

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 36

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Australian and Queensland Government funding split for previously deferred  
**Bruce Highway Nation Building Projects**

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 7 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Do you quickly have figures for those five projects—whether the 20 per cent is constant there?

**Mr Pittar:** I do not have a list of all the 80-20 projects for Queensland in front of me, but I can take it on notice.

**Mr Mrdak:** We can seek to get that for you.

**Answer:**

Schedule A to the Nation Building Program - National Partnership Agreement, in place between the Australian and Queensland governments, sets the funding arrangements for projects. The funding arrangements for the five projects are as follows:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Australian Government Funding (\$m)</b>	<b>Conditions</b>
Duplication from Vantassel Street to Flinders Highway	110.00	Australian Government will provide 80% of project costs up to a contribution level of \$110 million, subject to Queensland providing 20% of project costs up to a contribution level of \$27.5 million.
Realign and raise Highway from Sandy Corner to Collinsons Lagoon	50.00	Australian Government will provide 80% of project costs up to a contribution level of \$50 million, subject to Queensland providing 20% of project costs up to a contribution level of \$12.5 million.
Burdekin Road Safety Audit projects	25.00	Australian Government contribution capped at \$25 million.
Cabbage Tree Creek to Carman Road and Back Creek Range section upgrade	100.00	Australian Government will provide 80% of project costs up to a contribution level of \$100 million, subject to Queensland providing 20% of project costs up to a contribution level of \$25 million.
Upgrade of Caboolture to Caloundra	195.00	Australian Government contribution capped at \$195 million.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 37

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Queensland Government Contribution to Previously Deferred Projects

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 7-8 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Can I perhaps be more specific. Can you give me on notice the details of the Queensland government's commitment? The Queensland government is well known to be broke. It has no money. The floods and the cyclones impacted heavily on Queensland, again as your department well knows, and Queensland is one of the few states that did not carry insurance. Queensland is going to be the principal beneficiary of the flood levy, in which we are taxing individuals but not wealthy companies to pay for a lot of the flood recovery. I put to you that the reason Vantassel Street, for example, was not done four years ago is that the Queensland government was not able to cough up its contribution. Is that correct or not?

**Mr Mrdak:** I think that has been one of the issues in terms of getting it into the program. But, as Mr Jagers indicated, we now believe we have a program locked in that the contribution will be available to meet the cash flow we are projecting.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** As I say, on notice, if you can give me the details of the assurance you have. The Queensland Minister for Main Roads happens to represent one of the Townsville seats. In fact, he is originally from Burdekin, so he has the same sort of birth interests, almost, that I have. Yet I as a federal parliamentarian get continually annoyed with the Queensland minister, because whenever there is a delay it is always the Commonwealth's fault, notwithstanding the fact that he is the roads minister. He is always cleverly able to blame the Commonwealth—it does not matter which government. I suspect, and I have said all along, that the reason for this is that the Queensland government (a) does not have the money and (b) does not have the management expertise to do these works. I fear, with all of the work that is required to be done with flood and cyclone recovery, that the chances of these five projects getting started in the next 12 months are absolutely minimal. Hence my question to you: what sort of oversight does the Commonwealth have in the actual planning, design, construction and funding of these works? I think you have answered that.

**Mr Mrdak:** We do not have a direct role in the planning work, but certainly we focus on the program scheduling and the oversight of the funding. Mr Pittar, for instance, who looks after Queensland as part of our program arrangements, does manage that quite closely in terms of oversighting their program and delivery capability.

**Answer:**

Refer to 36.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 38

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Queensland Government Project Management Costs

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 9 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Just by way of example, so that I can understand what you are saying, and I hear what you say about the capital cities versus rural areas, as an exercise on notice, using the Vantassel Street \$75 million as a guinea pig, let me know—you were going to get me how much the Queensland government is putting into that—how much the Queensland government is going to get of your \$75 million for non-constructive work, that is, project management, oversight, checking out native title laws, arranging traffic flows, whatever they are. I would venture a guess that what the Queensland government will get from this will be about the same as their contribution to the project.

**Mr Jagers:** Yes.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Be that as it may, could you do that? Is that a reasonable request?

**Mr Jagers:** Yes, I am happy to take that on notice. As I mentioned before, we will be meeting with Queensland in the next few weeks. One of the first things that we need to talk to them about is a project proposal report which details those costs. I will be happy to take it on notice, but it will be dependent on the arrival of the report from Queensland which details those costs.

**Answer:**

Refer to 36.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 39

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Bruce Highway – Cooroy to Curra Section B

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 10 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** I accept all that, and I suspect the \$2.8 billion has been announced about five times in various budgets, press releases and announcements, much of it going back, I might say, to the previous government. That is what I am really wanting to ascertain: how difficult would it be in relation to the Bruce Highway to get for me a table of announcements—when they are originally made and when they were remade—correlated against when the work is actually done. I might say this is not a political attack on the current government; the current government suffers as much as any other government because of the Queensland government when the roads, particularly in my area, are not done, they are not flood proofed, and it is the Commonwealth government that gets the blame, unfairly in many cases, because the money is allocated. I do not want an entire section of the department to spend five weeks doing that, but is there a simple way of—

**Mr Mrdak:** Happy to take that on notice, Senator, and we can certainly seek to get an indication of what the schedule looks like. As you said, the current projects that are in the program were announced by the government in the lead-up to the 2007 election, and subsequent commitments have been made. For instance, the amount that Mr Jagers has mentioned includes new commitments that have taken place in the last few years since 2007. We can give you a program which sets out all of the government's commitments on the Bruce and when that was done, and also what the current cash flow is because we do put the MOU with Queensland up on our website.

**Answer:**

A full list of projects receiving Australian Government funding on the Bruce Highway can be found on the Department's website at:

[http://www.nationbuildingprogram.gov.au/publications/administration/pdf/MOU\\_List\\_QLD\\_19\\_08\\_2009.pdf](http://www.nationbuildingprogram.gov.au/publications/administration/pdf/MOU_List_QLD_19_08_2009.pdf).

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 40

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Roads Affected by Queensland Floods

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 10 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Yes. One wonders whether the cost of delays and accidents and lives makes that a false economy. I will come back later to the road over the Cardwell Range. As a general comment — and again in Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales where there have been natural calamities — is it generally accepted that work on scheduled road improvements will be delayed until perhaps more recovery work is done in public infrastructure?

**Mr Mrdak:** It is not generally accepted. However, certainly one of our considerations in January when we looked at the Queensland recovery effort is how could they manage. At the last count I think it is still something in the order of 13,000 or 30,000 kilometres of roads in Queensland were affected by flooding. I will check the number.

**Answer:**

In Queensland, the flooding events and Tropical Cyclone Yasi caused damage to 9,170 kilometres of the State road network.

As of 13 April 2011, 6,627 kilometres, or 72% of damaged state roads had been recovered.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 41

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Funding for the electorates of Lyne and New England

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 11 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Could you tell me the funding from your department alone across all of its areas that has gone into the electorates of Lyne and New England?

**Mr Mrdak:** We can certainly take that on notice.

**Answer:**

Under the Nation Building Program over the 6 years from 2008-09 to 2013-14, the following funding is being provided to projects which are either within the electorates of Lyne and New England or spread across multiple electorates including Lyne or New England.

Lyne: \$454.37 million

New England: \$372.22 million

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 42

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Federal Electorate information for the remaining unduplicated sections of the Pacific Highway

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 11 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** I wonder if the people that make these assessments ever drive the roads, but anyhow. Can you perhaps take on notice—

**Mr Mrdak:** We certainly are informed in that by the New South Wales RTA and particularly their regional office where they are located in those areas, and a lot of that assessment is done by those officers of New South Wales in that area.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** The RTA, of course, have not had a stunningly successful record to their credit. Could you give me some details, perhaps on notice—I think you said 67 per cent was duplicated, so the other 33 per cent—of where that 33 per cent is and what the federal electorate is? I suspect many of them are represented by government members, but they do not seem to be doing quite as well as the member for Lyne in getting that road fixed. Perhaps if you got me the details I could—

**Mr Mrdak:** We will come back on notice with the details of where the current program anticipates—as I outlined in my opening comments, the government has recently made an additional commitment funding to the Pacific Highway. We will come back on notice and provide you advice of the remaining sections to be duplicated.

**Answer:**

Currently the remaining unduplicated sections of the Pacific Highway are in Cowper, Page and Lyne.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 43

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Media Releases – ‘Labor’s Regional Nation Building Agenda’ and ‘Inland Rail Finally Out of the Bag’

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 17 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** I am an inveterate media release reader, particularly of Mr Albanese's. There was a media release from him dated 10 May 2011 and headed 'Labor's regional nation building agenda'. Could you please give the committee some details of the projects that were used to calculate the figures in the table in that media release?

**Mr Mrdak:** If I can get a copy of that release. That was 10 May?

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** 10 May 2011, entitled 'Labor's regional nation building agenda'. There is a table in that media release—if I could just get the projects that the department used to calculate the figures in that table. You obviously need to take that on notice.

**Mr Mrdak:** We will find that and get that detail for you.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Yes. It would have to be on notice, obviously. Also, in a press release on the same day, 10 May 2011, under the heading, 'Inland rail finally out of the station', there is \$300 million said to be allocated for inland rail from Melbourne to Brisbane. Can you identify for me where that spending is shown in the budget. How much of that spending is in the forward estimates?

**Mr Mrdak:** That will be part of the Nation Building Program 2, from 2014-15. I will check, but I think there is an amount of that in 2014-15 and the rest beyond 2014-15.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** The earliest part will be 2014-15? Will that be the \$300 million or—

**Mr Mrdak:** I will get the exact details as to how much is in 2014-15, but the bulk of it will be beyond 2014-15, so it will not be in the forward estimates. It is a commitment under Nation Building Program 2.

**Answer:**

- 1) Information is available on the Nation Building Program website:  
<[www.nationbuildingprogram.gov.au](http://www.nationbuildingprogram.gov.au)>.
- 2) The Government is providing \$300 million dollars for Inland Rail pre-construction activities. \$30 million is profiled for 2014-15, the remainder of the funding is profiled from 2015-16.



**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 44

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Commonwealth funding for roads

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 31 (25/05/11)

**Senator Humphries asked:**

**Senator HUMPHRIES:** Do they start building when the project is dependent on Commonwealth funding and they have not obtained that approval?

**Mr Mrdak:** Where they are at discrete stages I think there have been situations like that. I am happy to take that on notice.

**Senator HUMPHRIES:** I would be interested in any other projects where this approach has been adopted where effectively one government commits money in its budget—for a jurisdiction the size of the ACT, a very substantial amount of money—to begin work on a road when there is at this point, I take it, no commitment on the part of the Commonwealth to assist with the cost of building that road.

**Mr Mrdak:** That is correct. We would be happy to take it on notice to find out whether there are other examples like that.

**Answer:**

It is common practice for jurisdictions to utilise their own funds for pre-construction activities, including study, planning, scoping, option development, initial design and land acquisition, prior to seeking Commonwealth funding approval.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 45

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Mid-North Coast Aviation Plan

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 39 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Mr Oakeshott was saying it was \$22 million in one of his media releases: 'This is a very important \$22 million investment at the three local airports.' What happened to the other \$3 million, do you know?

**Mr Mrdak:** I may be wrong. It is not administered in this portfolio, but let me just check what the final funding was. I know some of the original work was around \$19 million, but I will come back to you. It may well be \$22 million. I am not familiar with it because it is not in this portfolio.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Minister Crean said:

The Gillard Labor Government will provide up to \$19 million for new and upgraded infrastructure and facilities at Port Macquarie, Kempsey and Taree airports, as part of this week's budget.

As I said, the member for Lyne was saying \$22 million. You might be able to explain that discrepancy or take it on notice.

**Mr Mrdak:** I will take it on notice and check with our colleagues at the department of regional Australia.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** I understand the Mid-North Coast Aviation Plan was put together by three local councils.

**Mr Mrdak:** That is correct.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** When was this plan provided to the department for consideration?

**Mr Mrdak:** From recollection, we first considered this in 2009.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** The whole plan for those three?

**Mr Mrdak:** That is right. It is a proposal for the upgrade in accordance with the master plan for Port Macquarie Airport and also expanded general aviation facilities at the other two airports.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** What other research, inquiry, business case or other information did the department rely upon in providing advice to the minister in relation to this matter?

**Mr Mrdak:** I would have to take it on notice because since October this matter has been with the department of regional Australia rather than us.

**Answer:**

This matter is for the Department of Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local Government.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 46

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Mid-North Coast Aviation Plan

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 40 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** I would like to know is this a \$22 million plan; is it a \$19 million plan? If it is \$19 million, is the federal government putting in the \$19 million, as they are saying, or is it up to the local or state governments to cough up the rest?

**Mr Mrdak:** I will get some details for you, but certainly the Commonwealth contribution is, as I understand it, \$19 million for the aviation plan.

**Answer:**

This matter is for the Department of Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local Government.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 47

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Mid-North Coast Aviation Plan

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 40 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Is the federal contribution capped at \$19 million?

**Mr Mrdak:** I believe it is. I will get some further details because we have not dealt with that as part of our budget process.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** You might be able to let us know if state or local government funds are being contributed to the whole project. That will let us know the detail and total cost of the project, no doubt.

**Mr Mrdak:** Certainly.

**Answer:**

This matter is for the Department of Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local Government.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 48

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Mid-North Coast Aviation Plan – Terminal at Port Macquarie

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 40 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Do you know when those discussions were held with you and your department?

**Mr Mrdak:** I can give you the details of those.

**Answer:**

The Department met with Port Macquarie Hastings Council on two occasions:

11 September 2009; and

29 September 2010.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 49

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Bruce Highway – Cooroy to Curra Section B - Environmental Impact Statements

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 40-41 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Did the department do an investigation or is the department aware of any investigation undertaken in relation to the environmental impacts of the section B of the upgrade on the Bruce Highway?

**Mr Mrdak:** There certainly would have been an environmental assessment undertaken prior to the project proceeding, under both Queensland and federal environmental legislation. I can get the details of what took place. I am not sure whether it was a full EIS or whether it was a lesser environmental study, but I can find out. We do not have the detail with us, but we will get you the exact details.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Were there specific environmental concerns about that section B? Was there anything out in the public arena?

**Mr Mrdak:** There would have been an environmental impact assessment done, but I am not too sure whether there was any specific—

**Senator WILLIAMS:** What I am saying is: are there any sensitive issues that people are bucking and screaming about?

**Mr Mrdak:** Given the location, I think there would have been. At the stage of the planning there was also the issue around the Mary River dam and the like and the implications for this section B. That proposal at that stage was very much alive at the time the project planning was being done for the road crossing. I will get some details, if I may.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Yes.

**Mr Jagers:** The project is well under construction so any environmental issues would have been resolved through either alignments or other steps that might have needed to have been taken at the time. But we will certainly have a look at those.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Are you aware of how those controversial issues were mitigated?

**Mr Mrdak:** Again, we will get some further details for you. There would have been, as part of the project—

**Mr Pittar:** As Mr Jagers said, the project is well under construction and due for completion by mid-2012. Without knowing the detail of what specific environmental issues might have been addressed through that process, there were issues around location of bridges in relation to particular waterways and matters such as that. The ongoing design of the project would be done in a way so as to mitigate impacts on the environment consistent with the environmental assessment undertaken.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Speaking of some of those bridges and waterways, I think Skyring Creek and Coles Creek were two sensitive areas. What is the impact of the construction of section B on those two areas?

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Mr Pittar:** My recollection is that the project is putting bridges over both of those water courses. The bridge designs will be done in a way so as to minimise the impact on those water courses and the environment around them.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Have the natural water courses been altered?

**Mr Pittar:** I cannot answer the specific detail on that, I am afraid.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Can you find out for me?

**Mr Pittar:** We can certainly take that on notice.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** If they were altered, how were they altered? Could you take that on notice too, please?

**Mr Pittar:** Yes.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** What protected species could have been affected by these changes, if there were any changes? Are you familiar with that?

**Mr Pittar:** I do not have the details of that.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** You might be able to get me the details of what protected species could have been affected by the changes and how affected species native to these water courses are being protected and whether environmental monitoring is still taking place and, if not, why.

**Mr Pittar:** There would be ongoing environmental monitoring of the project. The project is of significant scale, and the project managers would be required to ensure that, as the project goes forward, it continues to comply with any environmental requirements that were put in place, and that would include monitoring and other management aspects.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Have there been any reports in relation to the monitoring of the environmental impacts?

**Mr Pittar:** We have not had any concerns or specific issues drawn to our attention, so we understand that the project is being managed in such a way so as to deal with and address any environmental issues, along with any other issues that go with the construction of such a major project.

**Mr Mrdak:** We will check this afternoon and come back to you.

**Answer:**

The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads (Main Roads) has developed a complete Project Environmental Assessment Report for Cooroy Curra Project Section B as part of project development and has obtained all relevant Federal and State environmental approvals.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 50

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Queensland Main Roads

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 42 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** If those reports are given to Queensland Main Roads, are they for public knowledge?

**Mr Mrdak:** I would have to check. Usually there are commitments given to the public release of monitoring reports where there are conditions of the environmental approval. I do not know the specifics in this case, and I do not think our officers do at the moment, but we will check and come back to you.

**Answer:**

Environmental updates regarding the project are available on the Main Roads website:  
<<http://www.tmr.qld.gov.au>>.



**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 51

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Cooroy to Curra Upgrade – Community Complaints

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 42 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Could you take on notice if there are any other concerns that have not been solved or any general complaints coming through from that area? I want to know whether the issues have been mitigated, whether the problems have been solved or whether there is still conflict on those issues there.

**Mr Pittar:** We can.

**Answer:**

The Department is not aware of any specific unresolved community issues related to the project.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 52

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Northern Sydney Freight Corridor Scoping Study

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 43 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** When the study is completed, will it be made public? Do you know?

**Mr Jagers:** I do not know as yet. I will take that on notice, if I can. I am not too sure.

**Answer:**

Publication of the study will be considered once it is finalised, following conclusion of the Intergovernmental Agreement between the Australian Government and NSW for delivery of Stage 1 of the Northern Sydney Freight Corridor program.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 53

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Funding for Northern Sydney Freight Corridor Scoping Study

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 43 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** So all that \$15 million has been handed over to the New South Wales government?

**Mr Wood:** Yes.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** When was that done?

**Mr Wood:** The vast majority of that has been spent.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** When was that handed over for the study?

**Mr Wood:** I believe it was last financial year, but I will just check that.

**Mr Jagers:** We might need to get back to you on that.

**Answer:**

The 2008-09 financial year.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 54

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Reallocation of funding for the Northern Sydney Freight Corridor Program

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 44 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** I understand the money will now be paid from 2014-15. Will the full \$100 million be paid in 2014-15?

**Mr Jagers:** Funding for this particular project commences in 2011-12, so part of the funding has been deferred. All up, the Australian government is investing \$840 million in the project; a portion of that money was deferred to make way for reconstruction efforts in Queensland, but there is still significant Australian government funding happening from the next financial year.

**Mr Mrdak:** The intention at this stage is that the \$100 million will be paid in 2015-16.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** In what financial year will the remainder of the funds be paid?

**Mr Mrdak:** As Mr Jagers has indicated, subject to New South Wales and the Commonwealth settling the final memorandum of understanding, we would anticipate the funding starting to flow from 2011-12. There is a funding forecast at this stage—again, subject to finalisation—through 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 and then the \$100 million in 2015-16, to pay the last of the Commonwealth contribution.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Can you—take it on notice—give us a breakup of what funds will be paid in what financial year for this project?

**Mr Mrdak:** Yes.

**Answer:**

The funding is subject to the NSW Government signing the Northern Sydney Freight Corridor memorandum of understanding.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.: 55**

**Program: 1.1**

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

**Topic: Public availability of the NSW Infrastructure Australia submission documents relating to the Parramatta to Epping Rail Link**

**Proof Hansard Page/s: 48 (25/05/11)**

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Has the department received a submission, a business case or any other communication or request of support for funding between 2007 and 2011 from the New South Wales government for an Epping to Parramatta rail link?

**Mr Mrdak:** No.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** So no submission at all then? This was just a federal government commitment when there had been no request or submission from New South Wales.

**Mr Mrdak:** Infrastructure Australia indicated earlier this morning that they had received a submission. As part of the New South Wales submission to Infrastructure Australia last year, Parramatta to Epping was one project that had been put forward by the then New South Wales government, but since the announcement of the commitment by the Australian government there has been no further business plan or details of the project provided to the Australian government beyond what has been negotiated for the MOU.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Were there documents submitted by New South Wales for the application for this rail link?

**Mr Mrdak:** Certainly there would have been to Infrastructure Australia. I am not aware of those documents. It would have been part of the New South Wales submission last year, as I understand from Mr Deegan's evidence.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Are those documents available to the public?

**Mr Mrdak:** I will have to take that on notice. I do not know. I will check that for you.

**Answer:**

The NSW Submission to Infrastructure Australia of August 2010 is available in full on the NSW Government website at: <<http://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/infrastructure-australia-submission-august-2010>>.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 56

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Funding for M4

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 49-50 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** In what year was that money supposed to be spent on the M4?

**Mr Mrdak:** At this stage, I think it was at the end of the program, 2013-14.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** In what financial year will these funds be spent now they have been brought forward?

**Mr Jagers:** We will check, but I understand they will still be spent in 2013-14. I will need to come back to you on that.

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Can you give us a breakdown for each of the forward estimates of when that money is to be spent?

**Mr Jagers:** We will take that on notice.

**Answer:**

The Australian Government commitment of \$30 million for the M4 East is allocated in 2013-14.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.: 57**

**Program: 1.1**

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

**Topic: Road and Rail Funding, Cycleways and Rail Freight and Passenger Lines**

**Proof Hansard Page/s: 55 (25/05/11)**

**Senator Ludlam asked:**

**Senator LUDLAM:** I might have been asking the question wrongly in the last couple of sessions. Are you happy with that rough order of magnitude of a \$5.3 billion road funding budget?

**Mr Mrdak:** That is \$5.3 billion for the current year?

**Senator LUDLAM:** Yes, 2011-12 according to the library. They admitted that was a rough estimate because it is difficult to aggregate them across the different places where funding occurs. Is that more or less consistent with what you have?

**Mr Mrdak:** It is broadly consistent. We would be happy to give you on notice the details of the actual road expansion in 2011-12 vis-a-vis rail.

**Senator LUDLAM:** I would appreciate that. There are a couple of break-outs I am after which as far as I am aware are not in the budget papers at the moment. The first thing would be: can you break out what fraction of that \$5-odd billion on road funding has gone into the cycling infrastructure component?

**Mr Mrdak:** I will see if we can do that, yes.

**Senator LUDLAM:** If it is not possible to give us a dollar figure—although I imagine it probably is—then a kilometre figure would be helpful as well.

**Mr Mrdak:** We will need to seek that detail from the jurisdictions but we will undertake to do that.

**Senator LUDLAM:** That would be much appreciated. And is a spend of roughly \$1.22 billion on rail more or less consistent as well?

**Mr Mrdak:** In the coming year? Again, I will take that on notice. I think overall the Australian government's current program is around \$3.7 billion for rail, but I will take that on notice.

**Senator LUDLAM:** What I am interested in seeing—and what is very difficult to break out of the transport stats that are published by the Commonwealth and by the states for that matter—is the spending on passenger rail and freight rail where they are different lines. It is very difficult to establish the make-up of that figure. Could you provide that for us as well?

**Mr Mrdak:** Over the full Nation Building Program?

**Senator LUDLAM:** Yes, I would appreciate it if that data exists. I presume that it does.

**Answer:**

- 1) The following table sets out the estimated expenditure by the Australian Government in 2011-12 on road and rail infrastructure in each of the states and territories

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

State/Territory	Road Funding (\$m)	Rail Funding (\$m)
New South Wales	2179.8	181.1
Victoria	595.2	480.4
Queensland	1165.4	30.0
Western Australia	455.2	101.1
South Australia	320.1	256.2
Tasmania	78.3	34.0
Northern Territory	89.7	
Australian Capital Territory	36.9	
Other (refer to note below)	35.8	423.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>4956.3</b>	<b>1506.4</b>

Note: Other rail funding includes the Australian Government's equity injection in the Australian Rail Track Corporation to upgrade the national rail network, and the high speed rail implementation study.

2) Australian Government funding for road projects provides for dedicated bicycle infrastructure associated with the road. The cost of road projects generally do not separate out the cost element of associated bicycle infrastructure, and therefore it is not possible to provide a cost per kilometre. Below is a list of dedicated bicycle paths associated with road projects committed to by the Australian Government under the current Nation Building program.

- Banora Point deviation on the Pacific Highway (NSW) – 5.5 km cycleway
- Great Western Highway, Woodford to Hazelbrook (NSW) – 4.3 km cycleway
- Great Western Highway, Wentworth Falls East (NSW) – 2.3 km cycleway
- Princes Highway East, Traralgon to Sale (Vic) – 3.0 km cycleway
- Geelong Ring Road stage 4A, Anglesea overpass (Vic) – 1.9 km cycleway
- Geelong Ring Road stage 4B, Anglesea Road to Princes Highway (Vic) – 1.2 km cycleway
- Clyde Road upgrade (Vic) – 2 km cycleway
- Kwinana Freeway widening and upgrade (WA) – 32 km cycleway
- Great Eastern and Roe Highway interchange (WA) – 4 km cycleway
- Great Northern Highway realignment (around Port Hedland, WA) – upgrading of existing 3 km cycleway
- Northern Expressway (SA) – 23 km cycleway
- Kingston Bypass (Tas) – 2.5 km cycleway
- Brighton Bypass (Tas) – 2.4 km cycleway
- Bridgewater Bridge and Midland-Lyell Junction (Tas) – 0.3 km cycleway

3) The Australian Government will invest \$7.9 billion on rail over the 6 year period 2008-09 to 2013-14. Of this amount, \$994 million will be expended on purely freight lines, \$3,632 million on purely passenger lines and \$3,280 million on lines shared by freight and passenger traffic.



**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 58

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Mackay Multi-use Stadium project

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 60-61 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Mr Mrdak told me last time, 'Mackay stadium project is under the Infrastructure Employment Projects program', which is with this portfolio.

**Mr Jagers:** We do have a project under the infrastructure employment program but it is a—

**Mr Mrdak:** We will get the further details, Senator. There is an IEP project and we will get the details of that for you, if that is okay.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** I am interested because you told me last time that the money had been allocated. Can I just get some time lines on who else is contributing, if anyone?

**Mr Mrdak:** We will get that as soon as we can.

**Answer:**

Mackay Regional Council is contributing \$3.5m towards ancillary construction including road works, access and drainage.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 59

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Nation Building – Economic Stimulus Plan: Building the Education Revolution projects in North Queensland

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 60-61 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** Thank you. You also rather cutely answered my question on the cyclone category standard for Building the Education Revolution building codes. Again, I am not sure why I was asking your department. Are you involved in the Building the Education Revolution building codes under the nation building infrastructure investments? It is that program, is it not?

**Mr Mrdak:** I think it is done under one of the fiscal stimulus program items, so we do not have direct responsibility for it, no.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** My question was: 'Have those school halls in Northern Australia been built to category 5 level?' and your cute answer was: 'All projects under the Building the Education Revolution program have been built to conform to the standards which apply to school buildings in each state and territory,' which may well be correct, but it does not answer my question. I think the real answer is, 'No, they are not built to category 5; they are built to category 4,' which means that in Northern Australia in many communities we had these brand-new school hall buildings and not many other recently constructed major government buildings that could have been used as cyclone shelters, but people were not allowed into them because they were only category 4 and not category 5. If that is the case, it seems to me to be a wasted opportunity. Admittedly, category 5 is more expensive. But there was a promise made by the Queensland government to have a category 5 shelter in every community. That has not eventuated, of course, as with many of the things the Queensland government promised. But could you just confirm, wherever you got this information from, that they are in fact category 4 and not category 5?

**Mr Mrdak:** We will undertake to do that. I think that answer came from the education department, but we will chase that further.

**Answer:**

This matter is for the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 60

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Bruce Highway – Flood Mitigation

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 61-62 (25/05/11)

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** You are consulting with locals on that. In Cardwell, which bore the brunt of Cyclone Yasi, half the main road was washed away. There was a proposal to put the main road round the back, which some people supported. But the townsfolk thought that if you did that it would ruin the commercial centre of this little coastal village. Whilst I am not saying which is right, I am not competent to, make sure you do get adequate local consultation on whatever is done. I am sure you will. Could you give me on notice, if that is easier, funding allocated to 'flood-proof' the highway between Townsville and Cairns?

**Mr Pittar:** We can outline projects that will have some flood mitigation effects in that area.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD:** I think I asked this earlier in a different form. I really want to know when the commitment was made, where it is at now and when the work is likely to be done.

**Mr Pittar:** We can answer in that format.

**Answer:**

On the Bruce Highway between Townsville and Cairns, the Australian Government has committed \$40 million to raise 2.5 kilometres of the Bruce Highway on the southern approach to the Mulgrave River Bridge, south of Cairns. The project will complement earlier works completed as part of the Accelerated Bruce Highway Upgrade Package to construct a new Mulgrave River Bridge and raise the northern approach for which the Australian Government provided \$50 million.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 61

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Pacific Highway – Tintenbar to Ewingsdale Upgrade

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** 65 (25/05/11)

**Senator Williams asked:**

**Senator WILLIAMS:** Yes, I do. Mr Mrdak, are you aware of recent media reports that a section of the highway between Tintenbar and Ewingsdale has cost \$30 million per kilometre?

**Mr Mrdak:** I am not aware of the media comments. I do not know whether that is an accurate figure. I am happy to check it.

**Answer:**

The Tintenbar to Ewingsdale project involves the construction of a 17.3 kilometre four-lane divided road to Class M (motorway) standard with connections to the regional and local road network by grade separated interchanges.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 62

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Moreton Bay Rail Link – re-profiling of project funding

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Heffernan asked:**

I refer to Budget Paper No. 2 p.267 in relation to funding for the Moreton Bay Rail Link. I understand that \$133 million in funding has been brought forward from 2014-2015. Federal Government funding for the project in 2014-2015 was originally \$192 million.

- 1) When will the remaining \$59 million be spent?
- 2) If so, can you confirm that this \$59 million in Federal Government money has been delayed by a year?
- 3) Why was that decision taken?
- 4) Was consultation undertaken with the Queensland Government and the Moreton Bay Regional Council?
- 5) If not, why not?
- 6) If so, what did this involve?
- 7) When did this occur?
- 8) How much of the Government's \$742 million commitment has been paid? (in which financial years)
- 9) When is it expected that the remaining money will be paid?
- 10) Is the project still expected to be finished in 2016? If not, when will it be finished? Why has there been a delay?

**Answer:**

- 1) Following the \$133 million.
- 2) There is no delay in funding. Australian Government funding has been brought forward in the 2011-12 Budget.
- 3) To accelerate enabling work.
- 4) Yes.
- 5) Not applicable.
- 6) The nature of consultations between governments is a matter for government.
- 7) The timing of consultations between governments is a matter for government.
- 8) This is a matter for the Queensland Government.
- 9) See response to Question 1.
- 10) Yes.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 63

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Mud Holes – Sydney to Melbourne Rail Corridor

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Heffernan asked:**

Since the ABC's 7:30 Report, 27/09/2010, members of the rail industry have shared their concerns that problems such as mud holes resulting from the rail upgrade have not been addressed adequately.

- 1) Please provide an update of the condition of the rail corridor since the 7:30 Report aired? In your response please refer specifically to the reported mud holes as well as any damage to trains, cargo or tracks resulting from these issues.
- 2) Have the various complaints of the rail industry regarding the mud holes been acted upon? If so, what was the course of action? If not, why not?
- 3) What is the estimated cost of the upgrade to the Sydney-Melbourne rail corridor?
- 4) How much money was saved by the use of the side insertion method for replacing railway sleepers?
- 5) Where has this method been used before and what were the results of this method?
- 6) What has been the cost to the industry as a result of the poor railway condition in the newly upgraded sections of the corridor?
- 7) What is the evidence to suggest that the side insertion method of replacing sleepers causes mud holes? If there is no evidence, what evidence is there to suggest that the method does not create these issues?
- 8) The ARTC claims that the mud holes are caused by weather and not by the insertion method or the materials used; what evidence is there to support these claims?
- 9) If these issues are indeed caused by weather, why is it that the rail network is not at a high enough standard to meet any weather conditions?

**Answer:**

The Australian Transport Safety Bureau has been asked to undertake a system wide investigation into operations on the line between Sydney and Melbourne following a number of recent incidents.

In addition, the Australian Rail Track Corporation regularly publishes track performance data on its website.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 64

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Infrastructure Australia and the Parramatta to Epping Rail Link

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Heffernan asked:**

- 1) Has Infrastructure Australia received a submission, business case, or any other communication, or request of support for funding between 2007 and 2011 from the NSW Government for an Epping to Parramatta rail link?
- 2) If so on what dates were these received?
- 3) Who were the documents submitted by?
- 4) Is this document available publically? If not, why not?
- 5) What research, reports, or other analyses were utilised to support funding for the Epping to Parramatta rail link?
- 6) When were these research, reports, or other analysis commissioned? And finalised?
- 7) What were the recommendations of this research, reports, or other analysis?
- 8) Is this relevant research, reports, or other analysis available publically? If not why not?

**Answer:**

- 1) Yes.
- 2) August 2010.
- 3) The NSW Government.
- 4) The 2010 NSW Government Infrastructure Australia Submission is publically available on the NSW Government website at:  
<<http://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/infrastructure-australia-submission-august-2010>>.
- 5) The Parramatta to Epping Rail Link was developed as part of the larger Parramatta to Chatswood Rail Link. It was first announced by former NSW Transport Minister Bruce Baird in 1994.
- 6) The review was commissioned in June 2003 and finalised in August 2003.
- 7) The recommendation was that construction of a Parramatta to Epping Rail Link with a passenger interchange at Granville provided the best benefit cost ratio of the options considered.
- 8) The *PRL West Options Project Director's Report*, published through the NSW Government website at <<http://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/file/prl/PRL-West-Report.pdf>>.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 65

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Calliope Crossroads project

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Heffernan asked:**

- 1) **In relation to the Calliope Crossroads project in Queensland.** I understand that this was a 2007 election commitment to the upgrade the Bruce Highway for the Calliope Crossroads near Gladstone. Is this correct?
- 2) How much funding has been allocated to the Calliope Crossroads upgrade?
- 3) How much funding has been allocated to this project under the current Nation Building program?
- 4) When will this funding be paid?
- 5) What was this funding for?
- 6) How much funding has been allocated to the project under the Nation Building II program?
- 7) When will this funding be paid?
- 8) What is this funding for?
- 9) How much funding has been allocated to the project under the Regional Infrastructure Fund?
- 10) When will this funding be paid?
- 11) What is this funding for?
- 12) When will pre-construction work commence?
- 13) When will construction work commence?

**Answer:**

- 1) Yes.
- 2) \$150 million.
- 3) \$55 million.
- 4) Through the Nation Building Program.
- 5) Planning, pre-construction works, land acquisition and to commence construction.
- 6) \$95 million.
- 7) \$95 million will be made available from 2014-15.
- 8) Complete construction.
- 9) Nil.
- 10–12) n/a (see response to Question 9).
- 13) A date for the commencement of construction will be determined through the planning process.



**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 66

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Yeppen Floodplain Roundabout project in Queensland

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Heffernan asked:**

- 1) In relation to the **Yeppen Floodplain Roundabout project Queensland**. What is the current status of this project?
- 2) How much funding has been allocated to the Yeppen Floodplain Roundabout project?
- 3) How much funding has been allocated to this project under the current Nation Building program?
- 4) When will this funding be paid?
- 5) What was this funding for?
- 6) How much funding has been allocated to the project under the Nation Building II program?
- 7) When will this funding be paid?
- 8) What is this funding for?
- 9) How much funding has been allocated to the project under the Regional Infrastructure Fund?
- 10) When will this funding be paid?
- 11) What is this funding for?
- 12) Have planning and design work completed for this project?
- 13) When will pre-construction work commence?
- 14) When will construction work commence?

**Answer:**

- 1) The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads is currently finalising the Project Proposal Report for submission to the Australian Government.
- 2) The Australian Government has allocated \$40 million from the Regional Infrastructure Fund, with the Queensland Government to provide \$10 million. The Australian Government has provided a further \$1.5 million through the Nation Building Program for planning works.
- 3) \$1.5 million.
- 4) The Nation Building Program funding was paid in 2009-10 and 2010-11.
- 5) Planning.
- 6) Nil.
- 7) n/a (see response to Question 6).
- 8) n/a (see response to Question 6).
- 9) \$40 million.
- 10) Between 2011-12 and 2013-14.
- 11) Construction.
- 12) See response to Question 1.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

- 13) See response to Question 1.
- 14) A construction start date is still to be determined through the final planning and design process but is expected to be in 2011-12.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 67

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Gladstone Port Access Road

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Heffernan asked:**

- 1) In relation to the **Gladstone Port Access Road**. What is the current status of this project?
- 2) How much funding has been allocated to the Gladstone Port Access road upgrade?
- 3) How much funding has been allocated to this project under the current Nation Building program?
- 4) When will this funding be paid?
- 5) What was this funding for?
- 6) How much funding has been allocated to the project under the Nation Building II program?
- 7) When will this funding be paid?
- 8) What is this funding for?
- 9) How much funding has been allocated to the project under the Regional Infrastructure Fund?
- 10) When will this funding be paid?
- 11) What is this funding for?
- 12) When will pre-construction work commence?
- 13) When will construction work commence?
- 14) How was the road's route determined?
- 15) What community consultation has been undertaken in relation to the project?
- 16) When did this occur? Who was involved?
- 17) Were any community forums held?
- 18) What community consultation is planned to be undertaken prior to construction work taking place?
- 19) What community consultation is planned to be undertaken during construction?
- 20) Has a social impact statement been compiled?
- 21) If not, why not? If so, is a copy publically available and where is it available?
- 22) Has an environmental impact statement been compiled?
- 23) If not, why not? If so, is a copy publically available and where is it available?
- 24) How many private or commercial premises will need to be resumed to complete the project and on what streets/suburbs?
- 25) What is the budget for private and commercial land acquisitions?
- 26) How many private or commercial premises have been acquired to date for the project?
- 27) What is the cost of these acquisitions to date?
- 28) Will the route go through the local hospital grounds?
- 29) Why was this decision taken?
- 30) How much hospital land will have to be resumed as a result of the new road?
- 31) What is on this land?

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

- 32) What compensation is being paid to the hospital in light of this?
- 33) What consultation was undertaken with the hospital prior to the route being finalised?
- 34) When did this consultation occur and who did this involve?
- 35) What ongoing consultation is in place as pre-construction and construction work commence?
- 36) What contingencies are in place to ensure that construction will not affect the operation of the hospital?

**Answer:**

- 1) The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads is currently developing a Project Proposal Report for submission to the Australian Government.
- 2) \$50 million.
- 3) Nil.
- 4) N/A.
- 5) N/A.
- 6) Nil.
- 7) N/A.
- 8) N/A.
- 9) \$50 million.
- 10) Between 2012-13 to 2014-15.
- 11) Construct stages 2 and 3 of the Gladstone Port Access Road.
- 12) A date for the commencement of pre-construction will be determined through the planning process.
- 13) A date for the commencement of construction will be determined through the planning process.
- 14) The final alignment will be determined through the planning process.
- 15) This information will form part of the Project Proposal Report.
- 16 –36) See response to Question 15.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 68

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Sydney Passenger Rail Links

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

- 1) Has the Department received a submission, business case, or any other communication, or request of support for funding between 2007 and 2011 from Infrastructure Australia or the NSW Government for any rail link, including a North West Rail Link?
- 2) If so, who were the documents submitted by?
- 3) When was it received?
- 4) Is this document(s) available publically? If not, why not?
- 5) What was the recommendation of this submission, business case, or communication?
- 6) Specifically in relation to the NW Rail Link, has the Department received any submission, business case, or any other communication, or request of support for funding between 2007 and 2011 from the NSW Government for the North West Rail Link?
- 7) From whom was this information received?
- 8) When was it received?
- 9) What was the recommendation of this information, research, analysis or other information?
- 10) Is this document available publically? If not, why not?
- 11) What research, reports, or other analyses has the Department commissioned or undertaken regarding Sydney rail infrastructure projects from 2000 to 2011?
- 12) When were these research, reports, or other analysis commissioned? And finalised?
- 13) What were the recommendations of this research, reports, or other analysis?
- 14) Is this relevant research, report, or other analysis available publically? If not why not?
- 15) In light of the overwhelming mandate provided to the NSW Government to prioritise construction of the North-West Link over the Epping-Parramatta Link, will the Department consider reallocating the \$2.1 billion of funding towards that project?
- 16) If not, and the NSW Government proceeds with priority of the North-West Link, will the Department cease its project to build the Epping-Parramatta Link?

**Answer:**

See question 64.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 69

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Ipswich Motorway Upgrade - Dinmore to Goodna

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

I refer you to Budget Paper No. 2 p.270 which states that five previously deferred projects in Queensland would be funded through \$325.4 million in savings from the Ipswich Motorway Upgrade – Dinmore to Goodna project and the Bruce Highway – Cooroy to Curra project.

- 1) How much money has been reallocated from the Ipswich Motorway project?
- 2) In which financial years was that money due to be paid?
- 3) How much in each financial year?
- 4) How much was the original estimated project cost?
- 5) When was this determined?
- 6) How much was the original federal government contribution?
- 7) How much was the original state government contribution?
- 8) How was the amount federal government contribution determined?
- 9) How was the decreased amount determined?
- 10) What information, research, analysis or other information was relied upon to decrease costs to the project?
- 11) What is the updated total project cost?
- 12) What consultation was undertaken with the Queensland Government in relation to the decreased funding amount?
- 13) When did this consultation take place?
- 14) What did this consultation involve?

**Answer:**

- 1-14) Payments are made on milestones to ensure best value for money. The project is being delivered on time and under budget.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 70

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Bruce Highway Upgrade – Cooroy to Curra Section B

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

I refer you to Budget Paper No. 2 p.270 which states that five previously deferred projects in Queensland would be funded through \$325.4 million in savings from the Ipswich Motorway Upgrade – Dinmore to Goodna project and the Bruce Highway – Cooroy to Curra project.

- 1) How much money has been reallocated from the Bruce Highway – Cooroy to Curra project?
- 2) In which financial years was that money due to be paid?
- 3) How much in each financial year?
- 4) How much was the original estimated project cost?
- 5) When was this determined?
- 6) How much was the original federal government contribution?
- 7) How much was the original state government contribution?
- 8) How was the amount federal government contribution determined?
- 9) How was the decreased amount determined?
- 10) What information, research, analysis or other information was relied upon to decrease costs to the project?
- 11) What is the updated total project cost?
- 12) What consultation was undertaken with the Queensland Government in relation to the decreased funding amount?
- 13) When did this consultation take place?
- 14) What did this consultation involve?

**Answer:**

See question 69.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 71

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Bruce Highway Upgrade – Cooroy to Curra Section A

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

I refer to recent media reports concerning the upgrade of Section A of the Cooroy to Curra section of the Bruce Highway.

- 1) What is the cost of completing Section A?
- 2) What information, report, submission, analysis or other information was relied upon to determine the cost of completing Section A of the Cooroy to Curra project?
- 3) What is the total Federal Government contribution and in what financial years will it be paid?
- 4) How much federal government funding has already been paid to the Queensland government?
- 5) How much state government funding is being contributed to the project?
- 6) What correspondence, reports, submissions or other information has the Department received from the Queensland Government or any other State Government Agency in relation to the construction of Section A of the Cooroy to Curra section of the Bruce Highway?
- 7) On what dates was this information received?
- 8) I understand that preliminary planning for the project was sent to the Department in August 2010. What date was this preliminary planning received?
- 9) On what date did the Department and/or the Minister acknowledge receipt of the information from the Queensland Government in relation to Section A of the Cooroy to Curra project?
- 10) What date did the Department and/or the Minister respond to the preliminary planning information provided by the Queensland Government in relation to Section A of the Cooroy to Curra project?
- 11) What further information was requested from the Queensland Government?
- 12) I understand that further information was received from the Queensland Government in April 2011. On what date was this information received?
- 13) On what date did the Department and/or the Minister acknowledge receipt of the information from the Queensland Government in relation to Section A of the Cooroy to Curra project?
- 14) On what date did the Department and/or the Minister respond to the information provided by the Queensland Government in relation to Section A of the Cooroy to Curra project?
- 15) What information was relied upon for the Department to make an assessment that funding could be decreased for the Cooroy to Curra project?
- 16) Did the Department recommend decreasing funding for the project?



**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

- 17) How can a decision be taken to decrease funding to the project if according to media reports the Minister is unaware of the planning proposals submitted in relation to the project?
- 18) I assume that that the Department is aware that the RACQ has found that the Cooroy to Curra section of the Bruce Highway as the worst stretch of road on the national network in Queensland. How many more accidents will it take before the Government gets serious about making a full commitment to upgrading the entire Cooroy to Curra route to four lanes?
- 19) When does the Government expect that the four lane Cooroy to Curra project will be completed?
- 20) What progress has been made on planning and land acquisitions for Section A of the Cooroy to Curra upgrade project?
- 21) What is the budget for planning and land acquisitions for Section A?
- 22) How much money has already been spent?
- 23) How much money remains?
- 24) If there is an underspend, what will the funds be used for?
- 25) Has any land acquisition taken place in the last 12 months? If so, how many properties and in which suburbs are these properties?

**Answer:**

- 1-25) The Government will make announcements about future investment as part of future budgets.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 72

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Bruce Highway Upgrade – Cooroy to Curra Section C

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

- 1) What progress has been made on planning and land acquisitions for Section C of the Cooroy to Curra upgrade project?
- 2) What is the budget for planning and land acquisitions for Section C?
- 3) How much has been spent?
- 4) If there is an underspend, what will it be used for?
- 5) Has any land acquisition taken place in the last 12 months? If so, how many properties and in which suburbs are these properties?

**Answer:**

See question 71.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 73

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Bruce Highway Upgrade – Cooroy to Curra Section B alignment

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Macdonald asked:**

- 1) In a letter to the editor of the Fraser Coast Chronicle on 24-03-2011, Minister Albanese asserted that the route chosen for Section B which goes around the non-existent Traveston Crossing dam, was \$33 million cheaper than the community's preferred option, even though the route that is being constructed is longer and more environmentally and socially intrusive than the community's preferred option. What research, submission, analysis or other information was relied upon by the Department in assessing the merits of the different routes?
- 2) Was a cost benefit analysis conducted by the Department in relation to the different routes of the Section B upgrade?
- 3) If not, why not?
- 4) If so, when was this analysis undertaken?
- 5) What was the cost of each of the different proposed routes?
- 6) On what basis was the determined route recommended?

**Answer:**

See question 71.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 74

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Parramatta to Epping Rail Link (PERL)

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Williams asked:**

- 1) What research, reports, or other analyses
  - a) Has the department commissioned or undertaken regarding Sydney rail infrastructure projects from 2000 to 2011, and
  - b) Were utilised to support funding of the Epping to Parramatta rail link?
- 2) What information did the Department receive prior to the 11 August 2010 announcement to provide funding for the Epping Parramatta Rail link that led to the prioritisation of Federal funding to Epping Parramatta over the North West and South West Rail Links?
- 3) When were these research, reports, or other analysis commissioned? And finalised?
- 4) What were the recommendations of this research, reports, or other analysis?
- 5) Is this relevant research, reports, or other analysis available publicly? If not why not?
- 6) Has a cost benefit analysis been taken in light of the commitment to fund the project? If so what were the findings of that analysis? Will the analysis be made public? If not, why not?
- 7) Will a cost benefit analysis be undertaken in the future or is a cost benefit analysis being planned? If not, why not? If so, will the Department make public any report on the analysis?
- 8) What process did the Department use to assess the choice of Federal funding for the Epping Parramatta Rail Link against other transport infrastructure projects across the country?
- 9) Was the Department aware prior to the announcement on 11 August 2010 to provide Federal funding towards construction of the Epping to Parramatta Rail Link, that
  - a) The NSW Government Metropolitan Transport Plan 2010; and
  - b) Infrastructure Australia's National Infrastructure Priorities Report released on 30 June 2010; did not prioritise the Epping Parramatta Rail Link?
  - c) If not, why not?
  - d) If so, on what grounds was the decision made to provide Federal funding for this project?
- 10) What due diligence was performed by the Department prior to the announcement to ensure this Federal funding was being allocated to the infrastructure project of greatest need?
- 11) What other information does the Department now possess as evidence of the greater need for Federal funding of this project as a higher priority over the North West and South West Rail Links?
- 12) Have formal agreements/contracts been signed with external parties for the detailed planning of this project?
- 13) If not, when can we expect this to be undertaken?

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

- 14) If so, who are the parties and what are their roles?
- 15) What is the procedure and timetable for the tender process for the construction of this project?
- 16) What criteria will be used to select the most suitable construction company or companies?
- 17) How many residential properties will need to be compulsorily acquired for the construction of this project? In which suburbs are these residential properties located?
- 18) How many commercial properties will need to be compulsorily acquired for the construction of this project? In which suburbs are these residential properties located?
- 19) What is the estimated cost of acquiring:
  - a) The residential properties; and,
  - b) The commercial properties?
- 20) What is the consultation process and timeline for residents whose properties will be compulsorily acquired?

**Answer:**

1-20) See question 64.

**Rural Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2011

**Infrastructure and Transport**

**Question no.:** 75

**Program:** 1.1

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

**Topic:** Sydney Passenger Rail Links

**Proof Hansard Page/s:** Written

**Senator Williams asked:**

- 1) Has the Department received a submission, business case, or any other communication, or request of support for funding between 2007 and 2011 from Infrastructure Australia or the NSW Government for any rail link, including a North West Rail Link?
- 2) If so, who were the documents submitted by?
- 3) When was it received?
- 4) Is this document(s) available publicly? If not, why not?
- 5) What was the recommendation of this submission, business case, or communication?
- 6) Specifically in relation to the NSW Rail Link, has the Department received any submission, business case, or any other communication, or request of support for funding between 2007 and 2011 from the NSW Government for the North West Rail Link?
- 7) From whom was this information received?
- 8) When was it received?
- 9) What was the recommendation of this information, research, analysis or other information?
- 10) Is this document available publicly? If not, why not?
- 11) What research, reports, or other analyses has the Department commissioned or undertaken regarding Sydney rail infrastructure projects from 2000 to 2011?
- 12) When were these research, reports, or other analyses commissioned? And finalised?
- 13) What were the recommendations of this research, reports, or other analysis?
- 14) Is this relevant research, report, or other analysis available publicly? If not, why not?
- 15) In light of the overwhelming mandate provided to the NSW Government to prioritise construction of the North-West Link over the Epping-Parramatta Link, will the Department consider reallocating the \$2.1 billion of funding towards the project?
- 16) If not, and the NSW Government proceeds with the priority of the North- West Link, will the Department cease its project to build the Epping- Parramatta Link?

**Answer:**

1-16) See question 64.