259	II	STERLE	BRUCE HIGHWAY – COOROY TO CURRA	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No, because they're going to take it on notice and come back to me. I want to go to some specific projects now, as we work our way through. I want to go to Queensland, if I may. I want to ask questions around the upgrade of the Bruce Highway, Cooroy to Curra, section D. Has the business case with detailed costings been finalised?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> The business case is not yet finalised for that project.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell us when you expect it to be concluded.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I have been advised it will be finalised in June this year.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So it's started? It's off and running?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes, it's close to finalisation.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Oh, good. Has the detailed planning work been done?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes. The corridor has been defined and the detailed design is almost finalised as well.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's good. Are you able to tell us, in order to complete the project, whether any land resumptions be necessary?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes. A lot of the land resumptions have already been undertaken. The government committed \$52 million to planning and corridor preservation for that project previously.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How many of them are there?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> How many property acquisitions?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has Infrastructure Australia assessed and approved the project yet?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Not yet.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has the state government agreed to provide the balance of the required funding?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We haven't got formal agreement from the state government on their 20 per cent.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So you're putting in how much?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Equivalent to 80 per cent.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I meant a dollar figure!</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Sorry. It's \$800 million.</p>	108-109 21/05/18	
-----	-----	----	--------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------	--

					<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay, thank you. Has the state government submitted to you a project proposal report outlining the project's scope, cost estimates and delivery milestones?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Not yet.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Then can you tell us how the department determined the amount federal dollars that will be required to deliver the project and when that funding will be needed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> The department has been involved in and has seen drafts of the business case previously and had discussions with Queensland officials.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do we know when the construction will begin?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll have to confirm that on notice, but we've been advised that it could be as early by the end of this calendar year.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do we have a rough idea of when we think the project will be completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will take that on notice.</p>		
108	260	II	STERLE	BRUCE HIGHWAY – PINE RIVER TO CALOUNDRA ROAD	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Thanks. While we're on Queensland, can we talk about the upgrade of the Bruce Highway from Pine River to Caloundra Road. Has the business case with detailed costings been finalised there, Ms Garbin?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> There are a number of business cases for that corridor that are being developed. There's one part of the corridor where the business case has been finalised.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> When you say 'the corridor', do you mean Pine Rivers to Caloundra?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So there are a number of business cases in that area?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sorry, what were you saying?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> There is a business case that has been finalised for one part of it— Bribie Island to Steve Irwin Way.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is that a small part?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> It's a small part towards the northern end of the corridor between Pine River and Caloundra.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Towards the northern end?</p>	109-110 21/05/18	

				<p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell us when that was completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> The department was provided with a business case in the last two weeks or so.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay, good. Is it publicly available?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you know when it will be publicly available?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll have to take that on notice</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Good. No worries. Has the detailed planning work been done?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Planning work is ongoing on that corridor, in different sections—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sorry, how many corridors are in that Pine Rivers to Caloundra upgrade?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> There are a number of sections. The Queensland government is currently looking at planning for the whole corridor. They've broken it up into a number of sections where there is six-laneing, or whether it is flood mitigation or interchange improvements.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Off the top of your head do you know how many—what did you call them?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Business cases?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will have to take that on notice. I'm not quite sure.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No worries. In order to complete the project once again, will any land resumptions be necessary?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll have to take that on notice as well.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And just how many, once you do find out for us. And could you tell us whether Infrastructure Australia has assessed and approved the project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has it not been put to them, or they just haven't got to it yet?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> The first of the business cases—actually, we'll check to see whether that has been formally submitted to IA.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

109	261	II	STERLE	PINE RIVER TO CALOUNDRA CORRIDOR	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Right, but the \$800 million is the whole Bruce Highway. I'm only asking bits and pieces here, aren't I—broken up.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> The \$880 is for the Pine River to Caloundra corridor.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Great. Has the state government submitted to you a project proposal report—</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> for the project's scope, cost estimates and delivery milestones?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Not even for that little tiddly bit at the end?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We've got the business case for part of it. For the commitment that was made at budget last year, there was a \$530 million commitment made also for this corridor. That's the business case that has been provided to us, but we don't have any further business cases.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So how do we determine the amount, the federal dollars, that will be required to deliver the project and when the funding will be needed? How do we do that if they haven't agreed to anything yet?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We need to work through that with the Queensland government.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you know when construction will begin on that whole project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We will need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What about the little project—the little bit of the other bit?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll need to take that on notice as well.</p>	110 21/05/18	
110	262	II	STERLE	NORTH COAST LINE – BEERBURRUM TO LANDSBOROUGH	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's fine. While I'm on a roll, Chair, perhaps I can keep going so I can plough through them before others need to ask. I want to go to the North Coast Line—Beerburrum to Landsborough. Once again—here we go again. Are you ready? I bet you don't know what I'm going to ask you! You know the spiel, Ms Garbin. Try this: has there been a business case with detailed costings finalised?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Struth, I wasn't expecting that answer! Now what do I do? Can you tell me when it was completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> It has been submitted to IA. I'll have to double-check when—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You're jumping the gun here. That's great. Tremendous.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll have to double-check when the business case was actually</p>	110-112 21/05/18	

				<p>completed. We'll have to come back to you on that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Have you got the costings?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> \$780 million.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> \$780 million? Cool.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's the cost of the project.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> So, what about the land resumptions, once again? Are any of them necessary?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll have to take that on notice as well.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You don't know?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I don't have that information in front of me.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. And if you do, let's see how much they cost and when they commenced.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How does Western Australia get a heap of this money and not do anything for it? Can you tell me the secret? Anyway, I was just thinking out loud there. Can you tell me when the construction will begin?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Again, I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> While you're at it, perhaps you could also take on notice when you think it may be completed. Let's go to the Cunningham Highway—Yamanto to Ebenezer/Amberley. Has the detailed planning work been done?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I understand that some planning work has been done by the Queensland government for this project. There has been some planning work done.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Some? Were they breaking it up into other sections again?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> An initial proposal has been put to IA, and it's actually on the IA initiative list.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> What actually have they done?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> They've developed a business case, which has been submitted to IA—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> For the whole stretch?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> For that particular project.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Are there any land resumptions on that stretch?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll have to take that on notice.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> All right—and, if there are, how many and have they commenced, please...</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can you tell me when construction will begin?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> And completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> On notice again.</p>		
111	263	II	STERLE	M1 PACIFIC MOTORWAY – VARSITY LAKES TO TUGUN	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Let's go to the M1 Pacific Motorway—Varsity Lakes to Tugun. Has there been a business case with detailed costings finalised?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Not a detailed business case.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you know when it's going to start?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We expect that it will start at the end of the current project in 2020.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> At the end of 2020—so, do you know when it will be completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll have to take that on notice. We would expect that construction time frames would be about two years.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has the detailed planning work been done?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> There has been some planning work done. The Queensland government has done some preliminary planning for this project.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How long is this stretch of road here?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> In terms of kilometres? Or—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Inches—I don't know—</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Yes, kilometres is good. You'll take it on notice; okay. So, any land resumptions necessary for this stretch of road—the upgrade?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Again, we'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay. And, again, perhaps you could tell me how many and when they commenced.</p>	112 21/05/18	
112	302	II	STERLE	LAND RESUMPTIONS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Great. Can you take all the same questions on notice about land resumption and when it will start and end. Or can you tell me when it will start and end?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> The same time—in 2020.</p>	113 21/05/18	

113	264	II	STERLE	PACIFIC MOTORWAY UPGRADE – EIGHT MILE PLAINS TO DAISY HILL	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has the detailed planning work started?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Quite a lot of planning work's been done. The route was identified back in 2004. Quite a lot of property acquisition has already—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> 2004?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Yes. Quite a lot of property acquisition has already been done by the New South Wales government.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do you have any figures there, Ms Leeming?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I'm afraid I don't.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's all right; take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> The property acquisition that's been done in the past isn't part of that number, which is around about \$1.2 billion.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Could you take on notice how many, please?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> How much property was acquisitioned?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Would that information be available to you?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I'd need to ask the New South Wales government. I think it would stretch back a decade.</p>	113-114 21/05/18	
114	303	II	STERLE	LAND RESUMPTIONS 2	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Thank you. What about land resumptions?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I'm sorry, I don't have the detail of that. It's a bridge, so I expect not a lot.</p>	115 21/05/18	
115	265	II	STERLE	NORTH EAST LINK	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Once again, land resumptions—are you able to tell us in any detail there how many have been done?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> It's a major motorway; they would be substantial. But I don't have a lot of detail on that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You want to take it on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Sure.</p>	115 21/05/18	
116	266	II	SINGH	BRIDGEWATER BRIDGE BUSINESS CASE	<p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> The draft was completed in January. I understand it was submitted then. Did the department receive it in January as well or was that just IA?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I don't have the date at which we received it, I'm sorry. I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Okay. The press release of the minister in Tasmania was dated 13 January, of when it was submitted to IA.</p>	117-118 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> It would be around that time. I don't have it in my notes, the exact the date, but we can certainly get that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Okay.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> We'll get into that a bit more afterwards. What about planning work? Has there been detailed planning work done as part of that?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I wouldn't call the planning work detailed. The project is one that the Tasmanian government has been aware of, that there's been a need for this project for a long time. It's a substantial funding commitment, as you'd be aware. Until the Tasmanian government has had certainty that the Australian government will contribute a percentage of the funds, which we are, they haven't advanced a detailed planning. They've done some preliminary planning, I think, some geotech investigations. I'd have to get you the detail of that, exactly what's been done.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> That's fine. Is there any kind of time frame, though, around when that necessary detailed planning work will be completed or provided?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I'm afraid I don't have all of that detail with me. I would need to get that and confirm it with the state government as well.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> That can be taken on notice. Will any land resumptions be necessary as part of the completion of the project?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Again, because it's a bridge—the footprint of a bridge, which will be a new bridge—there will be some land acquisition there, but I don't think it will be a substantial land acquisition.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Has that land acquisition commenced?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Again, I would need to check with the Tasmanian government.</p>		
117	267	II	SINGH	BRIDGEWATER BRIDGE PROJECT COMPLETION	<p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Thank you for that. I understand that the various stages that you've described need to be completed, and you're waiting for the state government to come forward with a lot of that. Understanding that they only finally got their act together to provide a draft business case in January this year, when is the projected, scheduled project completion?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I would prefer to take that on notice and consult with the state government and get you an accurate answer—or a more accurate answer than I can give you.</p> <p><b>Senator SINGH:</b> Right. Is there an approximate year even? We won't go into</p>	119 21/05/18	

					<p>months, but is there an approximate year into the future so that the Tasmanian community can go, 'Okay, the federal government committed this much money. There's a draft business case, and this is for a new bridge in'—what year?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> We will endeavour to get you that.</p>		
118	242	II	RICE	RAIL PROJECT PAYMENTS TO STATES	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So there's going to be \$513 million spent by the end of the financial year?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> That money will be distributed to Western Australia in this financial year, that's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> How does the department decide whether the rail projects it allocates money to come from the notional \$10 billion for the National Rail Program or the rail investment component?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> The National Rail Program, in broad terms—if you remember, Senator, there was a series of criteria put out at the time of the announcement of the National Rail Program which highlighted the broad objectives the government would be looking to meet through the investment of the \$10 billion. The projects that have been selected under the National Rail Program have been assessed to meet those broad criteria. That's what's driven the selection. In the case of the Melbourne Airport rail link, there was a decision taken to not allocate the full \$5 billion from the National Rail Program itself because it was such a large component of the \$10 billion that it would have crowded out other investments across the rest of the country.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But given that it could otherwise be spent during the rail investment component of the National Partnerships payment, how do we know that it's actually \$10 billion of new money and not just shuffling money that would otherwise have been spent in the rail investment component?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> When last year the government moved to establish its rolling investment program and establish the allocation for future infrastructure investment, part of that future allocation was marking out specifically a minimum of a \$10 billion investment in rail. That was the intention: to ensure there was a dedicated fund within that overall infrastructure spend devoted towards significant urban rail projects, and that's what these projects are seeking to achieve.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Yes, but there's nothing in legislation and nothing to actually say that it's not money that would otherwise have been spent or allocated under the rail investment component of the National Partnerships payment.</p>	125 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> That's correct, Senator. But, as I said, it's a commitment to ensure there is \$10 billion spent on urban rail projects within the infrastructure bucket, as opposed to, for example, on roads.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay, so it's just collecting it altogether. Would you be able to take on notice—I presume you don't have the details here—the total grant payments to the states over the forward estimates that go into rail projects?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We'll just take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> And compared with the total that's going to road projects.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Certainly.</p>		
119	268	II	MCCARTHY	CENTRAL ARNHAM ROAD	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What about the Buntine Highway?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> It's similar for the Buntine Highway.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When do you think it will be completed in terms of that early planning?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We understand they will be completing that in 2018-19 for both roads.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> They'll be completing the planning?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Next financial year, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Will that be publicly available?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> If the planning is 2018-19, when do you expect the works to actually begin?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We anticipate that, once the planning is actually determined, we're hoping to commence works pretty much straightaway after those planning works have been done. We're very happy to come back to you, Senator, once we've got further information from the Northern Territory government.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Is that for both the Central Arnhem Road and the Buntine Highway?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Yes.</p>	129 21/05/18	
120	269	II	STERLE	TONKIN HIGHWAY GAP – COLLIER ROAD TO THE GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Okay, I'm going to go to WA. Who is that? I want to ask about the Tonkin Highway Gap upgrade, the highway from Collier Road to the Great Eastern Highway. Is there a business case?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No.</p>	130 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> No, okay. Can you tell us when this work will begin?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Why?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I don't have the construction time lines for that project.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Fifty-fifty, thank you. Now, there will be land resumptions. What can you tell us there?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will have to take that on notice, senator.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Can I just ask why? Is it because you haven't had any conversations? Or there's been a few, or—</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Not at that level of detail.</p>		
121	270	II	STERLE	MITCHELL FREEWAY EXTENSION – HESTER AVENUE TO ROMEO ROAD	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> The same. Are there any land resumptions, seeing that we have gotten that far down with the completion of some planning work. Have we mentioned anything about that?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I don't have the details. It's a widening project, so there will be minimal land resumptions, depending on how they choose to widen the road, whether it's into the median—in the middle.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> You'll take that on notice and if there is any change you will let us know?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes.</p>	133 21/05/18	
122	271	II	STERLE	GREAT EASTERN HIGHWAY BYPASS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has there been any detailed planning work done?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> As with all of these projects, early planning work has been undertaken.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I'm just trying to establish if it's a little bit, halfway, or deadset serious and off and racing. You don't know?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll take that on notice with regard to the actual detail of everything.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Sorry, I know you said you took it on notice. Is that because you do know, but not all of it, or because you don't have an idea yet?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We just don't have it in front of us.</p>	134 21/05/18	

123	272	II	STERLE	BINDOON BYPASS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> If my time is still there, I'll keep going. The Bindoon bypass—what's that project worth?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> \$275 million is the total project cost.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> That's a fifty-fifty split?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's an 80-20 split.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Is there a business case yet?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Not yet.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Do we know when this work will begin?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I don't have the construction time line, but I can give you the indicative funding profile.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> All right, let's go with that.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Funding starts in 2019-20, and the majority of the funding completes in 2022-23.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> When we say it completes in 2022-23—I've got no idea—is it normal or expected that that project would finish 12 months after the last set of funding? Is that how it normally works?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Normally the funding matches the delivery schedule.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> All right, so it's 2022-23. Any detailed planning on that project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> There has been some level of funding on this project. We have previously provided—I'll just double check that—some funding towards planning as part of another package, the Muchea to Wubin project on the Great Northern Highway.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> How much was that?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I will have to come back to you with funding for that.</p>	134-135 21/05/18	
124	273	II	MCCARTHY	BUNBURY OUTER RING ROAD	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay. If I can take you to Western Australia, to the Bunbury Outer Ring Road, stage 2 and 3. Has the business case with detailed costings been finalised for this project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When will this work begin and be completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We are currently working with the WA government to develop the business case.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Has the detailed planning work been done?</p>	136-137 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> No, Senator.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So when will that work be completed?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> They're currently in the process of doing the detailed design and the business case. I'll have to come back to you with dates on the completion of that work.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> In order to complete the project, will any land resumptions be necessary?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> It's likely that there'll be land resumptions, given it's the future stages of the bypass.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many and have they commenced?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I don't have that level of detail.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Will you provide it?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'm not sure whether that level of detail has actually been determined, but we'll check that with the WA government.</p>		
125	274	II	O'SULLIVAN	<p>COST DIFFERENTIAL FOR KILOMETRE-BY-KILOMETRE IN NT AND QLD</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Senator McCarthy may join me on this. I'm told by the Mayor of Bedourie that he can build a road with the Outback Way to the Northern Territory border. They've got capacity, they've got resources, they've got the gravel pits and they've got the expertise. When he gets to the border, it stops. And once you get over the border, they tell me that the cost per kilometre to build exactly the same spec of road can be up to eight times more expensive than what's been built in Queensland up to that point. We take one step out of Queensland and into the Northern Territory. I don't know whether it was Senator Sterle, but someone from Western Australia made the same observation that, once you get back into Western Australia, the cost per kilometre comes back dramatically.</p> <p>It's been explained to me before but I don't pretend to remember it—Senator McCarthy may help me. It is something to do with how their contestability arrangements and their local governments don't have capacity. It is all for contract work and so on and so forth. The burden of where I'm going with this is that, if we do have a council near the border that's capable of continuing on and contracting into the Northern Territory and producing much more for much less, what's the pathway we would need to follow to try and make that happen? Are you familiar with what I'm saying? Does this cost parity issue between the Northern Territory and Queensland resonate with you? I can only speak for Queensland.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes, we are aware of that.</p>	137 21/05/18		

					<p><b>CHAIR:</b> Do you have any sense of what the differential is in a kilometre-by-kilometre?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I don't have the numbers with me today. But we can take that on notice.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> All right.</p>		
126	275	II	O'SULLIVAN	ROAD-BUILDING SERVICES ACROSS BORDERS	<p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'm actually unsure about the cost-per-kilometre for the Boulia Shire Council roads, as opposed to the sections in the Northern Territory. We have had discussions with the Northern Territory in terms of tender processes and who can tender, and they have actually advised us that any council or any private sector firms can tender for their works.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> From another state?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> So you're telling me that Boulia can enter into the competition to provide road-building services across the border?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> And the same at the other end, from Western Australia?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Or indeed anywhere. It's an open competition. I imagine there are certain pre-qualifying conditions you'd have to meet as a contractor?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> But, to your knowledge, their pre-qualifying conditions are no more onerous than might be applied to someone building part of the Outback Way from Queensland?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Not that we're aware of.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> For example, if Boulia Shire qualifies to build the Outback Way in Queensland—if you don't know the answer to this, it will be important for us to know—is it likely that they will qualify to provide contract services into the Northern Territory?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct. But we can confirm that—</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> It usually depends on the value of the money at the project. We did quite a bit of work a number of years ago on pre-qualifications, to ensure that cross-border there was no discrimination—</p>	138 21/05/18	

					<p><b>CHAIR:</b> When you say the value of the contract, would that be a financial assessment on the contractor who is applying to do it?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's right.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Is there any way that we can encourage someone to have a closer look at this? Prima facie, if I were to accept as correct what the mayor at Bouliya says—and he's really a straight-shooter of a fella—I think there is a real up-side in terms of the cost of construction.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We can come back to you on it.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Obviously, the further you get across the border, the less advantageous this is, I suppose. But they've already got the pits and the approvals to extract gravels and all sorts of things. They argue that if a stone-cold contractor comes in and has to establish and then go ahead and get pits and access to gravel and so on, these are all significant additional costs that are involved.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We are happy to have a look at it, having raised it. We are monitoring it closely and costs are a key issue for us across a range of projects. We are happy to have a look at this specifically—</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator SCULLION:</b> I've heard the same thing independently of you. What I think the whole committee would be interested in is, first of all, is there such a differential in the cost, because of an artificial line? Is that correct, and if so is there another reason for it, because, quite clearly, I've had the experience on both the Western Australian and Queensland sides? It would be useful to get an answer to that.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We will make further inquiries on that.</p>		
127	276	II	STERLE	TONKIN HIGHWAY SOUTH TO SOUTH EAST HIGHWAY	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Has any detailed planning work been done?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> There is a level of planning work that has been done. I'm not quite sure exactly where they're at at the moment.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Could you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes.</p>	140 21/05/18	
128	277	II	STERLE	UNDERSPEND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I'm saying that there's an \$800 million underspend so far. History is showing me that this will be the fourth underspend in a row. I'm saying that in 2016-17 the figure was \$1.8 billion. <b>In 2015-16</b> it was a \$1.3 billion underspend, and in 2014-15 it was more than \$800 million. I'm just asking you: can you indicate</p>	141 21/05/18	

					<p>by project and by program where the underspend in 2017-18 is occurring, please.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We'll see if we have that for you here. If not, we'll take it on notice, but I'll see if we have the detail for you.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> If you have it there, let's go through it, because the chair's not going to cut me off just yet. How are we going with those figures?</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> Which year? Are we talking about 2017-18?</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Firstly, I come back to an \$800 million underspend for this year, 2017-18—that's what the budget papers are saying—compared to the announcement of \$8 billion last year. I was just highlighting that and saying that this is the fourth year in a row of underspend in infrastructure. So I'm just asking now if you can tell us where the \$800 million underspend is. What projects won't be financed this year that originally were to be financed?</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> From budget last year, there were considerable movements made at MYEFO. We had a range of projects at that point that were tracking towards their project milestones. We'll have to get a full list on notice, but the major ones—</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> I'll tell you this, and I'll finish on this: if you can just get me those projects where the money won't be spent, the \$800 million shortfall, I'm happy with that—well, no, I'm not. I mean I'd be happy to have that information.</p>		
129	278	II	STERLE	<p>PROJECT ADJUSTMENTS SINCE MYEFO TO BUDGET</p>	<p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> For the next few minutes I've got left, let's rattle through some others. That's about, quickly, \$270 million.</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> I've got that specific information on projects that we've had to adjust since MYEFO to budget. I haven't got the full list of the movements that happened between budget last year and MYEFO. I do recall that, with the Western Sydney Infrastructure Plan Northern Road project, we ended up moving a sizable amount. I can't give you the exact amount. I'll have to take that on notice. That was due to some delays in finalising the planning to have the project kick off construction.</p> <p><b>Senator STERLE:</b> Alright, take that on notice for us.</p> <p><b>Mr McClure:</b> For us to get to the full amount from budget last year to budget this year, I'll have to take the rest on notice.</p>	142 21/05/18	
130	279	II	RICE	<p>NORTH EAST LINK FUNDING AND MILESTONES</p>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> What time lines is the government proposing that the money be spent over?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> I will ask my colleagues.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> There's \$50 million profiled in 2019-20, \$50 million in 2020-21 and</p>	144 21/05/18	

					<p>\$100 million in 2021-22, taking that to \$200 million over the forward estimates, and the rest of the funding of 1.55 is beyond the forward estimates.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Are there any specifics other than just 'beyond the forward estimates'?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> There will be. I don't have that detail with me though.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But that has been determined?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> From memory, I think the expectation at this stage is that the project funding would run out to around 2020-25, with the majority in the couple of years before that. We can have look at the detail and provide further on that.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Okay—and take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> As I've said with earlier projects, at this stage that's very much the best information we have, talking with Victoria about where we see that project rolling out, but it's all subject to further discussion with the state.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But at the moment there is an indicative, itemised, year-by-year schedule?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Correct.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> And you're happy to take on notice to supply that?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Correct.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Associated with that, will there be milestones that the Victorian government will need to meet?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> There will, subject to the further business case and further discussion and negotiation with the state, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Can you tell me what those milestones are now, or would you have to take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We don't have those milestones yet. We have to go through the process of negotiating with the state around those milestones.</p>		
131	280	II	RICE	<p>BREAKDOWN OF FUNDING FROM 'STRONGER GROWTH TO CREATE MORE JOBS' BUDGET DOCUMENT'</p>	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I will leave it with that, given that I've got seven minutes to go. In the government's <i>Stronger growth to create more jobs</i> budget document, it was stated that there'd be a \$75 billion infrastructure program over the next decade. Are you able to break down for me how that \$75 billion will be allocated across different projects and across different programs?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> There's a lot of detail in that, Senator. Maybe I should take it on notice, if possible.</p>	145 21/05/18	

					<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> You've got the detail here? Yes, given the time. Would you be able to table it, perhaps, so that it's not taken on notice and not provided until two days before next estimates?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Let me check. I just want to check what we have and what we don't have and whether it answers your question in full. I wonder if it is possible, if we have a look overnight at what we can table for the committee tomorrow on that, just to check that what we have here will answer your question—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> That would be great. And then, once we've looked at that, take the rest on notice. Also, using the same criteria as to what's counted under that \$75 billion, would it be possible to look retrospectively to get a breakdown over the last decade as to what projects from, say, 2008 have been spent?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> There'd be quite a lot of work involved in that, so we wouldn't be in a position to provide that tomorrow. We could have a look at what we could over time, but it's quite a bit of work involved—</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> But you would be able to take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> I just want to compare the \$75 billion looking forward with what's been spent in equivalent projects over the last decade—and also, then, what percentage of government expenditure that spending would be over the decade.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Yes. We can have a look.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> And matched up as a percentage of government expenditure for each year over the decade?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We will be able to look at broad categories. Trying to break it down at a very discrete, minute level across the whole 10-year history will be quite difficult, obviously, but we'll see what we can do at a high level in broad categories.</p>		
132	282	II	MCCARTHY	BRISBANE METRO	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can I take you to Brisbane Metro. In January 2016, Brisbane Lord Mayor Graham Quirk announced a \$1.54 billion high-frequency rail system, which would run on rubber tyres. Since then, the Brisbane Metro has been described as (a) a high capacity bus system; (b) not a bus: it runs on tracks just like the Paris Metro; and (c) a 30-metre electric bus. Given that the government has seen fit to award \$300 million for the development and construction of the Brisbane Metro, can you tell me what type of vehicles will use it—trams, trains, banana buses?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I don't have the exact details, but we understand they're articulated</p>	18 22/05/18	

					<p>buses that are longer than normal buses. But I'll have to get the details for you on notice.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I've heard them described as bi-articulated buses.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Bi-articulated buses. So I could add that as letter 'd'!</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Please don't rely on my expertise as to the form of vehicle. Why don't we take it on notice and get an engineering or technical description of the vehicles.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you will come back to me on that. I think it's important because there is \$300 million for the development and construction, and if we don't know what type of vehicle—</p>		
133	283	II	PATRICK	<p>SUBMISSIONS FOR FUNDING FROM SA GOVERNMENT</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> In the budget, it appears as though there was \$3.4 billion in funding allocated to infrastructure projects across South Australia. In the chamber I made the point to the minister that that represents about three per cent of the \$75 billion amount that has been announced by the government as a total. I'd like to get a general understanding in relation to how the funding is allocated. I'll be upfront: South Australia has 7.1 per cent of the Australian population. I realise there are some projects that are not related to population; something like a road from Adelaide to Darwin might have some strategic significance.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> There's no doubt at least some merit to a claim that infrastructure funding does have some relationship to population. We wouldn't put an international airport at Coober Pedy, for example, because there's simply no market. And roads, clearly, have some relationship to population. Will you walk through some of the considerations that you go through when you allocate funding?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> I can lead off and my colleagues may then jump in. Within the \$75 million that you referred to there are a number of different subprograms that are each intended to deliver different aims. There is the overarching Infrastructure Investment Program, which is the way we fund essentially large infrastructure projects with the state governments. There is also then, as you would be aware, a series of subprograms, which particularly involve investing in blackspots across the country and other forms of investment at the local government level. A lot of those programs have their own formulas for how to distribute funding equally across the states.</p> <p>In terms of the Infrastructure Investment Program itself, which is the source we</p>	19-20 22/05/18		

				<p>use to fund the larger infrastructure projects across the states, it's really a combination of need. We do quite detailed transport modelling within the department. It looks at where we see the largest bottlenecks or transport congestion problems within our cities and regions and where we can get largest benefits in terms of economic productivity. It's a similar process that Infrastructure Australia goes through when they do their priority lists. We go through that process of working out where we see the biggest need across the country, and then government has an eye in deciding which projects are funded. Government has an eye to, if you like, equity, across the various states as well. It also depends heavily on the state government at the time and what planning work has been done by them on projects. Projects have to be developed to a certain stage before we're prepared to look at and invest in those projects. It is essentially a combination of need from a policy perspective. A certain element of balance across the country, I think, is the main answer.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I recognise there are commercial considerations and all those sorts of things. How much of it ties back to, say, the number and quality of submissions that may come from a state government to the Commonwealth?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> That's certainly a factor. Through the government's investment in the long-term pipeline, we are trying to lead the discussion to some extent and to look ahead to where we see the priorities, and help drive that work across the state governments. There's no doubt that if a state has done a high-level of active planning in their jurisdiction then it becomes easier to engage on those projects.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Can you provide me details on how many submissions the South Australian government made for funding this year?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We are happy to look at that on notice. We don't have it to hand.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> And across each of the states, if you would be so kind. You mentioned in your answer before a formula when talking about blackspots and other needs. Could you table that formula? I presume it's an operational guide on how to do this.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> A number of the subprograms have a set of criteria, so with maintenance it's actually a formula. With the Roads to Recovery Program and blackspots it's basically criteria. We can table all that for you.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Working in an open and transparent manner—it's not available on the web somewhere at all?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> I believe that they are publically available.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> I think they are. Most of them are. We will double check that but most of them are. We can provide the relevant links to those.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Either the links or the documents, if they're not on the web, would be appreciated...</p>		
134	284	II	PATRICK	FUNDING FOR NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR AND GAWLER RAILWAY	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b>... I don't want to crossover on what Senator Storer may have done last night but I want to talk very briefly about the North-South Corridor—not so much about the details of the project but what's the total allocation to the North-South Corridor?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> It's \$1.4 billion.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> How much has actually been spent to date on the North-South Corridor, of that \$1.4 billion?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Sorry, \$1.4 billion is the new commitment at 2018-19 budget, sorry.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> That's a new additional commitment?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> So what is the total commitment for the north-south corridor?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> We'll just have to do some adding.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Sure—adding under pressure!</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> With regard to the current construction, the Commonwealth allocated—I believe it was nearly \$3 billion.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Yes. The total allocation at the moment to the north-south corridor, including the \$1.4 billion in this budget, is \$2.99 billion.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> How much of that original funding has been spent? I presume the \$1.7 billion has already been spent and this new allocation is for future spending?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Expenditure prior to 30 June 2017 was \$731.8 million, and for this financial year we're anticipating spending another \$457.56 million.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> So that's allocation in terms of money passed to the government?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> There's still quite a lot of money left in the kitty for that project. I'm happy for this to be provided on notice. I presume there'll be allocations in the PBSs for each of the forward years, the four forward estimate years, but this clearly must go beyond that. Could you lay out the cash flow, the intended cash flow, until</p>	20-21 22/05/18	

					<p>the expiration of the \$2.99 billion?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We can take that on notice for you, and we'll make sure that we include all of the new funding in that as well.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Maybe you could look at the past funding and then look at what you intend in what years until it's exhausted. I presume you have those numbers in your system.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Yes, we can do that.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I might also ask for the Gawler railway as well, if that's possible, for the same thing.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Yes, absolutely.</p>		
135	285	II	BROWN	HOBART AIRPORT ROUNDAABOUT	<p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> I just want to get an update around the Hobart airport roundabout. I think the last time we spoke we were talking about tenders being let. Has that happened?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> No. My advice is that the tender award is expected to occur later this year or early next year.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> I think last time we met, or the last time we asked this question, it was late 2017 and early 2018.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> That's right; that's what I said then.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> So now it's been pushed out to—</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> It's been pushed out slightly. The advice from the Tasmanian government is that there have been some geotechnical complexities that they're having to look into. That's in the nature of elevated embankments around off ramps. They're just having a look at some of those works, so, no, they haven't gone out to tender. When a project is tendered, it needs to be properly scoped so that there are no surprises. They're just getting on top of those other challenges around that area.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> When would we expect construction to start?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Potentially in mid- to late 2019. There is still considerable planning work that needs to be done. There's an environmental assessment that's required, and there are the applications under the Airports Act, which involves a major development plan. Those are the complexities of building at an airport.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> How long is it anticipated to be before completion then, if</p>	25-26 22/05/18	

				<p>we're looking to mid- to late 2019 for a start date?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> It's approximately a three-year project—that sort of time frame.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> So what's that, 2022?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> That's right.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> Completion date, 2022.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> With all these projects, dates can change, challenges can arise. State governments just advise us. It's not something that we can actively manage in terms of the project time frames. They provide them to us, and we phase our payments according to the progress of the project. But there's a considerable amount of work being done at the moment by the Department of State Growth in preparing for this project and preparing the design and tender documentation.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> When did the work start? The commitment, I think, was a 2016 commitment.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> I think they started fairly soon after that, having conversations with the Hobart International Airport corporation and discussions with us about the scope of the project. It's been a fairly ongoing activity.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> Thank you, but of course it was the state department that gave you the original information that you gave to the estimates last time, which was that tenders would be sought for the project in late 2017 to early 2018. Is that correct?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> That's right. We endeavour to provide the committee with the information as we have it. It's not always information in the public domain, but we share that with you when we have it so that you understand how the project is progressing, and now you can understand some of the complexities of this project. All we can do is provide you with an update when you request it.</p> <p><b>Senator CAROL BROWN:</b> But there's no guarantee that the tenders will be sought by the new timetable that you've given of late 2018 to early 2019?</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> We're not in control of the tender process. That's just the latest advice we have from the Tasmanians.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK:</b> Can I ask some questions off the back of that, about the 3-year construction period? Could you on notice get us some more advice on that? That seems like a long time for that construction project. Like Senator Brown, I've got a sense of what's happening down there. We both know the area relatively well.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>That seems like a long time for that project.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Perhaps we'll come back to you with some advice.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK:</b> Another question, which you'll probably have to take on notice as well, is whether the extension of the runway project that's just been completed at Hobart Airport has had any impact on the land acquisition or some of the land issues around interaction with the realignment or the reconstruction of the highway.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> Will do.</p>		
136	286	II	MCCARTHY	BRISBANE METRO BUSINESS CASE	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I might take you back to Queensland, to the \$300 million for the development and construction of the Brisbane Metro. I note that in the options analysis of the Brisbane Metro business case, 23 options were originally short listed. This was then refined to six and finally to four viable options. However, only three options are detailed. Number one: the Paris-style subway metro; two, buses; and three, bus and train—BAT. What was the fourth option? Was it a light rail?</p> <p><b>Mr Pirie:</b> I'd have to take that one on notice, sorry.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you don't know?</p> <p><b>Mr Pirie:</b> I don't have that information here with me.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> That's different to whether you know.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We don't know.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> You don't know? There was a fourth option and you don't have an independent recollection between you as to what the fourth option was? I mean, I find that—</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> I don't have it to my mind, Senator.</p> <p><b>Mr Pirie:</b> No.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> That's why it was the fourth option. That's why it was down there as fourth. Someone can take that on notice.</p>	26-27 22/05/18	
137	287	II	MCCARTHY	SOUTH ROAD UPGRADE	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> I was talking to the minister, Chair. I want to move on to South Australian projects and the South Road upgrade. What is the breakdown of funding over each of the next four years for the Pym Street to Regency Road project?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We'll just try to dig that out, Senator.</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> Senator, funding starts for that project in 2019-20 with 10 million; 20</p>	33 22/05/18	

					<p>million in 2020-21; 22 million in 2021-22. That comes to 52 million. The rest of them are—125 million is beyond the forward estimates.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When does the construction schedule start? What is the scheduled completion date?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll have to confirm that for you, but we understand the construction is likely to start by the end of 2019.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So you'd need to check the completion date?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'd need to check on both to be sure.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Did the new South Australian government seek an 80-20 funding split for the project?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> I'll need to double-check the business case for that project.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> The South Australian government has committed to the funding allocation for this project. We are just having conversations with them now about the actual profile, though.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> About the actual split of it?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> No, they've agreed to the split. We're just going through it, and that's why Ms Garbin will have to come back to you on it.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So it is an 80-20 split?</p> <p><b>Ms Garbin:</b> It's 50-50.</p>		
138	288	II	MCCARTHY	BRINGING FORWARD FUNDING FOR SA PROJECTS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Is the government considering bringing forward infrastructure funding for any South Australian project?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Yes. We are in consultation with the South Australian government at the moment about what they anticipate their milestones to be.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Which projects?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> For the North-South Corridor and, I believe, the Gawler line as well.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> Officials have indicated to us that they think there is potential to move more quickly than our current profile. Obviously we're open to that. We're just working through those details at the moment.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How much are you looking at and when?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> I'm not sure. I'd have to take that on notice.</p>	34 22/05/18	

139	289	II	MCCARTHY	SHARE OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR SA	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What is the per capita share of federal infrastructure funding over the next four years for South Australia?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We might have to take that on notice just to break that down. It depends on how we define 'infrastructure funding' as well and whether we include, for example, subprograms and ROSI, which we've discussed through this process. So I think it might be easier to take that on notice.</p>	34 22/05/18	
140	290	II	MCCARTHY	GRANT FUNDING FOR VICTORIA PROJECTS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay, and what proportion of the \$6.3 billion in grant funding allocated in 2018-19 is earmarked for programs and projects in Victoria?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> Sorry, in 2018-19, for new projects?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> No, not new projects—for projects in Victoria.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> No, for programs and projects in Victoria.</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> I might pass it to Ms Leeming to see if she has that.</p> <p><b>Ms Leeming:</b> So the breakdown of the \$7.8 billion—</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> No, what proportion of the \$6.3 billion in grant funding allocated in 2018-19 is earmarked for programs and projects in Victoria—just a percentage?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> We might have to take that on notice. We can come back to you on it. It's just a matter of having to work out all of the different components.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> All right.</p>	34 22/05/18	
141	291	II	CHISHOLM	FUNDING FOR PROJECTS COMMITTED TO BY THE CURRENT GOVERNMENT	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Which of the projects committed to by the current government since 2013 have been funded, at least in part, using value capture?</p> <p><b>Ms Hall:</b> I'd probably have to take that on notice in regard to the projects. The Gold Coast light rail is one project where value capture was used. I'll have to go back, have a look and come back to you on that.</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> As a general point, we talked earlier today about the Western Sydney north-south rail link, which is an area where value capture is prospective. Value capture tends to be most prospective in significant urban rail projects, primarily where there are station precincts and developments around the rail line.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> I'm talking about since 2013 to the current day. Are you aware of any projects where it has been used, at least in part, to fund?</p> <p><b>Mr Yeaman:</b> We'll take that on notice and have a look.</p>	35-36 22/05/18	

142	292	II	CHISHOLM	ROAD USER CHARGING	<p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> In November 2016 the Australian government announced that a study would be established, led by an eminent Australian, into the potential benefits and impacts of road user charging. We still haven't had anyone appointed. I was just wondering when we expect the government to make progress on this.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> I don't have a specific answer to that, but I'll take that question on notice, specifically about the prospects for an appointment or how much further we've got along that line.</p> <p><b>Senator CHISHOLM:</b> Thanks.</p>	39 22/05/18	
143	346	II	STERLE	BRUCE HIGHWAY UPGRADE	Can you provide an updated funding profile for the Government's 10 year \$6.7 billion Bruce Highway Upgrade Program, starting in 2013-14?	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
144	347	II	STERLE	MIDLAND HIGHWAY UPGRADE	Can you provide an updated funding profile for the Government's Midland Highway 10 Year Action Plan?	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
145	348	II	STERLE	PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS FUNDED IN 2018-19 FEDERAL BUDGET	<p>Please provide the funding profile for the following projects and programs, which were announced in the 2018-19 Budget:</p> <p><b>Queensland</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bruce Highway - Cooroy to Curra (Section D);</li> <li>○ Bruce Highway - Pine Rivers to Caloundra (including the \$150 million Murrumba Downs Upgrade);</li> <li>○ Brisbane Metro;</li> <li>○ Duplication of North Coast Line - Beerburrum to Landsborough;</li> <li>○ Cunningham Highway – Yamanto to Ebenezer/Amberley Upgrade;M1 Pacific Motorway - Varsity Lakes to Tugun &amp; Eight Mile Plains to Daisy Hills;</li> <li>○ Warrego Highway Upgrade;</li> </ul> <p><b>New South Wales</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pacific Highway - Coffs Harbour Bypass;</li> <li>○ Port Botany Rail Line Duplication including Cabramatta Loop;</li> <li>○ Barton Highway Upgrade (part of ROSI);</li> <li>○ New Nowra Bridge;</li> </ul> <p><b>Victoria</b></p>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Airport Rail Link;</li> <li>○ North East Link;</li> <li>○ Monash Rail;</li> <li>○ Frankston to Baxter Rail Line Electrification;</li> <li>○ Congestion Package;</li> <li>○ Princes Highway Duplication - Traralgon to Sale;</li> <li>○ Geelong Line Duplication - South Geelong to Waurn Ponds;</li> </ul> <p><b>Tasmania</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Replacement Bridgewater Bridge;</li> <li>○ Tasmanian Roads Package (part of ROSI);</li> <li>○ Tasmanian Freight Rail Revitalisation;</li> </ul> <p><b>South Australia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gawler Line Electrification;</li> <li>○ South Road Upgrade – Regency Road to Pyn Street;</li> <li>○ South Road Upgrade – Future Priorities;</li> <li>○ Joy Baluch Bridge Duplication;</li> </ul> <p><b>Western Australia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ METRONET: Morley to Ellenbrook Line;</li> <li>○ METRONET: Byford Line Extension;</li> <li>○ METRONET: Midland Station and Bellevue Extension;</li> <li>○ METRONET: Related Projects;</li> <li>○ Bunbury Outer Ring Road - Stage 2 &amp; 3;</li> <li>○ Tonkin Highway – Stage 3 Extension;</li> <li>○ Tonkin Highway – Gap;</li> <li>○ Tonkin Highway – Hale, Welshpool and Kelvin Interchanges Upgrades;</li> <li>○ Mitchell Freeway Extension;</li> <li>○ Leach Highway / Welshpool Road Intersection Upgrade;</li> <li>○ Roe Highway / Great Eastern Highway Bypass Interchange;</li> <li>○ Stephenson Avenue Extension;</li> <li>○ Great Northern Highway – Bindoon Bypass (part of ROSI);</li> </ul> <p><b>Northern Territory</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Central Arnhem Road Upgrade;</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Buntine Highway Upgrade;</li> </ul> <b>ACT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monaro Highway Upgrade;</li> </ul> <b>Multi-jurisdictions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Major Project Business Case Fund;</li> <li>○ Northern Australia Roads Package (part of ROSI);</li> <li>○ Roads of Strategic Importance (excluding the Northern Australia Roads Package, Bindoon Bypass, Tasmanian Roads Package and additional funding for the Barton Highway);</li> <li>○ Outback Way – additional \$160 million;</li> <li>○ Urban Congestion Fund;</li> <li>○ Remote Airstrip Upgrade Program.</li> </ul>		
146	349	II	STERLE	ELECTION COMMITMENTS	<p>Could the Department list all the Government’s 2016 road and rail election commitments?</p> <p>For each of them please provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Funding breakdown between state and Commonwealth;</li> <li>○ Construction start date;</li> <li>○ Construction completion date;</li> <li>○ Funding profile.</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
147	350	II	STERLE	M12	What are the preliminary costings for this project?	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
148	351	II	STERLE	BREAKDOWN OF INVESTMENT IN TRANSPORT	Can you update the figures set out in the answer provided by the Department to Committee Question Number 26 from Budget Estimates 2017-18?	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
149	352	II	STERLE	MANNING ON-RAMP	<p>Was there any funding in the 2018-19 Budget to construct an on-ramp connecting Manning Road to the Kwinana Freeway southbound lanes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If yes, then what is the funding profile?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	

150	185	AMSA	ABETZ	COST RECOVERY	<p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> How will the cost recovery be determined? Are we going to charge on an hourly basis?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> There are two components of the cost recovery. On the services that can be directly attributed to a client there is a charge on a fee-for-service basis. That includes certificates of competency, certificates of operation and certificates of survey.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> Will that be done on an hourly basis?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Those costs have been modelled on the average cost to deliver those services.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> So it's a flat fee?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> It's a flat fee, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> For those particular services?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> There are some services which would be charged an hourly rate.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> What rate would that be?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I would have to take that one on notice. I don't have that off the top of my head. Other parts of the system cannot be directly attributed to a particular user. Things like compliance, enforcement, standards development, regulations development and those issues are charged under a levy across the whole industry.</p>	5 22/05/18	
151	186	AMSA	ABETZ	COST OF THE DELIVERY OF THE NATIONAL STANDARD	<p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> Do you have a full cost of the delivery of the national standard? Do you have a budget?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> We have worked through a cost—and the Department of Finance has checked those figures—from what we know about the industry right now, about how we will plan and deliver services and the levels of activity we think will be required. The review will be a good opportunity for us. We will then have much better experience with the industry and much more confidence about the levels of cost and activity we need to expend.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> In the first year of operation do you anticipate a surplus or a loss?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I believe in the first year there is a very small surplus in that particular funding line.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> How is that achieved?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Basically we're budgeting for the staff we've employed around the country. We now have better information around such things—</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> No, sorry; the profit. Will that be because you think you'll be</p>	5-6 22/05/18	

					<p>charging a bit too much on levies or that the hourly rate is a bit too high or the general levy is too high?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I think it's come about in things like rents for properties, as we've got better ideas about rents—we've opened new offices around the country, for example—and those sorts of areas.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> Have you split your budget on the issues that you just raised in a previous answer, on enforcement, compliance, education, administration? Do you have a split-up of that as yet?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes, we do.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> Would you be able to provide that to us on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes, I can give that to you on notice. Those figures were, I think, made available on our first round of consultation with industry as well.</p> <p><b>Senator ABETZ:</b> And they remain?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes.</p>		
152	187	AMSA	MCCARTHY	MARITIME FATALITIES	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can you list for us the names of the 13 fatalities, what state they occurred in and what sector of the maritime industry they occurred in?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I can't do that right now, but I can give you that information on notice.</p>	7	22/05/18
153	188	AMSA	MCCARTHY	PROSECUTIONS UNDER THE DCV NATIONAL LAW IN 2016-17	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can I just clarify something. You gave me the dates of 2016-17 as nine fatalities and then you said 2016. What's the differentiation there?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Sorry. If you said 13, I think you were quoting from our annual report from 2016-17—</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes. Thank you.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> The numbers I have here are calendar years.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay. I will go to the 13 DCV deaths in 2016-17. Were the deaths published anywhere?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> We certainly have those numbers in our annual report, as you see there. We don't publish more statistics than that at the moment. What we are working at, at the moment, is how we can better present the findings that come from coroners around the country. This is one of the things that the national system is allowing us to do for the first time. We are looking at the learnings from the coronial inquests into fatalities such as Mr Bradshaw and Mr Donoghue in the Northern Territory and the <i>Returner</i> coronial in Western Australia, and we are</p>	9-10	22/05/18

				<p>looking at how we can bring those lessons right around the country in the national system. We're just working on how we can put those findings relevant to our activities on our website and our responses to those things at the moment.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> For how long had 'a decreasing number of fatalities' been a performance indicator?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I think we only had it in there for one year.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> For one year?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes. And, again, with the national system, trying to get that national dataset is something that we're really—we're going to have to grow a lot of that data from scratch. We don't have a good dataset on incidents and those sorts of things. It's one thing we're very keen on—with the national system—to get much better reporting across the industry.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Is AMSA undertaking any prosecutions in relation to the 13 deaths?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I know we are undertaking prosecutions but I would have to take that one on notice. I'm not sure that any of the prosecutions we have underway are related or if we have briefs of evidence in preparation. The process is that we have an investigation. If we form the view there should be a prosecution, we'll form a brief of evidence. That goes to the DPP, and the DPP will decide whether there's a prosecution. I know we have various prosecutions and things in train but I would need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> You're not sure if any of those would be around the 13 deaths?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Around any of those particular incidents—no.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes—if you could take that on notice. How many prosecutions did AMSA undertake under the DCV national law in 2016-17?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Unless I have that in my statistics, I'll have to take it on notice. There are different enforcement actions we take. We commenced six prosecutions in 2016-17 and completed five.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you repeat that?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Six prosecutions commenced in 2016-17, and five were completed.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What happened to the sixth one? Is that still ongoing?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What were they in relation to? Are you able to say?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I'd have to take that on notice to see whether any of those are related to any of the fatalities.</p>		
154	189	AMSA	MCCARTHY	PROSECUTIONS THIS FINANCIAL YEAR	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay, that was 2016-17. What about this financial year?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Again, I would have to take on notice how many we have in the pipeline right now. Apart from prosecutions, there are also breach notices that we issue, there are directions notices that we and our delegates issue and there are prohibition notices. There are a lot of other compliance mechanisms that we use there.</p>	10 22/05/18	
155	190	AMSA	O'SULLIVAN	LIST OF FATALITIES	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> In terms of your prosecutions, there may have been a death, but the prosecution might not be related directly to the fatality?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> It could be about some other feature?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> It could be another incident altogether.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Sure. With deaths, I don't imagine it would be in your remit to prepare a brief of evidence, for example, to prosecute a misdemeanour or a crime, other than to cooperate with whoever the prevailing authorities are.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> No, we do briefs of evidence for prosecutions under—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> I appreciate that, but you wouldn't do a brief of evidence for a prosecution for manslaughter or murder.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> No.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> It would be another agency that would do that—</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> and you'd be the cooperating agency.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes. The police will do that, and the police will also do the preparation of reports for the coroner, and we will assist the police as well by providing information.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Just so I understand, what prosecutorial role, if any, would you have that relates to a death, other than perhaps where there were a breach that we might loosely regard as a workplace health and safety issue?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> If, for example, there were a fatality that came about because the operator of the vessel breached their obligations to provide a safe vessel, then</p>	10-11 22/05/18	

					<p>under the national law we could do a brief of evidence that would prosecute them for failing to meet their duties under that law.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> So it would be a negligence type thing around workplace health and safety.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Yes, vessel safety.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Thank you. I was just listening intently.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> Chair, it would be useful to have a couple of pieces of information, I think—first of all, around the fatalities, so we understand the scope of a fatality. For example, if somebody fell off a wharf, if they were coming down to say g'day to a fisherman and fell off the wharf and hit the boat in the water, that is an entirely different circumstance from a crew member not operating effectively and safely and getting crushed between the boat and the wharf. We talk about snorkelling fatalities. I don't really think they have much to do with AMSA, unless they're dangling their leg off and are STCW certified crew or something. So it might be useful to get a list of the fatalities—perhaps over the last decade?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> Back to 2013, when the national system started.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> It just would be useful to have a list of all the fatalities that they consider fatalities. But it might also be useful to have a look at the numbers of people who are now certified crews and the number of vessels we have, because these things aren't static. The industry grows, and we have more boats and more people. It'll just be useful, I think, to have those.</p> <p>The second element that I think might be useful for the committee to know is that AMSA will pursue you if you're operating your vessel and your vessel is two weeks out of survey, because it's a very important issue around insurance, qualifications and a whole range of those things that may not be at all associated with a fatality. So they have another role in a compliance mechanism. As the ship's master or something I would have to keep my qualification, make sure the vessel was kept within survey and do a whole range of things that are not necessarily about fatalities. So it might be useful, rather than to perhaps swamp all of that sort of stuff, to just have some raw numbers about those issues that they pursued that were not to do with fatalities and the issues that they pursued around the issues of the fatalities that Senator McCarthy is dealing with, if that might be of assistance.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So, Mr Kinley, you're able to get the last 10 years in terms of what the minister's just suggested?</p> <p><b>Mr Schwartz:</b> 2013.</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I suggest we go back to 1 July 2013, which is when the national law</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					came into effect.		
156	308	AMSA	MCCARTHY	FATALITY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DCV SECTOR AND UNDER THE NAVIGATIONS ACT	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How does the number of fatalities in the DCV sector compare to the number of fatalities on vessels regulated under the Navigation Act?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> It would be considerably less than under the Navigation Act. There are also a lot less regulated Australian vessels under the Navigation Act.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> When you say 'considerably less', what are we looking at there?</p> <p><b>Mr Kinley:</b> I'm trying to think whether there have been any.</p> <p><b>Mr Schwartz:</b> If we were to talk about regulated Australian vessels under the Navigation Act, I would suggest that you could count on one hand the number of fatalities over that period of time, but we'd have to confirm that. But if you're talking under the Navigation Act in totality, then, potentially, that's where we start talking about deaths of foreign seafarers on ships that are coming to Australia and deaths of people on passenger ships, for example. Yes, we could get those sorts of numbers, but it would be less than the 10 or 11 a year that we're talking about in the domestic sector.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> We are looking at the comparison between the DCV sector and the Navigation Act. If you're able to provide that information, that would be good.</p>	11-12 22/05/18	
157	191	AMSA	RHIANNON	LIVE EXPORTS	<p>Is the Department aware of new regulations put forward by International Maritime Organisation that cover sulphur emissions and greenhouse gas emissions discharged by ships that will come into operation on 1 January 2020?</p> <p>What impact will these regulations have on the live export ships that operate out of Australia?</p> <p>Will it mean that fewer ships will be registered and available to choose from, reducing the capacity and capability to move animals from Australia by sea?</p> <p>If after 1 January 2020 ships will need to start using fuel with lower than five per cent sulphur content and reduce their greenhouse gas emissions what is the Department doing to inform farmers and others involved in the live export trade of these impending changes that could result in insufficient number of ships to carry live exports to overseas markets?</p> <p>If there are insufficient number of ships to transport live exports will you work to transition the sheep industry from live exports to the boxed, chilled meat and</p>	WRITTEN 23/05/18	

					<p>dressed carcasses trade?</p> <p>Considering globally the live export fleet of ships has been identified as the oldest salt water fleet of ships in the world with an average age of 34-38 years old with some about 50 years of age how are you preparing for the likely scenario of a reduced number of live export vessels?</p>		
158	192	AMSA	REYNOLDS	BREACHES REFERRED TO AMSA	<p><i>The Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012</i> (National Law) sets out a number of requirements for owners, masters and skippers of Domestic Commercial Vessels to ensure the safety of their vessels, marine safety equipment and operations. Under the National Law, can AMSA please provide data as of 30 April 2018, where possible broken down by state and territory, showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The total number of breaches which have been referred to AMSA by state and territory agencies since the National Law was introduced in 2012. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the number of each of these referrals under the relevant sections of the <i>Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act</i>,</li> <li>○ following these referrals, the number of breaches which have been issued by AMSA, under the relevant sections of the <i>Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act</i>, and specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the number of breaches which have been issued under Part 3, Division 1, Section 13 (1)</li> <li>▪ the number of breaches which have been issued under Part 3, Division 1, Section 13 (4)</li> <li>▪ the number of breaches which have been issued under Part 3, Division 3, Section 18 (1)</li> <li>▪ the number of breaches which have been issued under Part 3, Division 3, Section 18 (4)</li> <li>▪ the number of breaches which have been issued under Part 4, Division 2, Section 45</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Please detail the outcome for each of the breaches issued by AMSA.</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 29/05/18	

159	193	AMSA	REYNOLDS	REPORTING OF AN INCIDENT ON A DOMESTIC VESSEL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can AMSA please outline the process of reporting an incident aboard a domestic commercial vessel which resulted in the death of a person, as required under <i>The Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012</i>?</li> <li>• Can AMSA please outline their responsibilities following notification of any such incident under <i>The Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012</i>?</li> <li>• Is there any other legislation under which AMSA has responsibilities in relation to this type of incident? Please advise the relevant legislative instruments and outline the responsibilities which apply.</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 29/05/18	
160	194	AMSA	REYNOLDS	INCIDENT ON CHARTER BOAT 'TEN SIXTY SIX'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can AMSA confirm that they were notified of the death of a passenger who had been on a charter boat named 'Ten Sixty Six' on, or around, the 30 October 2014. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can AMSA advise on what date this incident was reported to them?</li> <li>○ Can AMSA advise who reported this incident?</li> <li>○ Did the skipper/master/operator/owner of the vessel meet the legislative responsibilities to advise AMSA of the incident? If not, what if any action was pursued against the skipper/master/operator/owner?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Can AMSA outline the actions which they undertook in relation to this incident, as per their responsibilities under relevant legislation outlined in the previous answers?</li> <li>• Is it true that it is standard practice for AMSA to assign a Marine Safety officer to liaise with family members following an incident of this nature? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On what date was the Mills family assigned a liaison officer?</li> <li>○ If a liaison officer was not appointed, please provide the reasons for not doing so?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Is AMSA aware of the Investigation Report (Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012) Certificate of Operation 1209-1 'Takashi' 'Ten Sixty Six' 'Pia Rebecca' from the Western Australia Department of Transport, Office of Marine Safety?</li> <li>• Did AMSA receive this breach report from the Western Australia</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 29/05/18	

					<p>Department of Transport, Office of Marine Safety, making recommendations for AMSA to pursue a number of breaches against Dolphin Dive Charters Fremantle?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If AMSA received this report can you advise what, if any, actions were taken in response to this breach report?</li> <li>○ If AMSA received this report and did not undertake any action, can you please provide the reasons behind this decision?</li> </ul>		
161	195	AMSA	REYNOLDS	HEAD COUNTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Can AMSA confirm that they received advice from the Australian Government Solicitor in November 2016 which stated that there was no requirement to conduct a head count ‘under law’? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why did AMSA seek this advice?</li> <li>○ When did AMSA provide this advice to the Western Australian State Coroner?</li> <li>○ Did AMSA provide contrary advice to this during the public hearing for the Coronial inquest? Did this advice confirm that there was a requirement ‘under law’ to complete a head count.</li> <li>○ Is it also true that AMSA stated to the Coroner that the Safety Management System (SMS) of the ‘Ten Sixty Six’ charter boat stated that a head count must be conducted.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Can AMSA confirm that under the <i>National Standard for Commercial Vessels Part E Operations</i>, Operation Requirements Schedule 2, there is a clear requirement for a head count to be undertaken on a vessel carrying passengers? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In light of the advice AMSA received confirming there was a requirement for a head count to be done under the SMS, and ‘under law’, has AMSA reviewed the incident and investigation to see if AMSA could pursue legal action against the skipper/master/operator/owner over this matter.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● I understand that under several state jurisdictions it was necessary to undertake two headcounts on passenger vessels. Can AMSA confirm that this was the case?</li> <li>● Can AMSA confirm that under Western Australian Code of Practice contained the following requirement under Embarkation/Disembarkation Checks and Procedures: “<i>With the arrival of passengers, conduct a head</i></li> </ul>	WRITTEN 29/05/18	

					<p><i>count prior to and after completion of boarding and keep a record of this number during the voyage.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Does this count as a legal requirement?</li> <li>○ In AMSA’s view is the practice of undertaking one head count adequate to ensure all passengers return safely following a voyage?</li> <li>● When did the <i>National Standard for Commercial Vessels Part E Operations, Operation Requirements Schedule 2</i> commence? When did they come into operation in Western Australia?</li> <li>● Can AMSA confirm that the Western Australian State Coroner was informed AMSA would promote headcounts as a safety measure when they commence delivery of services for domestic commercial vessels under the National System for Domestic Commercial Vessel Safety on 1 July 2018? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Please outline what measures are currently in place to make owners/masters/skippers and crew members of the importance of headcounts.</li> <li>○ What would be deemed as best practice for conducting head counts on board charter vehicles?</li> <li>○ Can AMSA outline what process it will take to educate the sector regarding legislative requirements and best practice which apply when undertaking head counts?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
162	379	AMSA	RHIANNON	DETAINMENT OF LIVESTOCK CARRIERS	Please provide the details on why AMSA has detained 19 livestock carriers on 27 occasions in the past five years, including which ships and the specific reasons for each detainment.	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
163	380	AMSA	RHIANNON	LIVE EXPORT VOYAGES BY MV AWASSI EXPRESS	<p>Please confirm how many times MV Awassi Express has carried live export voyages from Australia in the past five years?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How many inspections of the Awassi has the AMSA has carried out in that time?</li> <li>b. Why has AMSA never identified the inadequacy of ventilation and onboard standards of this vessel prior to the recent public expose of the onboard conditions?</li> <li>c. What are the verification protocols for live export ships given the clear</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	

					<p>lack of rigorous checking by the agency? Why has AMSA not enforced standards on live export vessels?</p> <p>d. Which “independent third party” tested and passed the ventilation system on the MV Awassi Express prior to the baking deaths of 2400 sheep recently exposed by a whistleblower?</p>		
<b>National Transport Commission (4)</b>							
164	196	NTC	MCCARTHY	TRAVEL	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Thanks, Dr Kennedy. Did David Anderson travel with you for conferences, Mr Retter?</p> <p><b>Mr Retter:</b> During his tenure as chair he would have travelled to the occasional conference, yes.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What destinations did you go to in Australia?</p> <p><b>Mr Retter:</b> They would generally have been to capital cities for various conferences where transport issues were being discussed. I would have to take the specifics on notice and provide you with a written response.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Okay. What destinations did you go to around the world?</p> <p><b>Mr Retter:</b> I personally do not recall travelling overseas with the chair, but, again, I'll have to check the specifics of what travel was done, when and by whom, during the period of the chair's tenure.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could you also provide what other destinations you have travelled to, where that travel was paid for by the NTC in the last year?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Is that question—</p> <p><b>Mr Retter:</b> Who does that question relate to? To me or to the—</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> To the two of you travelling together.</p> <p><b>Mr Retter:</b> So just the travel where we were travelling together?</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Mr Retter:</b> Okay.</p>	41 22/05/18	
165	197	NTC	MCCARTHY	COST FOR INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How much does international travel for the senior leadership team cost per year?</p> <p><b>Mr Retter:</b> I'll have to give you the precise number on notice. I haven't got it in front of me.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Can we get a breakdown of the cost of international travel,</p>	42 22/05/18	

					accommodation and relevant incidentals for the senior leadership team in the last financial year? <b>Mr Retter:</b> Yes.		
166	198	NTC	MCCARTHY	HOSPITALITY COSTINGS	<b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Does the NTC engage in much hospitality with the board or external guests? <b>Mr Retter:</b> From time to time, we invite key stakeholders to talk with the board. That may include dinners, morning teas or afternoon teas, that sort of thing. <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> So hosting lunches. <b>Mr Retter:</b> Hosting a function either at lunch or dinner. <b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How much does the NTC spend on this kind of hospitality? <b>Mr Retter:</b> Again, I'll take that on notice.	42 22/05/18	
167	309	NTC	MCCARTHY	LOSS OF RECOGNITION OF AUSTRALIAN DRIVERS LICENCES OVERSEAS	<b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> My understanding is that if Australia is not consistent with the Geneva convention, we could lose the mutual recognition of drivers' licenses that Australians currently have when we travel overseas; would that be correct? <b>Mr Retter:</b> Without further analysis, that may be the case. I would need to double-check that before I give you a formal response. Again, I will make the point that I think it's a hypothetical question at this stage. We have at least 12 months, if not longer, before we will be putting firm legislation in front of ministers. Obviously, the question of Australia's position on any changes internationally will be one of the factors we consider.	45 22/05/18	
<b>Portfolio Coordination and Research (14)</b>							
168	165	PC&R	GALLACHER	ROAD ACCIDENTS DATA	<b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What is the main hold-up there? We've been at this for quite a while. What are the key problems that are not allowing us to measure hospitalisations as a result of road accidents? <b>Mr Foulds:</b> One of the major issues has been getting ethics approvals for national matching and linking of hospital deaths and crash data for past and future years. <b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> What does 'ethics approval' mean? <b>Mr Foulds:</b> In the research, when the research is done, you need certain approvals to be able to conduct research in a way that meets the ethics boards of hospitals and the research institutions. That approval has taken a while. I can tell you that all	29-30 21/05/18	

					<p>the permissions have been received in six jurisdictions: New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, the ACT and the Northern Territory. But Tasmanian health approvals are still required; there has been some difficulty in getting hospital acceptance. In Western Australia, the health process is still being clarified following legislative change but it should happen shortly. Ms Werner talked about stage 2—outstanding approvals for Tasmania and WA will be sought in stage 2. It has taken a long time but it is actually moving forward. There are states that have this data themselves and have linked crash data, police data and hospital data. The national overview is taking a little longer.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Just for the record, how long have we been attempting to get the national data together?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I'd have to take that on notice. I don't know when it began.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Is it over 10 years?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I would have to take it on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> It's not a matter that comes before you on a regular basis?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> There is a lot of work that's being done in this place. As Mr Foulds has just said, we have made significant progress. Yes, it is taking a long time to do it. But we are getting far closer than we ever have been to having what we think is a very important national dataset.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Mr Foulds, you mentioned electronic stability control. Has that been rolled out to all rigid and articulated heavy vehicles?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> Not all rigid. It's imminent. It is yet to be decided.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> Why did rigids get excluded?</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I'll see if I've got the full detail.</p> <p><b>Senator GALLACHER:</b> They make up the greater proportion of the fleet.</p> <p><b>Mr Foulds:</b> I just don't want to answer a question without looking at the detail. If I can't find it quickly, I'll have to take it on notice and try and get back to you later in the day.</p>		
169	215	PC&R	MCCARTHY	REGIONAL AUSTRALIA IMPACT STATEMENTS	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Could I take you to the regional Australia impact statements. Regarding the regional impact statements required for cabinet submissions, the department provides assistance to other agencies in developing those, doesn't it?</p> <p><b>Ms Taylor:</b> My understanding is that the regional impact statements that are attached to cabinet submissions are the responsibility of individual departments</p>	75-76 21/05/18	

					<p>bringing forward submissions to the cabinet.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What sort of assistance can the department give, though, for agencies completing the cabinet submissions?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> It is our portfolio coordination and research division. We can answer these questions now, Senator; they don't need to go to that division. If a department seeks some support in providing that regional impact statement, we will provide them with some support.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> What kind of support is that?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> They may need some support in helping identify the impacts on regional Australia. They might ask what would we typically look at in writing one of these reports. To be honest, it probably wouldn't be quite that basic, but it is effectively how to capture the regional impact and what is proportionate to the submission that is being brought forward. Is it going to have a very material impact, or is it a minor impact? We don't want to write long reports for a minor impact, but if it's a material impact there is an expectation that a serious analysis is done on the regional impact.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Does the department track this work? Is that what you would call your—</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Yes, it is our responsibility; or, if we feel a regional impact statement should have been prepared and it wasn't, we would make a comment that it should have been prepared.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> How many cabinet submissions in the past year has the department been asked for this kind of assistance by other agencies?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I will have to take that one on notice.</p>		
170	145	PC&R	MOORE	<p>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS</p>	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> and a number of departments, such as your own, have primary responsibility for some of the key goals. I want to find out exactly what your department is doing for the goals. I have to admit that I had great trouble finding a mention of them at all on your website. Google was my first port of call, and I couldn't find them, but that could be my poor performance on the website. What does taking primary responsibility mean to the department in this sense? Are you a member of all three committees that have been set up by DFAT and PM&amp;C?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We're mainly participating in the IDC. I'd have to take on notice exactly who is turning up to what meetings. If the material isn't on the website, it will be shortly, as we have been working with key stakeholders, including our colleagues in</p>	46 22/05/18	

					the states and territories, to give as meaningful a picture as possible as to where we're up to in terms of the goals.		
171	146	PC&R	MOORE	2020 SDG AGENDA	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> When did your department begin activity on the 2020 SDG agenda?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> People have changed positions here, so we need to take on notice when we first were engaged.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> You might want to take these all on notice, but if someone wants to jump in with some information, that would be great. I would like to know when the department was first engaged, what systems the department has put in place to communicate the SDG agenda to your staff and the various groups that work with you, and what consultative programs have gone on to engage people across the world. I'm particularly interested in the work with local government. I've seen some local government areas doing amazing work and taking leadership roles—the City of Melbourne and the City of Adelaide are examples, but some regional areas as well—but other places have no idea what I'm talking about when I mention it. I find that worrying, and I am interested to see if the local government part of your department has any role at all.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We have been working very closely with the Australian Local Government Association to support that kind of outreach to local governments, so we can expand upon what we've done with ALGA.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> If you can get any information on that as well, that would be great. My understanding in talking with Environment is that through their IDC process they have worked out that they're going to be linking their activities with their SDG agenda in their next annual report and corporate plan. It's probably a little easier for Environment because they have been working in this area for a long time, but has there been any consideration by your department of including the SDG agenda as a framework in those various publications such as your corporate plan and annual report?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We haven't been discussing that yet. I am aware that Environment is doing that, so we will be looking very closely at what Environment is doing and seeing how it would work in our context.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Can you give me any idea of what resources in the department work on these issues?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I think it would be easier to take that on notice.</p>	46-47 22/05/18	

172	306	PC&R	MOORE	MINISTERIAL DISCUSSIONS WITH THE DEPARTMENT ABOUT THE SDG AGENDA	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Have your ministers been engaged in any discussion with the department on this issue?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We've advised the Deputy Prime Minister of the work that we're doing in this area, and I'm not too sure if we've advised Minister Fletcher as well, given his interest, but we can take it on notice</p>	47 22/05/18	
173	147	PC&R	MOORE	SDG AGENDA	<p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> I'm trying to find stuff across the board on these issues. At any time in the information papers developed by the department for ministers, particularly the Deputy Prime Minister, to use in their speeches has there been a focus on linking activity to the SDG agenda? I've had a quick squiz and I can't find anything.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I'm not aware of anything we've done previously, but when the VNR goes out, that will give us a point in time to refer back to.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Good. Is there anything anyone would like to tell me, rather than my just talking at you?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> No, but we will take on notice and give you comprehensive advice.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> We'll have to leave Senator Moore with a positive impression of the committee.</p>	47 22/05/18	
174	148	PC&R	MOORE	COMPREHENSIVE BRIEF	<p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> Perhaps I can facilitate. This is probably the right place to ask for a comprehensive brief as a question on notice. As you indicate, this is across portfolios. I know skipping between Senate committees is how to keep yourself fit in opposition, but I undertake to provide an answer on notice that deals with a cross-governmental approach to the Sustainable Development Goals and the plan for each responsible department.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> That'd be fabulous. Minister—and this is totally inappropriate, Chair, so close your ears—can you give some thought to that in your own ministry. Senator McCarthy and I have spoken about things like the Closing the Gap program, where there is no mention of the SDGs, so I throw that at you to make a note of.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> The Closing the Gap program is unlikely under my leadership to provide Sustainable Development Goals as well. It's tough enough as it is. Obviously that's my view, but I'm there to be convinced.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> You could put it within the framework. Five of the goals relate directly to closing the gap.</p>	47 22/05/18	

175	149	PC&R	MOORE	SDG FRAMEWORK	<p><b>Dr Dolman:</b> Yes, we do have a number of links relating to various data initiatives. We're doing some work, for instance, on a transport and aviation satellite account, which is looking at the economic contribution of the transport industry and how you measure that—that's work with the United Nations, Canada, the US and the UK—and with ICAO, the international aviation organisation, looking at the contribution of the aviation industry. We're heading a working group that's working up the methodology for that. As part of that work we have close links with the Australian Bureau of Statistics and with our state government statistics agencies as well.</p> <p><b>Senator MOORE:</b> Would you mind, on notice again but not doing a huge exercise, seeing if any of those groups are talking the language of the SDGs, because what I am being told is that in other countries, and particularly in some of the organisations, they have now changed a lot of their programming and their strategic documents to have an SDG framework, and they're talking about that. It interests me whether that would happen. Senator Gallacher has told me that in the international road safety meetings he attends it's all framed within an SDG framework.</p> <p><b>Dr Dolman:</b> Sure, I would be happy to take that on notice. Road safety is another area where we collaborate internationally, and with our state governments, to collate data. We'll provide that.</p>	47-48 22/05/18	
176	150	PC&R	COLBECK	AVIATION FARE SETTING PRINCIPLES	<p><b>Senator COLBECK:</b> I was looking at your website and the services that you provide, or the projects that BITRE do. I have here some of the stats, so I do recognise the value in them. In the context of modelling, do you have any people who could provide the committee with some advice around aviation fare setting principles?</p> <p><b>Dr Dolman:</b> We monitor aviation fares and publish three indices each month that look at business class fares, economy fares and best discount fares, and show how they fluctuate over time. We have done some internal modelling work for our aviation and airports division looking at the drivers of airfares.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK:</b> You could become our second-best friends. Are there any specific trends coming through in that work?</p> <p><b>Dr Dolman:</b> Yes. We've also published some work on very long-term trends. The very long-term trend is for a reduction in airfares—particularly international airfares dropped very substantially with the introduction of larger planes late last century. Since then, they've continued to drop but more slowly. There's a whole</p>	51 22/05/18	

					<p>range of trends, depending on the scale you're looking at.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK:</b> Looking back, more particularly on a domestic basis, there would be seasonal trends that you could pick up across high-frequency routes and also regional routes?</p> <p><b>Dr Dolman:</b> There's very clearly seasonal trends, largely relating to demand. The obvious ones are the Christmas period, Easter holiday et cetera. Fares tend to increase during those periods. But there is a very clear seasonal pattern in the airfare data.</p> <p><b>Senator COLBECK:</b> You could give us some information around what you see as the drivers, particularly for the seasonal patterns?</p> <p><b>Dr Dolman:</b> Yes. It might be best if I took that on notice and gave you a more considered answer. Broadly, it relates to demand and there are other trends. There's capacity. Where an airline's providing a plane, they want to fill it. If you've got two airlines, there's competition and available capacity. Fuel is the other big one that fluctuates to drive some of those big trends. The patterns that you see are largely driven by changes in demand, seasonally.</p>		
177	293	PC&R	SINGH	POPULATION GROWTH IN WEST AND NORTH-WEST TASMANIA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the Department believe the declining jobs rate and poor economic growth in West and North-West Tasmania is in any way linked to the extremely low level of population growth in that region?</li> <li>2. Reports have described North-West population rate as “stalled”. Does the Department agree that this is the case?</li> <li>3. To what factors does the government attribute the low population growth in West and North-West Tasmania?</li> <li>4. What steps does the Federal government believe the State Liberal government should be taking to arrest and even reverse this population trend?</li> <li>5. Has the federal government made any suggestions on this issue to the State Liberal government?</li> <li>6. What steps is or will the Australian government be taking to improve population growth in West and North-West Tasmania?</li> <li>7. Does the government foresee any improvement in the short- or medium-term? How? When?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 30/05/18	
178	301	PC&R	MOORE	MENTIONING OF SDGS IN SPEECHES,	A request for the portfolio department with responsibility as a lead agency for particular Sustainable Development Goals(SDG), to provide information around any	WRITTEN	

				DOCUMENTS ETC. FOR THE COMING YEAR	public speeches referring to the SDGs, any plans to include the SDG agenda in annual reports, on the department's website and in work plans for the coming year.	5/06/18	
179	319	PC&R	GALLACHER	5G CONNECTIVITY FROM VEHICLES	Is there a taskforce or someone within the department looking into 5G connectivity from vehicle to vehicle and vehicle to intersection?	WRITTEN 6/06/18	
180	325	PC&R	STERLE	REGIONAL IMPACT STATEMENTS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For how many Cabinet Submissions has the Department assisted in the preparation of Regional Impact Statements in each of the following years: 2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 and 2014?</li> <li>2. How many times has the Department identified the need for a Regional Impact Statement in a Cabinet Submission?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 7/06/18	
181	342	PC&R	STERLE	PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many visits have there been to the Performance Framework Dashboard overall?</li> <li>• How many visits have there been in the past 4 weeks?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	
<b>Australian Transport Safety Bureau (3)</b>							
182	245	ATSB	O'SULLIVAN	IDENTIFICATION OF DRONES	<p><b>Mr Hood:</b> With respect to your drones question, we're doing our best to maintain the independence of our agency. The only input we made to CASA, in relation to the drones, was to suggest that the identification of drones would be very useful in the purpose of our air safety investigation were there to be a collision.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Is there technology involved on a commercial scale that would allow that to occur without, necessarily, having a number painted on the side?</p> <p><b>Mr Hood:</b> We did respond. The question was on notice. I have that somewhere, if I could get back to you on that one.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Yes.</p>	54 22/05/18	
183	246	ATSB	PATRICK	KPMG AUDIT REPORT	<p><b>Mr Hood:</b> There was also a program management board that oversaw the expenditure of the funds, and we had the processes and funds audited by KPMG. In terms of all the audit reports and the moneys in and out, that's certainly available if you'd like that.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Maybe it's worth tabling the KPMG report.</p>	58 22/05/18	

					<b>Mr Hood:</b> I'll take that on notice to provide that.		
184	366	ATSB	PATRICK	MH370	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ATSB has repeatedly said the satellite data shows MH370 was in a rapid and increasing rate of descent at the end. Larry Vance points out that in such cases, such as Swissair 111, the aircraft gets pulverised into two million smallish parts. How does the ATSB explain the fact that the flaperon and the flap were largely intact; there was nothing big or intact enough to be even recognisable as a flap or flaperon on Swissair 111?</li> <li>2. Does the ATSB think the flap and flaperon fell off due to "flutter" in a high speed dive? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If so, why was there no flutter damage to the leading edges?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Captain John Cox, a leading air crash investigator, says this of the satellite data when it comes to the speed of descent:                      The ATSB takes BFO data and derives a vertical profile between the 6th and 7th arc. This is very high (almost too high) indicating a extremely steep descent. However the 7th exchange is a "Power Up" exchange and the vertical information is not as accurate. Looking at the 1st Arc exchange, which was also a "Power Up" exchange the vertical date was determined to be spurious or so inaccurate it was not considered valid. If during a "Power Up" exchange the vertical data is less accurate then the 7th Arc exchange must be viewed with the same concern. Therefore, the vertical BFO derived data is less credible than other data points. This would support Larry's theory and weaken the ATSB position. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is Captain Cox wrong, and if so, why?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
<b>Airservices Australia (22)</b>							
185	247	Airservices	COLBECK	REACTIVATION OF VOR	<p><b>Senator COLBECK:</b> And you haven't reactivated any of the other navigational aids or changed any of the other approaches?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> There is a ground based navigation aid called a VHF omni-direction range, currently known as a VOR. It is a ground based aid that is at the airport. We've had to turn that and relocate it due to the runway extension, because of where it was. That has been relocated and now we're working through its future because of our move to satellite based navigation—and having a backup navaid network—and what role it continues to play. But it was turned off and moved as a result of the runway extension.</p>	66-67 22/05/18	

					<p><b>Senator COLBECK:</b> Has it been reactivated?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> I have to take it on notice, because there's a time you have it on and you're testing versus when you have it operational, and I'm not quite across that.</p>		
186	248	Airservices	PATRICK	AIRSERVICES CHARGES	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> You're a monopoly supplier, so I guess you'll have no problems tendering to the committee what the charge rates are for each regional airport around Australia.</p> <p><b>Mr Logan:</b> Absolutely.</p>	70	22/05/18
187	249	Airservices	MCKIM	LOSS OF SEPARATION AT HOBART AIRPORT AND GO AROUNDS	<p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No. We did this morning on questions that we could have got today referencing the safety incidents from the article of 19 May.</p> <p><b>Senator MCKIM:</b> By the way, do you intend to provide this to the community as part of the consultation?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Probably not this particular chart, but a chart that would depend on what we're actually trying to consult with the community on.</p> <p><b>Senator MCKIM:</b> I've just sent it down to my office, so it's fair to say they're going to have a look at it very soon if they haven't already. I just want to ask about safety first. We all want to see safe airports; I'm sure we can all agree on that. Can you just confirm, firstly, there were no loss of separation incidents at Hobart airport in the nine years prior to the changes?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No, I can't confirm that. I would say that there were; however, I'll have to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator MCKIM:</b> Could you provide that on notice to the committee, please.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Absolutely.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator MCKIM:</b> Thanks for that. How does that compare to perhaps a similar period of time prior to the changes?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Prior to the changes, we did a comparison. We had a look at the same period of time but 12 months prior. There were not the two loss of separation events or a loss of separation assurance event during that time but, as I was saying to Senator Colbeck, we did see a reduction in the number of go-arounds.</p> <p><b>Senator MCKIM:</b> Post the implementation of the change?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Post the implementation. In the incidents we saw beforehand, we saw more go-arounds than we did in this period after the implementation.</p>	71-72	22/05/18

					<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Do you have the figures for that?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Off the top of my head, it was 27 prior and 22 after; it was a difference of five.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> So a reduction of five for the same period in the previous year?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Correct.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Do you have the data for the same period in the previous years?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> We can do that. I don't have it off the top of my head, but we can provide that.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Maybe going back five years, if that's data that you keep. It's your assertion that the changes have made the Hobart airport safer—is that right?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> They improved the safety of flying in and out of Hobart airport, yes.</p>		
188	251	Airservices	MCKIM	INTERNAL REVIEW OF THE NEW FLIGHT PATHS	<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Have you done any internal review that found, at least in part, that the new flight paths were neither safer nor more efficient?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Can I ask you to take that on notice, and maybe you can have a look?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes, we will, but nothing's come to our attention that it's not safer. But whether there's something in there—</p>	73 22/05/18	
189	252	Airservices	MCKIM	CONSULTATION WITH AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS AND NUMBER OF CONSULTED STAFF	<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> Is it your contention that air traffic control staff at Hobart were also thoroughly consulted about the change?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The air traffic control staff would have been consulted in our normal change process that we do for any procedures or air route changes within the operation.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> All of them? Does that include all air traffic controllers or a part?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Technically, they wouldn't be operating under their licence if they weren't deemed to be competent or understand the changes that they shouldn't be—</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> No, I'm asking about the consultation.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> There's a normal change process that we have in the operations. That would have been carried out.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> I'm asking: did that normal change process involve consulting all air traffic control staff at Hobart about the change?</p>	73-74 22/05/18	

					<p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> It would depend on your definition of 'consultation'. I'm not trying to be—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Mr Harfield, it's a pretty simple question. You've got X number of air traffic controllers; you've got a change coming down the pike; you have processes of consultation. The senator's question is quite clear.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No, no. The thing is that they would be made aware of the change, and they would have—</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> That's not consultation. The burden of his question is consultation.</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> So they would have been made aware through our normal operational change processes, and they would have had the ability to object to the change or raise any issues that they had with the change, which is our normal process—</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> After the change had been made?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> No, Senator. Our requirements are that we do a safety assessment and people have the ability to raise issues associated with that safety assessment, and that's our normal operational change process.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> That includes all air traffic controllers in Hobart?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> There is an ability for all controllers—the reason I'm saying that is that I can't say that all controllers were applied, but it's available to them. I'd have to take it on notice to find what the process actually was.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> The normal process is that somebody from Hobart would have been involved in that.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> There we go.</p> <p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> I understand that to be true, but 'somebody' is obviously nowhere near all of the control staff at Hobart. Perhaps I could just ask you to take on notice how many of the air traffic control staff at Hobart were consulted and the nature of that consultation. Can you take that on notice?</p> <p><b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.</p>		
190	254	Airservices	MCKIM	ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTIONS AT HOBART AIRPORT	<p><b>Senator McKIM:</b> I'm aware my time's up, but, as I have other commitments in other committees, the chair's very kindly allowed me just a couple more questions. Was the new route design based on a trial at Albury Airport? If so, why was that, given that Albury's got a much lower level of traffic than Hobart and has almost no</p>	74 22/05/18	

					<p>jet traffic?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> No, it wasn't.  <b>Senator McKIM:</b> Isn't it the case that some air traffic controllers in Hobart actually made alternative suggestions that weren't accepted—  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I'm unaware of that, but I'll take that on notice.  <b>Senator McKIM:</b> thanks—and also that workload stress on Hobart controllers actually was raised as part of a safety assessment by the tower supervisor at Hobart?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I'll take that on notice.</p>		
191	255	Airservices	KETTER	PASSENGER THRESHOLD AT WHITSUNDAY COAST AIRPORT	<p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> Can you tell me: when did the Whitsunday Coast Airport meet the 350,000 passenger threshold?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I'd have to take on notice the exact month it ticked over, but it's been within the last 12 months.  <b>Senator KETTER:</b> Would somewhere around June 2017 be about right?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Yes.  <b>Senator KETTER:</b> That was last financial year.  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> Correct.</p>	75 22/05/18	
192	256	Airservices	KETTER	NUMBER OF ARFFS FIRE STATIONS BUILT IN THE LAST FIVE TO 10 YEARS	<p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> Can you tell me—and you might want to take this on notice—how many ARFFS fire stations Airservices has built in the last five to 10 years?  <b>Mr Harfield:</b> I'll take that on notice, but it's in the vicinity of five to six. But I'll get that clarified on notice.</p>	76 22/05/18	
193	297	Airservices	DUNIAM	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DECISION-MAKING PROCESS	<p>Airservices stated in its evidence that it complied with its obligations under the EPBC Act when implementing the new paths. However, according to the Air Noise Ombudsman's report, Airservices said that its 'environmental assessment' report should not be considered as a record of its decision-making process in this regard. Please provide a record of the environmental assessment decision-making process which demonstrates how Airservices met its legal obligations to determine the significance of the impact of the new flight paths within the meaning of the EPBC Act.</p>	WRITTEN 4/05/18	
194	298	Airservices	DUNIAM	GO AROUNDS	<p>1. Airservices stated in its evidence that the number of 'go arounds' (missed approaches) had reduced by 5 compared with the same period in the previous</p>	WRITTEN	

					<p>year to illustrate that safety has been improved by the new paths. However, I understand that Airservices does not classify go-arounds as a safety breach. For example, regarding go-arounds, I note that its website states 'This standard manoeuvre does not constitute any sort of emergency or threat to safety'. Please advise why you used these incidents as a measure of safety performance.</p> <p>2. Regarding the period you used as the baseline for comparison of go-arounds at Hobart in your evidence, is it the case that construction works had made the runway approximately 500m shorter at that time, thereby increasing the likelihood of go arounds, making this an inappropriate comparison?</p>	4/05/18	
195	299	Airservices	DUNIAM	AIRCRAFT HEIGHT REQUIREMENT INCIDENTS	<p>1. From safety data obtained from Airservices under the Freedom of Information Act, I note that there appears to have been a pattern of aircraft failing to meet the appropriate height requirements of the new paths (particularly SIDs), including the two 'loss of separation' and one 'loss of separation assurance' incidents referred to in your evidence. These appear to involve different types of aircraft and presumably different airlines. Can you confirm whether all of these incidents are 'pilot attributable' and if not, please provide the cause of the incidents from September 2017 to March 2018</p> <p>2. Can you also please provide dates and explanations of similar incidents (i.e. where an aircraft has failed to comply with the height requirements of the SIDs or STARs) post-16 March 2018.</p>	WRITTEN 4/05/18	
196	367	Airservices	RHIANNON	PFAS LEVELS	<p>With regard to Airservices' Information Sheet titled Gold Coast Airport and firefighting foam:</p> <p>Pg.2 of the attachment re the 2016 investigation of migration pathways at the airport boundary states, "PFAS levels within the airport boundary were below the criteria..."</p> <p>However the 2016 site investigation lab results reveal PFOS levels of groundwater in the eastern boundary area of GCA at 8.4 ug/L, substantially above criteria levels. The groundwater PFOS sample on the western boundary was 1.39 ug/L, also above a number of criteria levels. Further, a review of lab data a number of surface and groundwater sampling results within the airport site were above criteria levels.</p> <p>a. Given the actual findings as summarised above, which does the document state that "PFAS levels within the boundary were below the criteria?"</p>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	

					b. What consideration has been given to the surface and groundwater that is mobile and extensively spreads the PFAS contamination?		
197	368	Airservices	RHIANNON	TESTING OF PORE-WATER	The 2017 Biota Report (Cobaki Broadwater) states that testing of pore-water detected “no PFAS” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Did any laboratory results find above criteria levels, and if so why does the report state no PFAS was found in pore-water?</li> <li>b. Why are pore-water samples not referenced in the body of the report?</li> <li>c. Did sediment sampling undertaken for this 2017 investigation include any samples along the shoreline of the airport site and Cobaki Broadwater where the surface and groundwater discharge interface occurs? If not, why not?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
198	369	Airservices	RHIANNON	PFAS CONTAMINATION OF GROUNDWATER	Why does reference to the 2008 investigation make no mention of the PFAS contamination of groundwater, given lab results revealing PFOS levels at 110-470 ug/L?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
199	370	Airservices	RHIANNON	AECOM 2011 INVESTIGATION	Why is no reference made to the AECOM 2011, Parsons Brinkerhoff 2014 and 2015 PFAS investigation on GCA, or PFAS testings undertaken 2010-2015? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is it correct these investigations reveal the extraordinary fluctuations of PFOS of 3.36-2280 ug/L and particularly during the 2yr period 2012-2014 did not fall below 1280 ug/L.</li> <li>b. Is it correct the AECOM 2011 investigation revealed the PFOS surface water levels of Coolangatta Creek within GCA was up to 26.4 ug/L and PFOS in sediment up to 4.78mg/kg.</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
200	371	Airservices	RHIANNON	HEXANE CHEMICAL	What consideration is being given to revelations of the hexane chemical and its human health risks? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is this being considered as a contaminant of the PFAS chemicals given the lab results of the 2016 investigation reveal PFHxS levels of groundwater at 22.5 ug/L? If not, why not?</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
201	372	Airservices	RHIANNON	2016 AND 2017 INVESTIGATIONS OF PFOS LEVELS ON THE	What is the response to concerns that the 2016 and 2017 investigations of PFOS levels on the Gold Coast Airport have been very limited with significant limitations including only one-off sampling and no validation of data or seasonal/climate	WRITTEN 12/06/18	

				GOLD COAST AIRPORT	variational data?		
202	373	Airservices	RHIANNON	TESTING DONE ON THE PRIMARY DRAINAGE NETWORK AND DISCHARGE POINT AT THE COBAKI BROADWATER	Please detail the consideration and testing done on the primary drainage network conduit of the PFAS contamination from the primary source site and its discharge point to the Cobaki Broadwater.	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
203	374	Airservices	RHIANNON	PFAS CONTAMINATION INVESTIGATION AT GOLD COAST AIRPORT	When is the detailed PFAS contamination investigation to commence at Gold Coast Airport (GCA)?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
204	375	Airservices	RHIANNON	CONSULTATION/INPUT FOR THE SITE INVESTIGATION AT GOLD COAST AIRPORT	Has the detailed site investigation at GCA been subject to consultation/input from NSW and Qld State and Local authorities and community representatives? If not, will it be?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
205	376	Airservices	RHIANNON	MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR PFAS CONTAMINATION AT GOLD COAST AIRPORT	Has Airservices developed its management strategies for containment and remediation of PFAS contamination at GCA?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
206	377	Airservices	RHIANNON	AECOM 2011 REPORTS	Is it possible to obtain the AECOM 2011, Parsons Brinkerhoff 2014 and 2015 PFAS investigation reports for GCA	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
<b>Civil Aviation Safety Authority (4)</b>							
207	236	CASA	O'SULLIVAN	INCIDENT FILE	<b>Senator PATRICK:</b> So these photographs are of the state of a tyre for a Qantas aircraft that landed in Brisbane. It was transiting through Townsville, this was in 2016, and the log of events shows that, due to insufficient manpower available to carry out the wheel change, the aircraft was sent on: 'The tyre may continue in service without safety concerns but must be replaced at the next check.' The bottom line is that there were not enough engineers on the ground to change the	80-81 22/05/18	

					<p>tyre, so they sent the aircraft on to the next location—possibly under commercial pressure; I don't understand the reasons why. But you would I'm sure appreciate, Mr Carmody, the seriousness of having an aircraft take off with a tyre in that state, noting in extremis the Concorde, when it took off from Paris, shed a tyre which went through the fuel tanks, with a tragedy at the end of that. So I suspect you would be concerned about an aircraft that might take off with a tyre like that?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I'm aware of the matter because it was 18 months ago. It's been referred to us. It's been referred to the Industry Complaints Commissioner, and the Industry Complaints Commissioner has reviewed the matter. So it's gone through our internal processes. I will make a couple of points: I saw the document, which hasn't been tabled but which you read out, that the tyre was released. So an engineer certified that the tyre was okay. I don't know, therefore, what damage occurred on subsequent landing. I assume that's not take-off damage; that's landing damage. An engineer certified it was suitable for take-off.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I've talked to a number of engineers who have suggested that that sort of damage to a tyre couldn't happen on a single landing; you might get an isolated location; the point of the two photographs is they show that it's all around the tyre. But, in general, would that not concern you at all?</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I was concerned, but, as I said, the matter was raised, it went to the independent Industry Complaints Commissioner and it was reviewed. So, as far as I'm concerned, any matters have been resolved.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> That's noted.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> There is a completely independent mechanism; it's independent of me.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> I appreciate that. I often have a plumber come to my house and the tap is still leaking afterwards. If that's the case, then I'd be concerned about the independence or the attention paid by an independent—</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Can I just stop, because I think there is a step in the middle that you are missing. That is that this gets investigated by CASA, and in this instance it was. There were concerns over the investigation and it then went on to the complaints commissioner. The role of the complaints commissioner is not to conduct an investigation. The complaint was that CASA had not conducted its job properly.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> So it was investigated by CASA and it was then peer reviewed by another office, so a different part of the organisation, to see whether the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>investigation was well founded, which we do quite often in contentious cases. We put inspectors from a different location on to review the matter so that we have a different set of eyes—an independent set of eyes. That was done in the process. Then it went to the industry complaints commissioner.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> We could spar around all day here—I hope I don't mow your lawn, Senator—I'd like you to take on notice to supply the committee with the entire file, cover to cover: any artefacts; any photographs; any interviews, whether audio or otherwise; any files that are held, IT, however it does. You know the drill. From A to Z, supply it to the committee so that we can have a look at this.</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Certainly, Senator.</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> Can I just get a point of clarification. For the interests of completeness, the body is slightly independent from you. So the material of the committee you are going to provide includes their deliberations as well?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Absolutely.</p> <p><b>Senator Scullion:</b> Just for clarification.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Thank you for that, Minister—A to Z.</p>		
208	307	CASA	PATRICK	TCAS INCIDENT ON A QANTAS FLIGHT	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I'll mention another incident as well that you are probably aware of, a TCAS incident on a Qantas flight. The aircraft arrived into Sydney on 19 November 2016. The tech crew reported that, 'TCAS: some targets displayed in wrong position last three sectors—that is, aircraft landing in Melbourne appeared 90 degrees out on final.' Are you familiar with or have you heard—</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> I'll have to take that on notice. I haven't got the documentation in front of me.</p>	81 22/05/18	
209	237	CASA	PATRICK	INVESTIGATION AND TCAS MATTER	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> There's a detailed set of concerns that the federation has laid out as to what did not occur in the investigation of the tyre matter and in the TCAS matter, and hence the relation to what I've tendered to the committee. I don't know where we go from here, Chair. I'm disturbed by that and maybe they need some time to look at it and respond. Could we also get the TCAS file?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> I'm satisfied that Mr Carmody and his team will mull over this for a little bit, and we'd look forward to a further conversation soon and not after waiting for next estimates. When you think you've satisfactorily had a look and talked to the commissioner, you might contact Dr Thompson and we can just have a meeting for</p>	84 22/05/18	

					<p>15 minutes—</p> <p><b>Mr Carmody:</b> Chair, that would be fine. I'd also be happy to provide you with a specific written response on the issues that you've raised surrounding this so you would have something formal, if that would suit the committee as well?</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> Yes, I think that's suitable for the committee.</p>		
210	238	CASA	KETTER	MANPOWER SHORTAGES	<p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> I have a follow-up question. The issue that gave rise to the problem is the manpower shortage at Townsville Airport, as I understand it. Was that investigated as part of CASA's processes, and what was the result of that? Has that been rectified?</p> <p><b>Mr Crawford:</b> That would ultimately be a matter for the SMS at Qantas. Their safety management system should follow-up on that. What we do is we review the effectiveness of their SMS.</p> <p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> Sorry, I can't hear you, Mr Crawford.</p> <p><b>Mr Crawford:</b> That should have been followed up with the operator's safety management system. What we do is we do surveillance on the operator; we look at the effectiveness of their safety management system.</p> <p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> Is the answer to my question that—</p> <p><b>Mr Crawford:</b> The issue is that, at the end of the day, we cannot determine from the photograph taken at the other airport whether that tyre was serviceable or not. We can't by looking at that photograph. But the maintenance engineer says that the tyre was safe to go, so he is saying it was serviceable. That's what we have to work with.</p> <p><b>Senator KETTER:</b> That's not the issue I'm raising. I'm talking about the assertion in that log that there were manpower shortages which gave rise to the fact that the tyre couldn't be changed.</p> <p><b>Mr Crawford:</b> We'll take that on notice.</p>	84	22/05/18
<b>Aviation and Airports (9)</b>							
211	205	AAA	O'SULLIVAN	CHICAGO CONVENTION AND THE GENEVA CONVENTION	<p><b>CHAIR:</b> The Geneva convention that the senator's referring to, does that cover aviation as well?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> That would be the Chicago convention, I think.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> The Chicago amendment to the Geneva convention?</p>	45	22/05/18

					<p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> I was going to make the point that we've only been a signatory with the conventions for five or six seven years.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We've been a signatory to the Chicago convention for far longer than that. If I can take that on notice, I will.</p> <p><b>CHAIR:</b> You should take it on notice. I've spent 20 years investigating catastrophic air crashes all around the world. My memory is that we signed up after the Qantas QF52 incident in Western Australia. Take it on board because, if it is the same, it wouldn't affect it. We've all had our licences recognised for 20 or 30 years, which would proceed that. Sorry, Senator McCarthy.</p>		
212	199	AAA	PATRICK	ITS REVIEW	<p><b>Ms Spence:</b> The ITS was part of our portfolio responsibility, so yes.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I note that that report is not going to be released, and I understand why that might be. Noting it's a legacy report, does your department still hold the conch in respect of that report?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> No, that would be a matter for Home Affairs.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> It's not been made public, and I completely understand the security reasons for that. But the cost reasons or the cost details associated with that would surely be releasable; I will perhaps seek that through other means. Did you provide any input to that review that related to cost?</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> No. It was done by the ITS. I think the Office of Transport Security would have provided limited secretariat support for the ITS as he undertook the review. I don't recall any specific input to it beyond the secretariat support that would have been provided.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Can you check that on notice, just to confirm? You don't seem 100 per cent sure—maybe 99 per cent!</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> Of course.</p>	91 22/05/18	
213	200	AAA	PATRICK	OPERATING COST FOR SCREENING	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I'm putting to you that the reason for not releasing that report relates to security and not to cost. I typically have about 10 FOIs on foot at any particular time. I've got two in the AAT at the moment: one appealed by the department, one appealed by me. I'm very familiar with that space. I probably will FOI that document, seeking only the information relating to cost, and I'm pretty confident I'll get that, unless there's some real commercial sensitivities in there. There was a different regime between the Senate and FOI. Rather than FOI-ing you,</p>	91-92 22/05/18	

					<p>can I ask you to table some of the material that you may have provided to the minister, specifically in relation to the costs associated with screening. In fact, I'm not interested in the equipment cost because that's actually been covered; I'm interested in the operating costs and what recommendations you may have or advice you may have given in relation to costs.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We'll take that on notice. I'll have to go and consult with my colleagues. Because the responsibility—</p> <p>...</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> We'll take that on notice and try and sort out what we can.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> I'm interested in the temporal position of the government over time, and we have obviously got to a different spot. I have asked Home Affairs about that. That would be appreciated.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> Let's just be crystal clear what you seek. You seek our advice on the costs of screening equipment?</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> No, because, in this instance, the \$50 million covers the cost of that equipment, so that's no burden to the airports. I'm interested in advice or data you have around the operating costs. You might have done analysis that said the impact of that will be X number of dollars on a terminal charge or something like that.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I'm happy to take that on notice.</p>		
214	201	AAA	PATRICK	PUBLIC SAFETY ZONES AROUND SYNDEY AIRPORT	<p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> Are you looking at public safety zones around Sydney Airport?</p> <p><b>Mr McRandle:</b> We're looking at public safety zones generally across Australian airports as part of the National Airports Safeguarding Framework. A consultation process commenced a little over a week ago with the community around public safety zones. It will include all airports. Queensland has already incorporated the public safety zone approach to their airports. There are others around Australia that haven't adopted it.</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> That's on your website, is it?</p> <p><b>Mr McRandle:</b> It is on our website.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> We can send the link to the secretariat if that would help?</p> <p><b>Senator PATRICK:</b> That might be helpful, and I'm happy to help advertise that.</p>	92	22/05/18
215	202	AAA	RICE	COMPLETED MDB	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> They're concerned about what the potential noise and pollution</p>	92	

				STUDIES	<p>impacts are going to be of the additional runway. They are also concerned that having 60 days to respond, given this is going to be a rather substantial piece of work, is going to be very tight for them. Are you aware if any of the MDB studies have been completed and whether it will be possible to release them earlier than that July-August period?</p> <p><b>Ms Horrocks:</b> From memory, a number of the studies—and I'd have to go back and check on notice exactly which ones—have been released through the community aviation consultation group, which is the community forum, and they have been releasing them as they become complete so they've been passed through. I can get you, on notice, a list of which ones have actually been released.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> And whether there will be more that are going to be released prior to that July-August date?</p> <p><b>Ms Horrocks:</b> Yes.</p>	22/05/18	
216	203	AAA	RICE	CONSIDERATION OF EXPOSURE DRAFT	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Was the consideration of the exposure draft all done in-house or did you engage any external reviewers to look at it?</p> <p><b>Ms Horrocks:</b> Do you mean apart from the agencies—the ones that I just said? We reviewed it internally, yes, and then we circulated it to the agencies, as I mentioned.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Which agencies was it circulated to for getting feedback from?</p> <p><b>Ms Horrocks:</b> CASA, Airservices and the environment department.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> When was the exposure draft given to you?</p> <p><b>Ms Horrocks:</b> About a month—six to eight weeks ago. We need to take that on notice.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Have you sent your feedback to the—</p> <p><b>Ms Horrocks:</b> That's correct.</p> <p><b>Senator RICE:</b> So you turned that around in a two-month period?</p> <p><b>Ms Horrocks:</b> Six to eight weeks, yes.</p>	93 22/05/18	
217	204	AAA	RICE	PERMANENT NOISE MONITORING AT SECONDARY AIRPORTS	<p><b>Senator RICE:</b> Are you able to tell me whether there's any permanent noise monitoring at any of these secondary airports? I understand there is around the airports. I can put it on notice to Airservices if you aren't able to tell me.</p> <p><b>Ms Spence:</b> I don't think we've got it easily to hand, but we can take that on notice and work with Airservices Australia.</p>	94 22/05/18	

218	330	AAA	MOORE	CODESHARE AGREEMENT BETWEEN QANTAS AND AIR NEW ZEALAND	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When did the Department become aware of the proposed codeshare arrangement (“the agreement”) between Qantas and Air New Zealand (“the parties”)?</li> <li>2. How did the Department become aware of the agreement?</li> <li>3. Has the Department met with either of the parties and if so when and between whom did the meetings take place – please include any phone calls, teleconferences and video conferences?</li> <li>4. Has the Department been provided with any written material (including in electronic form) regarding the agreement – if so, can it be provided to the Committee?</li> <li>5. Has the Department discussed the agreement with the New Zealand Ministry of Transport, the ACCC, other relevant New Zealand government agencies, or any other Commonwealth agencies, Ministers or Ministerial advisors and if so when and who was involved in the discussions? Did other parties express any view on the agreement and if so what?</li> <li>6. Does the Department consider the agreement may lessen competition and if so how and in relation to what markets?</li> <li>7. Does the Department consider the agreement will impact on the ability to compete either in Australian or trans-Tasman markets and if so how?</li> <li>8. Does the Department consider the proposal has any public benefits and if so what?</li> <li>9. Does the Department consider the agreement may require authorisation under section 88 of the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth).</li> <li>10. Does the Department consider the agreement will further the Government’s aviation policy objectives and if so how? If not, why not?</li> <li>11. Does the Department intend undertaking any action in relation to the agreement and if so what?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 5/06/18	
219	382	AAA	MOORE	CODESHARE AGREEMENT – MINISTER	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When did the Minister become aware of the proposed codeshare arrangement (“the agreement”) between Qantas and Air New Zealand (“the parties”)?</li> <li>2. How did the Minister become aware of the agreement?</li> <li>3. Has the Minister or his office met with either of the parties and if so when and between whom did the meetings take place – please include any phone calls, teleconferences and video conferences?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 5/06/18	

					<p>4. Has the Minister or his office been provided with any written material (including in electronic form) regarding the agreement – if so, can it be provided to the Committee?</p> <p>5. Has the Minister or his office discussed the agreement with any other Australian or New Zealand Ministers or their offices? Did other parties express any view on the agreement and if so what?</p> <p>6. Does the Minister consider the agreement will further the Government’s aviation policy objectives and if so how? If not, why not?</p> <p>7. Does the Minister intend undertaking any action in relation to the agreement and if so what?</p>		
<b>National Capital Authority (1)</b>							
220	294	NCA	MCCARTHY	ACT LIGHT RAIL PROJECT	<p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Thank you for that, Dr Kennedy. Given the clear congestion and productivity benefits of light rail, can you confirm the territory will not be charged licence fees for building valuable infrastructure on or alongside Commonwealth roads and land and past many Commonwealth Public Service agencies?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> This might be one that we need to get the NCA—the National Capital Authority—in for, to take questions of detail around those sorts of things. I'm happy to take these questions on notice. I note they're not scheduled to appear this time.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> By all means, take the questions on notice and we'll see how we go.</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> I'll take them on behalf of the NCA. We'll work together with them to provide answers for the committee.</p> <p><b>Senator McCARTHY:</b> Have you been asked by government to conduct or have you, of your own volition, conducted any assessment of stage 2 of the ACT's light rail project?</p> <p><b>Dr Kennedy:</b> The department is aware of stage 2 of the light rail project, and it is aware of conversations going on between the NCA and the ACT government, but as far as I'm aware, and I don't have the relevant officials here, those conversations are between those two parties. However, I'll report back to you on notice on the full extent of those conversations.</p>	14 22/05/18	

Corporate Services (1)								
221	381	CORP	PATRICK	QANTAS AND VIRGIN SPLIT	<p>For FY 16/17:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please provide details of the Qantas/Virgin split for official travel in terms of:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Total number of tickets</li> <li>b. Total value spent for official travel?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. In the event there is a disparity of greater than 65/35 in the split (either way), please provide a detailed reasons for the split in the context of a lowest practical fare policy.</li> <li>3. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from only the Qantas Chairman’s Lounge?                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Could you please provide a breakdown of the travel for each of those individuals between Qantas and Virgin?</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from only Virgin’s The Club?                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Could you please provide a breakdown of the travel for each of those individuals between Qantas and Virgin?</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. How many people in your organisation have been invited to (on the basis of their official position), and accepted, memberships from both the Qantas Chairman’s Lounge and Virgin’s The Club?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 12/06/18		
Western Sydney Unit (11)								
222	332	WSU	STERLE	WESTERN SYDNEY CITY DEAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the process for dividing the \$150 million for the Western Parkland Liveability program between the councils? What set of criteria has been developed? Please provide</li> <li>• What processes around governance are in place to oversee the successful implementation of the Western Sydney City Deal?</li> <li>• How regularly do the Councils meet with the State Government and Federal Government to discuss the City Deal? Please detail dates of all meetings that have occurred since the City Deal was signed in March. Is there a forward</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18		

					<p>meeting schedule? Please provide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What role will the Greater Sydney Commission play in the delivery of the Western Sydney City Deal? How regularly does it meet with the local councils to discuss this? Please provide dates.</li> <li>• What progress has been made on the following commitments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Establishing an Indigenous Business Hub in the Western City;</li> <li>○ Immediate commencement of the design and investment case for the North South Rail Link (including the South West Rail Link);</li> <li>○ Establishment of the Western Sydney Development Authority;</li> <li>○ Establishment of the Western Sydney Investment Attraction Office;</li> <li>○ Establishment of the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) Quality and Safeguards Commission in Penrith;</li> <li>○ The release of the Penrith Multi-User Depot for sale;</li> <li>○ Establishment of the Skills Exchange near the Western Sydney Airport;</li> <li>○ Provide \$60 million, with \$30 million from councils, to establish a hallmark Western Parkland City Liveability Program;</li> <li>○ Develop a Strategic Assessment under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) to protect the environment and streamline environmental approvals for development;</li> <li>○ Undertake land use and infrastructure planning for a new Growth Area for the Greater Penrith to Eastern Creek corridor, and; Develop transport and water infrastructure models to innovatively plan for future infrastructure needs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Please provide an implementation timeline for each of these.</p>		
223	333	WSU	STERLE	WESTERN SYDNEY CITY DEAL – HOUSING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How exactly will the allocated \$15.0 million ‘accelerate planning and zoning reforms to support housing supply in Western Sydney’ as it is stated in the Budget?</li> <li>• What is the timetable for the distribution of those funds? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will they be released as a one-off payment, or by other arrangement?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Will there be any thresholds or requirements that need to be met prior to</li> </ul>	WRITTEN 8/06/18	

					<p>release of funds?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be any specific targets to improve housing affordability i.e. social housing targets, affordable housing targets? What consideration is being given to this?</li> <li>• What process will be in place to verify improvements in planning and zoning against the outcomes as nominated in the deal, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The delivery of new housing?</li> <li>b. Improved housing affordability?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
224	353	WSU	RICE	AVIATION SAFETY	<p>With reference to the response received to question SQ18-000116 put in Additional Estimates this year, referring to ‘the highest safety standards to ensure Australia’s long tradition of world-leading aviation safety is maintained’:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What are the specific standards applicable?</li> <li>ii. Where are they published?</li> <li>iii. How do these standards ensure that aircraft are not within 2000ft of each other?</li> </ol>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
225	354	WSU	RICE	NIGHT-TIME NOISE AND HEAD TO HEAD OPERATIONS AT WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In responding to SQ18-000117 put in Additional Estimates, it was stated that ‘head to head’ operations to and from the south-west of Western Sydney Airport ‘would minimise night-time noise in built-up residential areas’. How will night-time noise be measured? And will it include effective perceived noise level or annoyance level as a measure of impact on amenity?</li> <li>2. Regarding noise impacts of proposed night-time operations of Western Sydney Airport: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. What steps are to be taken to minimise noise impacts?</li> <li>ii. How will they ensure communities are not subjected to disruptive night-time noise, e.g. 10 dBa above background noise</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Noting that Sydney Airport has parallel runways and access to Botany Bay and even there the ‘head to head’ mode is only used occasionally, is it not the case that ‘head to head’ operations at Western Sydney Airport would pose a significant risk to safety because the site will not have parallel runways for at least the first 25 years of its operations and does not have access to a large body of water such as a bay or a harbour? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Given the above constraints, does this mean that proposed night-</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	WRITTEN 12/06/18	

					time noise mitigation options are significantly impeded by the unsuitability and risks of ‘head to head’ operations at WSA?		
226	355	WSU	RICE	NOISE FROM FLYOVERS FROM WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT	Noting that existing noise from daily flyovers over Blacktown and the Hills Shire to and from Sydney Airport is loud, regular, and well above ambient noise levels, how will aircraft noise be mitigated from flyovers to and from Western Sydney Airport over Blacktown and the Hills Shire throughout the day and evening?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
227	356	WSU	RICE	REPRESENTATIVES ON FOWSA	Given the expected impacts on Blacktown and the Hills Shire, why are there no community representatives from Blacktown and the Hills Shire on the Forum on Western Sydney Airport (FOWSA)? Why were two residents from the Hills Shire who asked to be on FOWSA rejected?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
228	359	WSU	RICE	TENDERING PROCESSES FOR WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT	Regarding the tendering processes for Western Sydney Airport, what are the detailed design specifications that a tenderer will use to inform their costings?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
229	360	WSU	RICE	GOVERNANCE OF WSA CO	Regarding the governance of Western Sydney Airport Co: i. Who are the shareholders from Government? ii. Are there directors on the Board from Government? If so, who?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
230	361	WSU	RICE	WSA BUSINESS CASE	1. Noting there is a ‘public version’ of the Western Sydney Airport business case available online: i. What is not included in that ‘public’ version? ii. Why is a full version of the business case not publicly available? 2. With reference to the business case for WSA and its federal funding commitment, does the Government consider externalities imposed by the airport build and operation in assessing the overall cost of the project on the Australian taxpayer? If so, how?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
231	362	WSU	RICE	BUDGET FOR WSA CO	How much is allocated in the budget for WSA Co this year and for future years?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
232	364	WSU	RICE	APPROVAL OF THE	According to Section 2.2.3 ‘Runway Modes of Operation’, Page 43 of the 2016 Draft	WRITTEN	

				2016 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT	EIS, "To manage noise impacts, a third operating mode, 'head to head'...will be thoroughly evaluated through further detailed assessment to determine the preference for such an operating mode prior to commencement operations." What justification was provided by the Minister for the Environment, Josh Frydenberg, for approval of the 2016 Environmental Impact Statement for Western Sydney Airport, when a key claim that it has in relation to the mitigation of noise has not been 'thoroughly evaluated'?	12/06/18	
<b>WSA Co (3)</b>							
233	357	WSA Co	RICE	PREVENTION OF SURFACE BREAK-UP AT BADGERYS CREEK	Noting the geology of the Badgerys Creek includes Bringelly shale, what specifications were included in the tender documents related to the geological make-up and necessary concrete/other augmentation to prevent surface break-up when aircraft land? What provisions are in place to ensure unexpected costs associated with geological considerations or remediation?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
234	358	WSA Co	RICE	2012 JOINT STUDY ON AVIATION CAPACITY IN THE SYDNEY REGION	With reference to the 2012 Joint Study on Aviation Capacity in the Sydney Region by the Australian and New South Wales Governments (the Joint Study), and noting that more than 40% of air traffic to Sydney Airport (KSA) is to Brisbane, Canberra, the Gold Coast and Melbourne: i. Did the Joint Study consider the number of slots that would be freed up at Sydney Airport by east coast high speed rail? Would it not be the case that high speed rail would significantly remove capacity constraints at Sydney Airport until 2048 at the earliest? If not, why not?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	
235	363	WSA Co	RICE	BUILDING CONTRACTS	When does WSA Co expect to award contracts to build runways, terminals etc?	WRITTEN 12/06/18	