

Questions on Notice Budget Estimates 2009 - 2010

Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government Portfolio

Wednesday, 27 May and Thursday, 28 May 2009

QON No.	Date Asked	Hansard page reference/ Written	Senator	Question
AA 01	28/05/09	44	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I was going to ask you: since the agreement came in, have you noticed a change in the culture of the air traffic controllers? But as it has only started today I guess you will not have noticed any change at all. Perhaps since the agreement was made, although it came into place today, have you noticed any change?</p> <p>Mr Russell—From the point of agreement in principle, there is quite a process involved in having the agreement written up and then reviewed by, as part of the government bargaining framework, the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations and the Australian Workplace Authority. We have seen since that in-principle agreement was reached some months ago that things have settled with the air traffic group.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—In a statistical way, would the number of one-day sickies have decreased in the last two months?</p> <p>Mr Russell—I would need to provide you with more detail on that and I am happy to do so, but we have seen a general decline in the number of sick days taken year on year. I am happy to provide you with further detail if you would like it.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—If I could leave that on notice, in a relevant period—I mean, when we last discussed this in estimates. Perhaps that might be an appropriate time, or shortly after. Anyhow, I am just interested in the statistics in some relevant period that I will leave to you. I understand one of the issues in negotiations was the skills shortages in your part of the industry. I am just wondering what plans you have in place to address the issue of skills shortages into the future.</p>
AA 02	28/05/09	45	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—You mentioned that... Is it possible to get on notice statistics of how many AT controllers have left Australia in the past year?</p> <p>Mr Russell—We can provide with you that information now.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—And how many of them have returned or been replaced by ATCs from overseas? Would that information be—</p> <p>Mr Russell—I can provide some of that now and perhaps, if it is not adequate, we can take the rest on notice.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Yes, sure. That will be good.</p>

AA 03	28/05/09	48	Sterle	<p>CHAIR—Earlier this year, Mr Russell, Airservices Australia had a meet and greet upstairs here. I remember having the opportunity, as would a lot of other senators, of looking at some new surveillance technology for Australian airspace. You have got me thinking about this after what Senator Macdonald was talking about. Can you update us on where we are up to?</p> <p>Mr Russell—Much of the continent of Australia has no traditional radar coverage. We provide radar coverage in areas largely around our capital city airports and largely down the east coast of Australia around to Adelaide.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—How long has that been the situation?</p> <p>Mr Russell—A long time. Australia has been amongst the first countries to announce a program of introducing what is called ADS-B, automatic—</p> <p>CHAIR—Data surveillance?</p> <p>Mr Russell—Sorry, it is one of those acronyms. In relation to aircraft suitably equipped with the right transponders, broadcast to satellites which are then broadcast back to our ground stations, we can pinpoint the location of these aircraft in upper airspace. We have been working on this program for some years. We currently have 16 of these ground stations in place in Australia. Our aim is to roll out a full 28 by the end of the year and then perhaps more of them. This will be the first time in upper airspace, above flight level 250, that we will have radar-like coverage of by far the majority of international and domestic aircraft flying through our airspace. It will allow us to improve efficiency by closing up the long separations between aeroplanes that are currently the case and improve of course the safety of operations. It is a program, as I say, that we have been working on. It is not without some challenges. It has meant we have had to go back and reconfigure the whole digital backbone of communications throughout the country in some very remote areas. By the end of the year I hope to have that program in place.</p> <p>CHAIR—Do you have a list or could you tell us where these 16 stations are?</p> <p>Mr Russell—Yes, I can. I can provide that to you and perhaps a map, again, might be helpful.</p> <p>CHAIR—That will have the 28 by the end of the year? It will have their locations as well?</p> <p>Mr Russell—It will show you what we have active at the moment and what we propose to have connected by the end of this year.</p>
AA 04	28/05/09	49-50	Sterle	<p>CHAIR—Welcome back, everyone. We will continue. Mr Russell, I have just about finished my questions, but we were talking about the wonderful initiatives that Airservices Australia has commenced in Wagga at the Riverina TAFE and you had told me that there are 18 students who have gone in the first batch and that each semester that will increase and there will be 36 going through, I think.</p> <p>Mr Russell—There will be the 18 each semester. So, in total, by the end of the year we will</p>

				<p>have 36 in training.</p> <p>CHAIR—That is a wonderful initiative. And of those, you told me, there were six from the Riverina.</p> <p>Mr Russell—That is right.</p> <p>CHAIR—So I take it that the other 12 have come from other parts of New South Wales or other parts of Australia?</p> <p>Mr Russell—Other parts of Australia, with a bent towards young people from regional Australia.</p> <p>CHAIR—Sorry, there is a fellow doing the mobile phone walk out there. He has got something glued on his ear and is shouting. I missed all of that, I am sorry.</p> <p>Mr Russell—Six of the 18 have come from the Riverina, broadly the Riverina area, and the remainder have come from other parts of Australia, mainly with some background in regional parts of Australia. We set out to target that area in particular.</p> <p>CHAIR—That is a wonderful initiative, because this committee has seen similar things happening in other parts of transport in Queensland—Brisbane comes to mind. Would you be able to table more information on the—</p> <p>Mr Russell—Yes, we will be pleased to.</p> <p>CHAIR—Riverina TAFE, the courses you do and where the students have come from. Congratulations. Well done.</p>
AA 05	28/05/09	57	McGauran	<p>Senator McGAURAN—So, the two new what you call trigger points and checks and balances were in the old agreement.</p> <p>Ms Fleming—No, sir. The eight-day cap on single day sick leave was not in there. The formal letter at 10 days was not in there, and the ability to revert to a capped system if people took more than 15 days was not in there. So, they are the additional things.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—But that is just the trigger points, what you act upon, such as talking or counselling, if you like, and the referral to a medical officer, were also in the old agreement.</p> <p>Ms Fleming—Certainly, they were parts of it.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—All you have done is put days on it now.</p> <p>Mr Russell—Look, Senator, a much tighter arrangement has been put in place with respect to this agreement. It is a major step forward as far as the organisation is concerned, and it is one where I have a great degree of confidence that we are going to be able to manage this issue, which we set out to do at this beginning of this negotiation—manage it very effectively. Now, it is up to management to do the job, and that is something we do not shirk from.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—What role did the Minister have in this agreement, the finalising of the agreement or the ticking off of the agreement?</p>

				<p>Senator Conroy—A constructive one, unlike the lackadaisical, incompetent role performed by the previous Ministers over 11½ years, Senator McGauran, who never achieved a significant movement like this.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—What do you say—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—A constructive one.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—What does—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take it on notice and we will let you know.</p>
AA 06	28/05/09	58	McGauran	<p>Senator McGAURAN—How will you prove to me or show to me or convince me that this is not just paper talk, it is real muscle?</p> <p>Mr Russell—Senator, let me answer that by saying this: I was personally involved throughout every step of this negotiation. I can assure you that it was a difficult and robust discussion, but I think we ended up with a fair deal and I believe it is the basis for us being able to take Airservices forward. I think we have made some very significant ground here and, for me, the job is to ensure now that I bring the organisation together. I do a lot of work on engaging the staff, particularly in the air traffic group, to get them to understand where this organisation is headed. I can say that our board have asked for regular reports on the productivity improvements that are embodied in this agreement. I make the point to you that I think it is a fair agreement.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—The proof of the pudding will be in the eating.</p> <p>Mr Russell—It will.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—The proof will be in the pudding, to which I remind you that Senator Macdonald has asked you for the number of sick leave and absentees, I think, from January through until now. Is that right?</p> <p>Mr Russell—Yes, I think so. I made some notes.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—This is from the in-principle agreement, at the time of the in-principle agreement.</p> <p>Mr Russell—We will certainly provide that.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—Probably included in that answer, can I have the last 12 months up to date, up to now—going back 12 months—of sick leave of all the capital city airports in each state?.....</p>
AA 07	28/05/09	59	McGauran	<p>Senator McGAURAN—I still have some more questions on the agreement. Can I have, for the last 12 months, the number of days of absenteeism in each capital city airport?</p> <p>Mr Russell—We will take that on notice, Senator. Yes, I would be happy to.</p> <p>Ms Fleming—Could we clarify what you are wanting as absenteeism, as compared to sick leave.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—Yes, distinct, separate.</p> <p>Mr Russell—Annual, special leave, as well as people on sick leave.</p>

				<p>Senator McGAURAN—No, people who just do not turn up.</p> <p>Mr Russell—People take annual leave as well. That would be included under a question asking—</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—They are entitled to take annual leave.</p> <p>Mr Russell—But if you ask me for some statistics on absenteeism, that would be included. People are not at work for quite legitimate reasons; they are on leave.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—Absolutely.</p> <p>Mr Russell—Do you want that included?</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—No, definitely not.</p> <p>Mr Russell—Okay. So it is about sick leave, in particular?</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—How do you define ‘absenteeism’? You are not absent if you are on holidays.</p> <p>Mr Russell—You are, technically.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You have said that you would take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Are there people who just do not turn up?</p> <p>CHAIR—Senator McGauran, do you have any other questions?</p> <p>Senator O’BRIEN—It could only mean people who are absent for no reason.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—Yes, people who do not turn up to work without reason. Thank you.</p> <p>Mr Russell—Absent without reason. If I can agree on that, I will be pleased to provide that for you.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—Is that possible? Maybe it is not.</p> <p>Mr Russell—It is.</p>
AA 08	28/05/09	62	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—In Canberra here, for instance, where there is the radar on the hill here that can be read from Melbourne, can’t it, out of hours?</p> <p>Mr Russell—The Mount Majura radar, yes, it is. It is plugged into the system in Melbourne.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—So this bloke that nearly flew into the mountain out here, if he had come down lower, would have been controlled by the bloke in Melbourne. Instead of that, he was flying on his own and he bloody near put that 737 into the hill.</p> <p>Mr Russell—I am happy to take that issue on notice, because I think there is more to it than perhaps either you or I, at this present point, have in front of us. So I am happy to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I do not want to interfere with any inquiries, but was there any inquiry?</p> <p>Mr Russell—As I understand it, there was an inquiry.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—What did it conclude?</p> <p>Mr Russell—I do not have the details with me, but I am happy to take it on notice.</p>

AA 09	28/05/09	75	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—At 11 o'clock at night when half the airspace is pretty well empty, the air traffic blokes in Melbourne can see what is going on here in Canberra. Why can't they have responsibility for it?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—To start with, they do not man the tower at those times of day.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I understand that, but they can actually monitor the approach so that that mob there does not fly into a hill.</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—I do not know why. You would have to ask Airservices that one.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I will ask the Department to give consideration to why this is so. The new CEO, who is obviously very experienced, might give consideration to that.</p> <p>Mr McCormick—I will take that on notice and I will pass it to Airservices and the Department.</p>
AA 10	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Airservices Australia</p> <p>I understand Airservices Australia has been running an air-traffic situational awareness trial called Unicom. I understand this was an initiative of Airservices Australia and has been conducted at Dubbo, Wagga Wagga in late 2007 and then expanded to include Port Macquarie, Hervey Bay and Olympic Dam. I further understand that it is an attempt to provide an alternative arrangement for regional airports catering for higher capacity jets now using aerodromes in regional Australia without the expensive infrastructure associated with licensed air traffic controllers and control towers. Is this a correct summary?</p>
AA 11	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you provide more information about the trial?
AA 12	N/A	Written	Nash	What was its cost? How many people did it employ?
AA 13	N/A	Written	Nash	I further understand that the trial concluded on 31 March 2009. Is that correct?
AA 14	N/A	Written	Nash	Has Airservices Australia completed its report analysing the trial?
AA 15	N/A	Written	Nash	Has the report been submitted to the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA) for its policy consideration?
AA 16	N/A	Written	Nash	What are the conclusions of the report?
AA 17	N/A	Written	Nash	Was Airservices Australia happy with the results of the Unicom trial?
AA 18	N/A	Written	Nash	Have you been advised by CASA of its response to the report?
AA 19	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the report be made publicly- available?

AA 20	N/A	Written	Nash	Will Airservices Australia be supporting the adoption of Unicom as a permanent service to be included as part of the suite of third party air traffic services and provided to industry?
AAA 01	28/05/09	26-27	Back	<p>Senator BACK—I ask the questions because of a concern as to the fiscal status of the Westralia Airports Corporation. In terms of major capital expansion, I think Moody's have recently said that, in the absence of an improvement in market conditions and an agreement with the airlines, it is not expected to occur and will put pressure on WAC's credit rating. In other words, it causes us in the west enormous concern that there may be some delay or in fact termination of that particular project.</p> <p>Ms Gosling—What I can do is outline some of the works currently underway and what is actually planned with that major upgrade proposal, if that would be of assistance.</p> <p>Senator BACK—It would be. I would be most appreciative. Relating to the airport infrastructure itself—I will not get to the roads yet, because it is very difficult for most people to even get there—in 2007 Perth airport was the worst performer in the country with 33.6 per cent of flights delayed. I understand this has blown out to 36 per cent. Do you have any more recent figures? Can you confirm that deterioration of 33 to 36 per cent? Do you have any more recent figures?</p> <p>Ms Gosling—I would have to take that on notice.</p>
AAA 02	28/05/09	28	Back	<p>Senator BACK—Thank you for that. Just with regard to access of aircraft, the Senator to my right had the dubious pleasure of flying with his good lady wife to Perth recently, and I think he is still getting over the shock of his approach into the terminal as we sort of made our way around through the barricades. There were 45 aerobridges planned originally for the redeveloped airport and I understand that has been scaled back from 25 to 45; is that correct?</p> <p>Ms Gosling—I would have to take that on notice, Senator.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Excellent. I guess that the aircraft we are speaking of happened to be the one the parliamentarians fly on. Do you know if aerobridges will be available for incoming and outgoing 737 aircraft at some time? Are you able to answer that?</p> <p>Ms Gosling—I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator BACK—I guess what I am anxious to know, as you have indicated you will provide, is the number of aerobridges. Do we know if aerobridges service 737s at other Australian airports?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—They certainly do, Senator.</p> <p>Ms Gosling—They do.</p>
AAA 03	28/05/009	30	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Can I have the list of approved aircraft since these regulations started, in 1995 I think for Sydney and 2000 for Adelaide?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I do have a copy of those two lists.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Can we get them tabled? I take it you have a copy of the copy, have you? Was the CL-Challenger 600-1-A11 type on the list?</p>

				<p>Ms Ellis—No, my understanding is the aircraft that you are referring to is not actually on the list.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Was it on the list?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I would have to read the list. I am sorry, I have just shared it with you.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—We will get a copy.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—The circumstances are that the airports that are subject to curfew—Sydney, Adelaide, Essendon and Coolangatta—prohibit most jet movements during the night-time. The circumstances for each of those airports and curfews vary slightly. That said, for Sydney and Adelaide there is a list of prescribed aircraft that are exempt from the curfew requirements. The aircraft in question that you have mentioned is not one of those aircraft and—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—The act says that it should operate on type and the list says that it should operate on the model. Is that inconsistent?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—Not according to the legal advice that we have received.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Could we see a copy of that legal advice?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We do not normally provide legal advice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—We are a bit inconvenienced in that we do not have the list. Is it my understanding that the Challenger CL-600-2B16 is on the list?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I will have to have the list.</p>
AAA 04	28/05/09	31	Nash	<p>Senator NASH—Aside from Fort Street High School, has the Commonwealth carried out insulation work on any other State Government-owned buildings?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—Yes, the Sydney program. As far as the breakdown of public buildings is concerned, I would have to take on notice what/were state.</p> <p>Senator NASH—If you could take on notice how much was spent and where, that would be great. Given that the Commonwealth has taken responsibility for the State Government-owned buildings, is there not any concern that an expensive precedent has been set? Where is the line going to be drawn on what is going to be Commonwealth responsibility for State buildings from here on, outside of the context of election commitments?</p>
AAA 05	28/05/09	31	Nash	<p>Senator NASH—There was another response to a question on notice, again from February, which declined to give details of the Fort Street High School insulation work on the grounds that the project for insulation of Fort Street High School has not yet gone out to tender. Is that the case? Has the project gone out to tender? Where exactly is that at?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—As to the status of the Fort Street project, the funding does not actually come online until 1 July. In response to an approach from the New South Wales Government in March, the Government decided in April that the New South Wales Department of Education and Training would actually oversight the project. Our understanding is that there are additional works to be carried out at Fort Street High School and there are efficiencies to be achieved with the work being done simultaneously. The arrangements will be set—</p> <p>Senator NASH—Sorry, can you just clarify that for somebody who does not do this sort of thing in buildings? What is the simultaneous work that is taking place?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I am not aware of the full detail of that. I could take that on notice.</p>

				<p>Senator NASH—Given that you said there are benefits in doing it simultaneously, it would be good to know what that is.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I will take that on notice. The arrangements will be agreed between the Australian government and the New South Wales Government through a national partnership agreement.</p>
AAA 06	28/05/09	32	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Now that we are on aircraft noise—and I am going to come back to airspace later—where are we up to with Tralee? The proposition at Tralee is that we are going to build a subdivision under the landing and take-off, which is just stupid, in my view—and I am a wool classer and a welder. Do we know where we are up to with that?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—My understanding of the current status of the Tralee proposal is that the land has been zoned residential. There is a proposed development. The issue is that where the residences are proposed we fall within the current framework of the AS20/21 insulation standards within the 20 ANEF contour. If residences are established, it will be incumbent upon the developer to comply with relevant standards.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—So will there be any—</p> <p>Ms Gosling—Senator, can I just add to what Ms Ellis said. It is correct that the land has been zoned and now the decision as to whether to proceed with the development is with the New South Wales Government.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Can I just get this clear. Obviously, there was a disagreement between the operators of the airport and the developer of the land.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—The operators of the airport being the largest donors to the Liberal Party in the ACT—that is the same thing?</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—That is for you. I understand the—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—But that would be a fact, according to Electoral Commission records.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I have no idea. I do not give a rat's arse who donates to anything, because I do not think that should have anything to do with good judgment. I understand that the developer of the land might also be a donor and I do not care about that. What I care about is that Canberra has a fantastic facility which they hope to create a transport hub in. I am just wondering and curious as to why we would deliberately—and I do not know who else is in the purse of these people and I do not care, right, but obviously Queanbeyan Council has been influenced by some of it. I am interested as to why sane people, where Canberra has a fantastic facility that Sydney and other places do not, who have the opportunity to create a serious hub in aviation—would go ahead with this, knowingly agreeing to a subdivision under the flight path of the take-off and landings of this thing. There might be really good reasons why.</p> <p>Ms Gosling—Senator, it is going to be a question for the State Government rather than the Commonwealth Government in terms of the development.</p>

				<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—We do not want to revisit Wollongong. I am wondering: have you have been consulted? I mean, surely people in aviation would be able to say, ‘This is stupid.’ The guy who has the land, as I understand it—because I have had the discussions; I have not talked to him for three or four years and the AFP will tell you why, if you want to know—obviously has an option on the land. You say it has now been rezoned.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—That is very funny.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Mate, you know my point.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Just sledges someone—just gives us a lecture about probity and then sledges someone for being a crook. I love it.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—No. Sorry, you are misinterpreting what I am saying. Will there be legal comeback on anyone if this goes ahead with the approval? So if the people who live there, who build houses under the flight path—and, sure, I have heard the argument that the plane will turn and all of that—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You raise a very legitimate point, Senator Heffernan.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Will there be—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We are happy to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—On the developer or on the airport? It annoys me that a development goes ahead and then after the development has gone ahead, people decide to live there and then they say, ‘We want to remove the airport.’ That is my question.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—That is a legitimate question and we will take it on notice.</p>
AAA 07	28/05/09	33	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Could we then go back to my Challenger aircraft? These are concerns raised by people who obviously have a Challenger 600/1. In the list that you have provided, what I have asked for—and you may be able to give it to me on notice—is the list going back to the beginning of the list in the case of Sydney 1995 and in the case of Adelaide 2000. This list that you have given me supersedes those lists?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—Yes, the two lists I have provided to you. One is a copy of the updated list that was updated by previous Minister Truss in 2005 for Sydney. My understanding is the list for Adelaide dates back to the origins of the curfew regulations for Adelaide, which is dated 2000.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—So that is two lists, is it?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—That is two lists.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—So could we have the original list? What I would like to know—and maybe someone who is listening in the Department can tell us—is: was the Challenger 600/1 on the original list? Do you know?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—My understanding is that it was not and it is not on the current list.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Yes, I am aware of that. The act clearly states that they refer to aircraft types; is that right?</p>

				<p>Ms Ellis—Yes.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Why then do the related regulations and instruments lists refer to all models and variances of types and not to the legal type of definition of them?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—Senator, I am sorry; I would have to take that question on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Thank you. You might have to take a few of these on notice. The models and variances described are generally sales and marketing descriptions, not legal definitions of types applied by the manufacturer and national regulatory authorities, including CASA. So if you could give me the answer to that. Why the variation? As I said earlier, the access type and the lists say ‘model’. So if we could have the answer to that. The people who are concerned about this have information that the CL-600 was originally on the approved list but it has since been removed and the Challenger 600-2B16 model 604 is now on the list but was not before.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—That is my understanding.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—But I have just said that the Challenger 600 was on the list. You say it was not.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I am sorry?</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—My information is that the Challenger 600 was previously on the list.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I will have to take that on notice because that is not my understanding.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Okay. If you do answer that the Challenger 600 was on the list, can you advise us why it was taken off the list and the process that made that possible?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—We will do that.</p>
AAA 08	28/05/09	34	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Why is it not possible without Ministerial intervention, as advised by your Department, to reinstate the CL600 as for the CL600-2B, as they are legally on the same type of air certificate and substantially the same aircraft and same compliant noise profiles? It is just like the difference between one type of Holden and another. Why is it not possible to sort that out?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I am not an aircraft specialist, I am afraid.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—And neither am I.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—My understanding of this particular situation is that it is a want for a certain operator to use an aircraft in and out of Adelaide or Sydney airport during curfew. The curfew legislation, as I say, specifies, for both Sydney and Adelaide, lists of the jet aircraft that can in fact be exempt from curfew arrangements.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I understand that.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—The aircraft in question is not on that list. Changes to those lists, because they are legislative instruments, or changes to regulations would have to go through a legislative process.</p>

				<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—You are going to tell me how a plane that is on the list comes off the list. What causes it? You might take that on notice. If there are planes that have been on the list that have come off the list, what are the details of those planes and why were they on one minute and off the next? In the Government fleet, do we have Challengers?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We do, actually.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—What model are they?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—That is for PM&C.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Or I guess we would have to talk to Air Force.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I would be curious where that fitted into this—that is, whether one came on the list because the Government bought the things and obviously you now have a need to fly inside and outside of curfew hours.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Generally, in aviation, exemptions are made for State aircraft. I am not sure that is the case here.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I would be curious to know what model of Challengers we have.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Certainly.</p>
AAA 09	28/05/09	35	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—There are a significant number of Australian aircraft on the register that are fully compliant in regard to the core requirements of the act, including the Challenger 600-1, that are not permitted to operate within curfew hours—that is, under what the act says on type. Why is that so? What is the mechanism that is used to decide who does and does not get on the list?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I am happy to take your questions on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I am happy for you to do that. Why is it that there are three aircraft types—</p> <p>Falcon 200, HS125-700B, Mitsubishi MU300—that are on the list but are no longer operated in Australia but can be operated by foreign operators within curfew hours?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—Again, Senator, I will take your question on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—What is the mechanism or justification that is used to discriminate on which of the act compliant, Australian registered aircraft types are entered or not entered on the list of aircraft permitted to operate during curfew hours? Do you want me to repeat that?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—No, I will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—But you did not hear the question.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I am happy for you to repeat it.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—It would be more polite if you heard the question then took it on notice. Wouldn't you agree?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—My apologies, Senator.</p>

				<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—What is the mechanism or justification that is used to discriminate on which of the act compliant, Australian registered aircraft types are entered or not entered on the list permitted to operate during curfew hours?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—Senator, I think it would be helpful if we come back to you with the process. As I say, the issue at stake here is the particular operator's aircraft is not on the list—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—And it has never been on the list.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I have taken that on notice to confirm. My understanding is it has not been.</p>
AAA 10	28/05/09	36	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—So, you have legal advice to the effect that the act, which specifies on type, is not watertight, that you can get around it?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—No, that is not what I am saying.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—So is the Challenger 600-1 compliant or not under the act?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—It is not included on the list and it is therefore not exempt—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—No, that is not my question. Is it compliant under the act? I know it is not on the list. Is it compliant to be on the list under the Act?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will happily take that on notice and get you a precise answer.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Thank you. There is a respite period now, Minister, because I will move to Senator Back.</p>
AAA 11	28/05/09	36	Back	<p>Senator BACK—Just before I go to regional airports, I want to confirm the Minister's offer to take on notice the question regarding the possible fate of the priority regarding the intermodal project for Perth. Could the Minister in that same response also advise whether there are any mechanisms by which the Westralia Airports Corporation can seek other means of Government support to facilitate the development of the planned expansion? I repeat what I mentioned yesterday, and it is in that 2009 report, that the current cost to the Western Australian economy of the deficiencies of the airport is estimated at, I think, \$21 million, but more frightening is the fact that their plan suggests that by 2011-12 the loss to the economy will be \$207 million per annum. I ask if the Minister could take that on board, because that is a particularly serious issue, especially—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am happy to add that to the issues we have taken on notice for you, Senator Back.</p>
AAA 12	28/05/09	37	Back	<p>Senator BACK—Are you aware of aerodromes or councils that actually have not been able to get their act together and make application in a way adequate to be assessed? In other words, are you aware of airstrips around rural and remote Australia where they would be at risk of the Royal Flying Doctor Service not being able to land under adverse conditions, conditions sufficient for normal operation of those aircraft?</p> <p>Mr Borthwick—I am not aware specifically of that information. I should add that, as part of our assessment process for the applications, the assessment panel includes a representative of the Royal Flying Doctor Service who brings the direct experience of operations into-and-out</p>

				<p>of the aerodromes that have applied. Through that process, they could put forward suggestions about aerodromes that they know about which perhaps did not apply, and we would contact that local council and encourage them to apply and provide whatever assistance we can to assist them in framing the application.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Does the Department have sufficient funding, in the event that those applications come through, to be able to assist?</p> <p>Mr Borthwick—I think in the most recent round, which has closed, there have been more applications for funding than we have funding available.</p> <p>Senator BACK—In line with that—and I realise you would not have the information now—could you take on notice: is it possible for us to be informed of remote airports and amounts that actually have been successful over the last 12 months, 18 months to two years?</p> <p>Mr Borthwick—That information is currently on our website, but we are happy to provide it to you as well.</p>
AAA 13	28/05/09	39	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—There you go. Can I go back to where I was? If so, I am reliably informed—and I stand to be corrected—that the Government Challengers are the 604s, which are on the list.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We said we would get back to you on that. We do not know that to be the case.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Anyhow, you can still get back to me. With regard to compliance with weight and noise requirements under the act, unless the regulations and instruments have been used to discriminate against compliant aircraft, some people are arguing that the act should define the types that should be on the list. The list is based on the model; is that right?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—The list is based on what, Senator?</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Not the type but the model.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—I think we are getting into a legal argument and I am definitely not qualified—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—And neither am I.</p> <p>Ms Ellis—to give you an answer. You have asked if the 600 is—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—You will take it on notice?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Yes.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Okay. Simple compliance with the weight and noise requirements under the act should be all that is required, surely. I mean, you either comply or you do not. If you comply, you should be on the list. Wouldn't that be a reasonable thing to say?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You are asking opinion now.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—No.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Yes, you are. We are happy to take the question on notice.</p>

				<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Well, I will assert—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You can assert it and then you are asking the officer to comment on it.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—No.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—That does not change the fact that—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—No, I would never do such a thing. If you complied with the weight and noise requirements under the act, that would have the added benefit of it not being necessary for the Minister or the Department to modify the list every time there is a new entrant onto the Australian register or a new compliant type certificate added. You are either the right type, the right noise profile and the right weight or you are not, but that does not seem to be the way the system operates. We understand that the Act must also apply to foreign-registered aircraft; is that right?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—Yes, Senator.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Very good. Their suitability will of course be measured against the act and type, but is it true that they are also subject to a separate form of regulatory control for entry into Australia by your Department?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—If they are regular passenger aircraft being flown by a foreign airline then they are subject to a whole range of controls to do with safety and security and then they receive a licence to fly into Australia. If you are talking about charter, there are different arrangements. The answer is: it depends on the circumstance but, yes, there are other controls.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Obviously, these people are concerned—and our job is to represent concerns—that they are being denied the opportunity to earn regular and export income as a consequence of the interpretation of the Act. That is, their Challenger 600/1 is compliant under the Act but excluded under the list. They are of the view that the list has the unintended consequence of discriminatory conduct by Government, restraint of interstate trade, loss of significant export income, economic loss to the company and inability to hire more staff to service the existing demand currently filled by foreign competitors. So with that in mind, I would be grateful if we could clear up this matter. Obviously if this 600/1 was originally on the list, we have all got a serious problem.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We will take the question on notice. I would simply note that the intended nature of the list is to protect people under flight paths.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Yes, I agree with that.</p>
AAA 14	28/05/09	41	Nash	<p>Senator NASH—On the issue of the second airport, Badgerys Creek is no longer an option? That is completely off the radar?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Correct, Senator.</p> <p>Senator NASH—What is the Government’s plan for the land, then? I used to live in the area when all of this was happening and all of the acquisitions were occurring, which was an</p>

				<p>inordinately long time ago now. If the airport is not going ahead, what is the plan for the land?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—That is a question for the Government.</p> <p>Senator NASH—Minister, I suppose you are not—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I will take that on notice.</p>
AAA 15	28/05/09	42	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Under the current arrangements what is the maximum number of movements for Sydney airport?</p> <p>Ms Gosling—In terms of hourly movements there is the 80 movements per hour cap, if that is what you mean. It is difficult to say.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Following up from Senator Nash’s question, how do you assess when the airport is at full capacity—when the maximum number of movements have been reached?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Capacity is an interesting question. You can talk about hourly capacity, which is the 18 movements an hour cap, but it is also how movements are distributed through the day. For example, Sydney airport seems to be peaky—morning arrivals and afternoon departures. Basically, the answer to your question is a complex sort of issue about when capacity is reached.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Under the current operating plan the maximum is 80 movements per hour for 18 hours a day, is it?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We are having to do the maths.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—We will not hold you to it.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—When does the curfew start? Is it 10?</p> <p>Ms Ellis—Eleven pm to 6 am.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—That is seven hours off 24, which is 17 hours a day. So the maximum use is 80 movements for 17 hours. How many of those hours are now at capacity, at 80 movements?</p> <p>Ms Gosling—We will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—What I am seeking, and Senator Nash was referring to, is how many movements there are currently in each of those 17 hours.</p> <p>Ms Gosling—We will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—That is doable, is it?</p> <p>Ms Gosling—It is a question of whether you are doing actual movements for a set period, whether you are doing an average day or a busy day. We will try to give you some illustration.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will try to give you an answer.</p>

AAA 16	28/05/09	42	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—A former employee of Bombardier, the manufacturer of the Challenger aircraft, is prepared to swear that the Challenger 600 was on list in the late 1990s and was taken off and replaced by the 604 in the context of negotiations between Bombardier and the government for the RAAF tender.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We appreciate—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—A swap occurred.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—that piece of information. As we said, we will take it on notice and come back to you with the situation as far as we are able to ascertain.</p>
AAA 17	28/05/09	56	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—On that very issue. I understand a cleaner was threatened with the sack for refusing to go on board a plane carrying a passenger with possible swine flu. See media release dated 1 May 2009. Could you investigate that on behalf of this Committee?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I will take that on notice—</p>
AAA 18	28/05/09	60	Milne	<p>Senator MILNE—Thank you. I apologise, because I should have asked this in the Aviation and Airports Section, but to some extent it is Airservices as well. There is quite a lot of concern on the north-west coast of Tasmania about ongoing air services, particularly to Devonport. If you cannot answer this and it relates to the people who were here before, then could you take it on notice? Has there been any discussion—there has been media speculation—about the possible sale of the Devonport Airport, leaving the Burnie Airport as the main airport in North West Tasmania?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Senator, that is one for the Department, and I will happily take that on notice and see what we can find for you.</p> <p>Senator O'BRIEN—The Devonport airport is owned by Tasports?</p> <p>Senator MILNE—It is owned by Tasports.</p> <p>Senator O'BRIEN—So it is not a Federally-owned airport.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We can endeavour to find out what we can.</p> <p>Senator MILNE—Nevertheless, I would be very interested. If I can just explain, there has been media speculation that Tasports is in negotiation for the sale of that airport. That would significantly alter air services going to the north-west of Tasmania and the mix in Tasmania, and I would just like to know if there has been any discussion about the sale; or, if the airport is sold, are there conditions requiring that it remain as an airport and that the appropriate level of oversight and whatever, in terms of air safety standards, would continue to apply. So any information you could give me about the future of those two airports, Burnie and Devonport, and any discussion about them, I would appreciate that. Thank you.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I am happy to go hunting, Senator.</p> <p>Senator MILNE—Thank you.</p> <p>CHAIR—Thank you, Senator Milne.....</p>

AAA 19	28/05/09	60	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Some people have made the following allegation. They state:</p> <p><i>The Commonwealth failed, prior to the privatisation of airports in the nineties, to provide existing sublessees adequate opportunity to regularise their lease terms in order to secure a value for their capital improvements ... We know that argument. They continue: The Commonwealth has acknowledged its stated aim was to maximise the sale price of airport operations at the expense of the existing leaseholders. If you are going to sell it, you are going to tell the bloke who has owned it. As has been demonstrated at Canberra airport, there are lots of opportunities. These people also allege: The Commonwealth failed, despite provision to disallow airport master plans, to retain adequate control over airport operators, following privatisation, to ensure they act reasonably in respect of existing sub-lessees. This company, who I will not name, sought to renew long-term leases on its two sites in the year prior to the privatisation of Canberra Airport in May 1998. They go on to say: The Federal Airports Corporation failed to give the applications proper consideration prior to the airport's sale. Discussions had been on the basis of a security of 25-year leases in return for significantly increased ground rental. The Federal Airports Corporation also failed to follow up an August 1997 ministerial direction setting out processes to follow where the existing lease negotiations were in train. Despite the opportunity, the transport department failed to intervene when notified of this company's concerns prior to the airport's sale. The new airport operator subsequently failed to renew the first of a five-year option on one of the two leases, claiming that the site was shortly required for development purposes. And we can obviously see some of the spectacular development that has taken place. Further, they say: The then recently (refurbished) hangar complex was sold at a nominal sum. We otherwise had to demolish it and the airport operator proceeded to rent it out to our competitor. In reality, the hangar remained in situ for the next eight years. The other lease expired on 30 September 2004. The operator extended our tenure on the site at greatly increased rent—and we have seen all this at Bankstown as well—until July 2007, when we were given two-weeks notice to quit and demolish the buildings. Alternative sites that were offered to us entailed the construction at our expense not only of a hangar and an office complex in a non-general aviation precinct on a remote part of an airfield, but also apron and taxiway. Moreover, the lease offer was for only 12 years, making amortisation of the costs over such a short period virtually impossible. The improvements would have been effectively gifted to the airport operator on lease expiry. Our presence at this airport is now curtailed and we had to relocate, including constructing new maintenance facilities, at another place at great cost and business dislocation. Our losses, readily quantifiable, through the failure to be granted the new lease is approximately \$4 million to \$5 million.</i></p>
--------	----------	----	-----------	---

				<p><i>Our original 2002 claims for defective administration and/or an act of grace payment to redress our losses were rejected by the then Transport Minister and finance minister respectively, based largely on advice from the Australian Government Solicitor and statements by the particular airport management. The Commonwealth Ombudsman has also examined the matter. He found that we had been disadvantaged by the privatisation process, the Federal Airports Corporation and subsequent treatment by the new airport operator, but he was not prepared to intervene on our behalf. The basis of our now reopening the matter is that we have had the opportunity to read the 2003 Attorney-General's legal opinion that was relied upon by the former minister in declining our original defective administration claim. Our detailed April 2008 submissions addressed to the Attorney-General identify significant areas. The Attorney-General referred the matter to the federal transport minister, who passed it on to the Finance Minister to consider an act of grace application. This was followed up with a letter on 15 January to the Minister, pointing out the Department's responsibility to reconsider the defective claim. We have received no response, nor to a later letter of 5 May, addressed to the acting Departmental Secretary. We would like acknowledgement ... our matter was mishandled ... an undertaking from Department officials that they will immediately refer our 2008 submissions to the AGs, in order that the AGs might reconsider the merits of our defective administration claim and, whilst they are at it, the act-o- grace application, albeit that the grant or not of this is a decision for the Finance Minister or his delegates. I will fill you in with the names that are missing at an appropriate time, because there is a feeling by some of the people involved in this that they can be intimidated and their business life made difficult by naming the various bits of it in public.</i></p> <p>Mr Tongue—Senator, it sounds like a complex matter and I am happy to take it on notice. The question you are chasing is the current state of the matter?</p>
AAA 20	28/05/09	77	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Very good. Some might say that NAS is not in the US airspace classification system, but on page 23 of the Minister's airspace policy statement it is clearly set out there what our position should be. There is now a new draft policy statement, which I think you have got.</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Yes.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Senator, can I just clarify: is that the draft that was released on 2 December 2008, with the aviation green paper.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—As I understand it, it is the latest draft.</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—No. That is not correct, Senator. This is the one that was released for public consultation; it is not the latest version.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Could we have the latest?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—You would have to seek that from the Department.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Certainly, Senator, we will get that for you.</p>

AAA 21	28/05/09	82	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—That one there, which is not the latest one, removes any reference to NAS or upgrading the airspace in any specific way. Why is that?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—The reason that—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—It is a single document that replaces a much larger document.</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—I understand, yes.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—And it has taken out—</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—The airspace policy statement from 2007, Senator, was an excellent document for doing what it was designed to do, which was to cover the transition from regulation of airspace by Airservices to CASA. And I fully understand and support that document because it set out, in some considerable detail, how we should operate. The drawback with that is that within this document there are several differences of requirement, some of which we have already touched on. So, for example, it says ‘Do NAS, but do risk based.’ It says to take public transport operations as our first priority, and yet we should also consider other aspects of equitable access and efficiency. So there are various aspects of this which are difficult to reconcile on occasion. In the new draft what we are trying to do—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Which is the one I have not got, is it?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Even in this particular version what we tried to do was to allow CASA the flexibility to do what was best for Australia in any particular circumstance.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—By having no guidelines at all.</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—There are principles in here, in the same way that there were in the original policy statement.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—But there is no reference to NAS in there.</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—No, there is not.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—That is curious, is it not?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—But similarly, in the present policy statement it says—</p> <p>Mr McCormick—Senator, while Mr Cromarty looks for the page number, that draft that we are referring to—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Which is the second latest version.</p> <p>Mr McCormick—Indeed, or the one that you have. I have not released that or signed off on that document, which will require my signature before it went to—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—You will put your wise head to it before it—</p> <p>Mr McCormick—To the Department.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—In due course, and at the appropriate moment, you will make that available to this Committee.</p> <p>Mr McCormick—That is correct, Senator.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Thank you very much for your assistance.</p>
--------	----------	----	-----------	--

AAA 22	N/A	Written	Milne	<p>Sale of Devonport Airport</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When the Devonport Airport was sold by the Commonwealth initially what were the conditions of the sale regarding ongoing air services? 2. Have those conditions been met to date given that the airport was on sold to Tasmanian Ports? In full? In part? Please give details. 3. What powers does the Commonwealth have to enforce the original terms of sale? 4. Is the future of Devonport airport and a possible sale under discussion currently? 5. Do the original conditions of sale from the Commonwealth still apply? If not, why not?
AAA 23	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<p>Federal Airport Corporations: Leases and Sub-Lessees</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many sub-lease renewal applications were in train at FAC airports (listing Canberra separately) at the time of issue of the August 1997 ministerial direction to the FAC and FAC guidelines outlining the processes to be followed in the period leading to privatisation? 2. What additional resourcing was provided to FAC management to help them deal with the anticipated increase in sub-lease renewal applications following the announcement of airport privatisations? 3. What appeal mechanisms were available to sub-lessees who were not satisfied with either FAC and/or then departmental decisions relating to lease negotiations during the pre-privatisation period.
AAA 24	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Noise Insulation for Public Buildings</p> <p>Regarding the response to question on notice AAA 03 from February 2009, which indicated that <i>“the Commonwealth took responsibility for the insulation of eligible buildings, including eligible State buildings.”</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why was the insulation of these state government buildings not the responsibility of the respective state government? 2. Why did it become the responsibility of the Commonwealth to carry out the insulation work given that the buildings were owned by state governments? 3. Aside from Fort Street High School, has the Commonwealth carried out insulation work on any other state government owned buildings? If so, how much was spent and where? 4. Given that the Commonwealth has taken responsibility for State Government-owned buildings in this case, has an expensive precedent been set? 5. Will the Commonwealth have to take responsibility for the insulation of any other State Government-owned buildings? 6. If so, how will the cost of this work be met?

AAA 25	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Regarding the response to question on notice AAA 14 from February 2009 which declined to give the details of the Fort Street High School insulation work on the grounds that “<i>the project for insulation of Fort Street High School has not yet gone out to tender.</i>”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is this an inadvertent oversight or is there still more work to be done at Fort Street High School that has not yet gone out to tender? 2. Are the details of the \$14.5 million project to insulate Fort Street High School in the Minister for Transport’s electorate now available given that the work has been completed? 3. If not, when will this information be made available? 4. Maureen Ellis stated in the October 2008 round of Senate Estimates that the details would not be available until 2009. Given that we are well into 2009, will the details be made available this year? 5. If not, why are the details still being withheld?
AAA 26	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Regarding the response to question on notice AAA 12 from February 2009 which indicated that the noise contours have recently changed in Adelaide.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does this mean that further work could be commissioned? 2. If so, what would be the estimated cost of this work and how would this cost be met?
AAA 27	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Regarding the response to question on notice AAA 13 from February 2009 which mentioned two public buildings in Adelaide which have recently become eligible for insulation under the Adelaide insulation program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the insulation work been put out to tender? 2. What is the estimated cost of the insulation work at these sites? 3. How will this cost be met?
AAA 28	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Sydney Airport Unfortunately, the Government has simply ignored any questions this Committee has asked about Sydney Airport. So I will try again. The Government’s National Aviation Green Paper states on page 17 that <i>Sydney Airport is approaching capacity</i>. When will Sydney Airport approach capacity?</p>
AAA 29	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I note the Government’s support for a second airport for Sydney and the statement on page 166 of the Aviation Green Paper that: <i>The construction of an airport at Badgerys Creek is no longer an option</i>. Given that Badgerys Creek is not going to be used as the site for a second airport, what is the Government’s plan for the land?</p>
AAA 30	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Will the Commonwealth sell it?</p>
AAA 31	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Have any discussions to that end occurred?</p>
AAA 32	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>What sites are being considered for the second airport?</p>

AAA 33	N/A	Written	Nash	What are the options?
AAA 34	N/A	Written	Nash	What are their respective merits?
AMSA 01	28/05/09	94	Macdonald	Senator IAN MACDONALD —I must just, if I could, put a question on notice to AMSA asking them to update their investigations into this oil spill of the <i>Pacific Adventurer</i> .
BITRE 01	27/05/09	149	Colbeck	<p>Senator COLBECK—We sort of danced around that <i>Circular Head Dolomite</i> stuff. Could I just ask you to review your answer to that question for me, please? You gave me an answer on notice to a question I asked before.</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Yes.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—I would just ask you to review the answer, please.</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Yes. I think that is probably better directed to the Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics, because your question was about their parameter report, but we will certainly review it in consultation with the Bureau.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—Thanks, that is fine</p>
BITRE 02	27/05/09	154	Colbeck	<p>Senator COLBECK—My question is effectively on notice. It is our ongoing argument that goes back to the review done on the Tasmanian Freight Equalisation Scheme. The dispute revolves around the ratios for high-density products and a reference that was made in response to a question on notice to me at the last Estimates, which talked about a reference in a Circular Head Dolomite submission to the Productivity Commission, suggesting a 30 per cent density rate rather than one that was current. They are disputing that. I have a question on an answer to a question on notice that refers to paragraph 5 in their submission. I have both of their submissions and they are still questioning with me where the reference comes from, because their view was that the density ratio should be removed, even if there were a category set up for that particular agricultural product, which is obviously their objective.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—That is a fairly detailed question. I am just hazarding a guess that they may not be able to give you a fulsome answer.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—As I said at the outset, there is a Question on notice to another part of the Department, who I assume will be coming back to you. So now you have it from me as well and you will have an understanding as to what my issue is. The question that I put to Mr Sutton was asking him to review the answer, because we do not agree that what is in the answer is correct.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—That is fine. I am happy with that.</p>

<p>BITRE 03 [NBII 77 to NBII 80 are NBII input to BITRE 03 sub-questions 4-7]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Ludlam</p>	<p>I refer to predicted global oil decline rates as described by, for example, the International Energy Agency's World Energy Outlook (WEO) published in November 2008, and ask:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How were global oil decline rates factored into decision-making on infrastructure spending, either by the Government or its advisory bodies including Infrastructure Australia? [IA input] 2. Were global oil decline rates explicitly factored into any of the infrastructure decisions announced in the 2009/10 budget? [IA input] 3. If yes to (2), will the Minister outline specific examples and table supporting documentation outlining the assumptions underlying the decisions? [IA input] 4. Is the Minister aware that the planning documents submitted for the proposed F3 Freeway extension assume +22% to +59% traffic growths in 10 years? [NBII 77] 5. Does the Minister consider these projections plausible in the light of the WEO document and related sources? [NBII 78] 6. Is the Minister aware that the planning documents submitted for the proposed Pacific Highway Kempsey bypass assume a doubling of traffic out to 2031? [NBII 79] 7. Does the Minister consider these projections plausible in the light of the WEO document and related sources? [NBII 80] 8. Is the Minister aware that the BITRE forecasts a doubling of air traffic out to 2030? [BITRE input] 9. Does the Minister consider these projections plausible in the light of the WEO document and related sources? [BITRE input] 10. Can the Minister outline whether or not future funding rounds managed through the selection process undertaken by Infrastructure Australia will explicitly include forecasted global oil decline rates? [IA input]
<p>CASA 01</p>	<p>28/05/09</p>	<p>48</p>	<p>Macdonald</p>	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I am not sure that ignorance might not be bliss in this instance. Finally—and this is not your area but you would know—are all GA aircraft now required to have their own internal radar that sees through rain and cloud?</p> <p>Mr Russell—No.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—The one that sees mountains is, though, as opposed to other aircraft?</p> <p>Mr Harfield—It is probably a question—</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I should ask CASA.</p> <p>Mr Harfield—They will give you their details, but there are certain requirements for certain categories that have to have the ground proximity warning systems involved. They should be able to give you the finer detail.</p>

CASA 02	28/05/09	69-70	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—In the Australian airspace policy document, on page 19, which lists the safety priorities of the Government, which was given to you nearly two years ago, it says: <i>NAS—The National Airspace System used in the United States and which has been adopted as the model for reform of the Australian airspace system since 2002</i>. Could you confirm that that is still the Government’s policy?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—That is correct, Senator.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I refer to the <i>Australian Airspace Policy Statement, 28 June 2007</i>, under the signature of Mark Vaile. Is the NAS policy as listed in this document still the policy CASA is acting on?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Senator, can I just clarify that? Are you talking about this particular document?</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—The 2007 Mark Vaile document.</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Sorry, what is your question?</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Is the National Airspace System as listed in that document still the policy CASA is operating on?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Yes, that is correct.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Which is the US system?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—It depends how you—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—The US system, I am aware, is changing to satellite from ground.</p> <p>Mr McCormick—I am new to this position—but that is not to say I am not responsible for it. This document does say it will be modelled on the US system; it does not say we will adopt the US system. There are a few other issues, I think, particularly on page 15 of the document to which you refer—the airspace policy statement signed by the Hon. Mark Vaile—which says:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">5.5 How major changes to airspace will be made</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">... These steps will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • risk management analysis consistent with the CASA Risk Management System and the Common Risk Management Framework (see below); <p>And there are further references to that common risk management framework. My own inquiries have discovered that that common risk management framework has never reached a final version.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—This document has, by and large, been ignored. Paragraph 5.4 on page 15 of the policy statement says:</p> <p>The Government expects CASA to establish a work programme that is inclusive of the Government’s priorities for airspace reform to progress NAS implementation as outlined</p>
---------	----------	-------	-----------	---

				<p>in this Statement. Is that fair enough? CASA established this work program and is it clearly to progress the NAS reforms? Mr McCormick—Yes, Senator. Senator HEFFERNAN—Can we have a copy of those documents? Mr Cromarty—Yes, Senator. We have supplied them to the minister as well. Senator HEFFERNAN—So you can supply them to us? Mr Cromarty—Yes.</p>
CASA 03	28/05/09	70	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—In line with the Statement of Expectations issued to CASA on 12 March 2007, CASA is to develop a detailed implementation programme for these reform priorities for submission to the Minister by 30 September 2007. Mr Cromarty—Yes, Senator. Senator HEFFERNAN—Was this submission of a detailed implementation program given to the minister by 30 September 2007? Mr Cromarty—It was, Senator, yes. Senator HEFFERNAN—Can you provide the details of how and the fact that it was handed over then? Mr Cromarty—Yes, Senator. Senator HEFFERNAN—Confirmation by way of paperwork.</p>
CASA 04	28/05/09	82	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Do you or any of your team have an approximate price of the cost of the supply and fitment of these devices? Mr McCormick—For the TAWS-B proposal—the one we have just done the notice of proposed rule-making on—we do not have a cost. But I can perhaps get you an industry average cost, if we take that on notice. Senator IAN MACDONALD—Yes. But are we talking \$10,000, \$100,000, \$1,000? Does anyone have any approximate idea? Mr McCormick—I am afraid we will have to take that on notice. I would not like to mislead you. Mr Cromarty may have some information. Mr McCormick—I would not like to mislead you, Senator. That was talking about TAWS-A, and the aeroplanes I think you are talking about are down at TAWS-B, which we do not have the figures for aeroplanes. Senator IAN MACDONALD—Well, then get me that. Thank you.....</p>
CASA 05	28/05/09	82	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—.....So TAWS-A is what is used on RPT aircraft. Is that generally the case? Mr McCormick—Much larger aircraft. Yes, that is correct. Senator IAN MACDONALD—Wasn't it RPT or is it only— Mr McCormick—RPT charter, if greater than 10 passengers or greater than 15,000</p>

				<p>kilograms max takeoff.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—The weights do not mean much to me. So more than 10 passengers, whether it is RPT or charter, has the TAWS-A and the TAWS-B is six passengers or more?</p> <p>Mr McCormick—I have got two conflicting figures in front of me about whether it is six passengers or six seats fitted to the aircraft. If I could take that under notice, I will get an answer back to you.</p>
CASA 06	28/05/09	84	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—You are talking to someone that does not understand these things. I understand that on Qantas and Virgin they have something up the front that, if they are running into another plane or a mountain, something shows to them. That is all I am interested in, and, I suggest, all that most of the flying public is interested in. I accept that as being the case on Virgin, Qantas and other RPT carriers. But I am wondering how far down that goes. We have talked about the terrain things. Do your requirements require those 10-seater GA aircraft to also, as well as having the terrain things, have the ability to see another aircraft in front of them in poor visibility conditions?</p> <p>Mr McCormick—There are three separate systems we are talking about. There is the weather radar. There is a requirement in the Civil Aviation Orders for aircraft of a certain size to have a weather radar fitted.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—That is everyone, isn't it? Even the Baron has a weather radar.</p> <p>Mr McCormick—I believe the requirement to have the traffic collision avoidance system fitted applies to aircraft which have 30 seats or more, but I will take on notice. I do not have that in front of me. There are three systems that we are talking about. One is the weather radar, one is the traffic collision avoidance system and one is the ground proximity warning system or the TAWS system. With some aeroplanes, if you pay enough money, you can get an instrument that will show you all three of those on the one instrument. Some other aeroplanes will have a separate instrument for each one and they work on different readings.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—What I am really after is: what requirements does CASA put on which aircraft owners to have all three of those systems? That is really what I am after. If you do take an answer on notice, please do not answer in technical terms. I am assuming, and your officers at the table must know this, that everyone has the weather radar?</p> <p>Mr McCormick—I will take the first part on notice. We will provide you with a detailed breakdown of the numbers of passengers, seats etcetera. They are all in the Civil Aviation Orders, but I will admit they are not something that can be committed to memory. They are far too prescriptive. As far as the weather radar goes, I will take it on notice.</p>

CASA 07	28/05/09	87	Back	<p>Senator BACK—Mr Denby, is this the sort of anomaly that you found when you started the process on 6 April? Are these some of the anomalies that came out of the process?</p> <p>Mr Denby—We have no anomalies where we have not detected drugs and later found that drugs are in use, no.</p> <p>Senator BACK—You have had no false negatives?</p> <p>Mr Denby—We have had no false negatives—and that includes our testing of the machinery using spiked samples. We have control samples provided by laboratories which provide us with controls of both negative and positive samples, and we have had no false negative samples.</p> <p>Senator BACK—I do not want to get into the technicalities as to how you did the controls, because that is a very complex world, where all sort of anomalies occur—children, adults, men, women, pregnant ladies. But I am sure they will be worked out over time. How long after a drug is used do either your control tests or the field evidence show you that you can detect drugs by an oral swab?</p> <p>Mr Denby—Much like alcohol-testing, that depends on many things, such as body mass, type of activity undertaken by the person, type of drug used. It is a very complex science. I am happy to submit quite a lengthy document that would give you all those variables, but there is no exact answer for any particular drug or any particular person.</p> <p>Senator BACK—I would be interested to receive that.....</p>
CASA 08	28/05/09	75-76	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—In 6.2, the policy states: CASA is to undertake by June 2008 the assessment of the following NAS 3(b) Characteristics, and determine as appropriate an implementation programme according to the outcome of the analytical and consultative process outlined in Part 5 of this Statement. Have we complied with that undertaking in the policy?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Yes.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Is there a chance that we can bring class E down to 1,200 feet?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Yes.</p> <p>Mr McCormick—In 6.2 25, it says: Low level Class E corridors: <i>this NAS characteristic deals with low level Class E corridors, where required, above 1,200FT ...</i></p> <p>We cannot go around making corridors between nebulous places, and I do not think there has been an industry requirement or a submission to us requesting a corridor of class E airspace at that height. That may go somewhat to the work program of the Office of Airspace Regulation.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I understand the issues, the workload and the priorities, but this is the beginning of this exercise, not the finish of it. I understand that characteristic 23, ‘Class E terminal airspace to be introduced at specific locations,’ could mean that in places</p>

				<p>like Port Macquarie the airspace would be upgraded from uncontrolled G to controlled E and the airlines would be given full air traffic separation, whereas at the moment they fly in uncontrolled space. Has anything been done about this?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Yes.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—What has been done?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—We consider the use of NAS characteristics on every review that we do. For example, at Karratha we are specifically looking at this solution.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Which is quite a busy place.</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Which is similar to Port Macquarie.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—So, Port Macquarie is likely to be done?</p> <p>Mr Cromarty—Port Macquarie will be on our work program. I cannot tell you exactly where it is on our work program at the moment, but I could take that one on notice for you.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Yes, fair enough.</p>
CASA 09	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has a new CASA Board been appointed? If no, when will this happen, if YES, who is on the Board and what is their background/experience? 2. Without compromising air safety, what steps will CEO introduce as to strive for better efficiency? 3. CEO stated "<i>we are not in the business of putting general aviation out of business by putting excessively onerous requirements on them</i>", can I inform you that I receive quite a few complaints from pilots and aviation companies stating the CASA regulators can be quite overbearing, if regulators don't like a certain person or they disagree with something, they tend to take that as a personal vendetta against that person who ultimately suffers the consequences of a unfair and unjust decision making process, how do you think you will address these "prejudices" and/or strive for a workable balance of regulation between operator and CASA? 4. CEO stated <i>CASA was good organisation with a good reputation but that it needed "a bit of direction" in terms of governance</i>, could you expand and explain this statement?
CASA 10	N/A	Written	Nash	How many random drug tests has CASA carried out in the last twelve months?
CASA 11	N/A	Written	Nash	Where have these random drug tests been carried out?
CASA 12	N/A	Written	Nash	How long has the current system of random drug testing been in effect?
CASA 13	N/A	Written	Nash	Does CASA provide advance notice that random drug testing will be carried out? If so, how much advance notice is given?
CASA 14	N/A	Written	Nash	What proportions of tests are returned with a positive result?

CASA 15	N/A	Written	Nash	What testing methods are used?
CASA 16	N/A	Written	Nash	What proportions of tests are conducted using oral swabs?
CASA 17	N/A	Written	Nash	How reliable are oral swabs in random drug testing?
CASA 18	N/A	Written	Nash	What drugs can be detected using oral swabs? Are there any drugs that cannot be detected using oral swabs?
CASA 19	N/A	Written	Nash	How long after a drug is used will it still be detectable using oral swabs?
CASA 20	N/A	Written	Nash	Do other drug testing authorities (for example police and road traffic authorities) use oral swabs in drug testing?
CASA 21	N/A	Written	Nash	In the event of a positive test, what immediate action does CASA take?
CASA 22	N/A	Written	Nash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are secondary tests carried out in the event that an initial test returns a positive result? 2. If not, why not? 3. If so, how and when are the secondary tests carried out?
CASA 23	N/A	Written	Nash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you keep records on the number of false positives recorded in the course of tests? 2. If not, why not? 3. If so, how many false positive have been returned in the last twelve months?
CASA 24	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I refer to the random drug testing that was carried out on 8 April 2009 on students and pilots of the Royal Victorian Aero Club at Moorabbin airport in Melbourne. A number of tests were carried out that returned negative results, but the chief pilot falsely tested positive for cannabis and was immediately suspended from safety sensitive aviation activity. The next day, CASA issued a clearance, but not before the chief pilot's activities for the following week were cancelled, damaging the club's reputation and causing financial losses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does CASA bear any liability with respect to loss of business in cases like these? 2. CASA's response to the RVAC mentioned "<i>it should be appreciated that the implementation of drug and alcohol testing is still new and there will be a need to improve processes and practices over time.</i>" 3. What steps is CASA taking to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of the random drug testing system?
CASA 25	N/A	Written	Nash	What other means of testing are available to CASA?

CASA 26	N/A	Written	Nash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is urine or blood testing feasible for random drug testing? 2. How reliable are urine and blood tests? 3. How long does it take for the results of urine and blood tests to be returned?
CASA 27	N/A	Written	Nash	If testing with oral swabs returns false positives, is it not possible that it also returns false negatives?
CASA 28	N/A	Written	Nash	Is there any way of knowing how many false negatives have slipped through the cracks of the random drug testing system?
CASA 29	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Trial of Unicom System</p> <p>I understand Airservices Australia has been running an air-traffic situational awareness trial called Unicom. I understand this was an initiative of Airservices Australia and has been conducted at Dubbo, Wagga Wagga in late 2007 and then expanded to include Port Macquarie, Hervey Bay and Olympic Dam. I further understand that it is an attempt to provide an alternative arrangement for regional airports catering for higher capacity jets now using aerodromes in regional Australia without the expensive infrastructure associated with licensed air traffic controllers and control towers.</p> <p>Is this a correct summary?</p>
CASA 30	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you provide more information about the trial?
CASA 31	N/A	Written	Nash	I further understand that the trial concluded on 31 March 2009. Is that correct?
CASA 32	N/A	Written	Nash	Has Airservices Australia completed its report analysing the trial?
CASA 33	N/A	Written	Nash	Has the report been submitted to your organisation for its consideration?
CASA 34	N/A	Written	Nash	Has CASA determined its view on the trial?
CASA 35	N/A	Written	Nash	What are its views?
CASA 36	N/A	Written	Nash	Has CASA completed a report on the trial?
CASA 37	N/A	Written	Nash	Civil Aviation Safety Authority for its policy consideration?
CASA 38	N/A	Written	Nash	Will the report on the Unicom trial be made publicly available?

CASA 39	N/A	Written	Nash	Will your analysis be made publicly-available?
CASA 40	N/A	Written	Nash	Will CASA be adopting Unicom as a permanent service to be included as part of the suite of third party air traffic services and provided to industry?
CASA 41	N/A	Written	Nash	When?
CORP 01	27/05/09	12	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—I accept that, but we have a figure here of \$3.7 million. Was that figure obtained a bit like the broadband network figure of ‘just pluck a figure out of the air, it sounds big, it sounds good and we’ll run with it’ with no business case and no underpinning of that figure? Surely there is some underpinning here of \$3.7 million.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—All our costs are scrutinised by the Department of Finance, Senator. I am happy to take it on notice and we will do our best to break it down.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—If you could. Basically, what I do not want is one element ‘staff’ and the other element ‘outside’, but if you can break them up somewhat. I do not mean to the last dollar and cent. I would imagine there would be at least 10 or a dozen areas into which you could break that figure up.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We will see if we can do some grouping.</p>
CORP 02	27/05/09	19	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Could I just ask finally on the Corporate area, can you just explain to me the division of responsibilities between the Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary and how the process works within the Department? I am not sure if that is a question for you or for the Minister. I think it would be for you, Mr Tongue.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I can seek some information. What would happen if it is either agreed between the Ministers, or the Prime Minister will sometimes set out individual area? I will seek some information from the Minister and we will provide whatever is available.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I think this would be, and what we used to have—what were they?—letters from the Prime Minister.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—That is what I am saying, I will seek whatever information is available and provide it to the Committee.</p>
CORP 03	N/A	Written	Boyce	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many people with a disability were employed full-time and how many part-time? What classifications were these staff employed under? 2. What percentage of staff in the Department had a disability at March 30, 2008 and March 30, 2009? 3. What programs does the Department have to encourage the employment of people with a disability?

CORP 04	27/05/09	13	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—And your anxiety to get me to ask questions seems to be somewhat misplaced, I would imagine, given your commentary just then. Given the sensitivity, can I ask you: does the media monitoring these days also include monitoring of blogs?</p> <p>Mr Banham—It can, Senator.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—There we go; it can.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I would certainly say that I hope so. In the new media world, I would hope that it is monitoring all relevant media.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—I am not critical; I am just asking. Once again, thanks for your intervention, Minister. Can you tell us which blogs?</p> <p>Mr Banham—I would not have that information. I can get that. I am not actually aware that we are monitoring blogs, but the media monitoring service can monitor blogs.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—On notice, then, if you monitor any blogs, can you let us know which ones, in general terms?</p>
CORP 05	27/05/09	13	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—One thing you do engage in very well is Twitter. Can I ask whether this portfolio shares the media monitoring with the Shadow Minister’s office?</p> <p>Mr Banham—No, we do not.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—That is a decision for the Minister, Senator Abetz. My understanding is that across the previous Government and this one that is a decision taken by each individual Minister.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—That is right.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—When I was a Shadow, in some cases I was forwarded by my Minister copies of the material and in some cases I was not. So, it is down to the individual discretion of the Minister.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—That is right. Thank you very much for that. That is all information that was well known to all of us. Why has the Minister exercised his discretion not to share the media monitoring with the Shadow Minister?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am happy to take that on notice, and if the Minister has got anything he would like to pass on to the Committee—</p>
IA 01	27/05/09	26	Abetz	<p>Senator Conroy—But now you are asking for an interpretation and the detail of the advice to the Government. I would say to you that I think right now you are a little further across the line than the officer needs to answer. If you want to perhaps reword or rework your question—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—No, thanks. We now understand that the various criteria were marked off and judged by a methodology. On the basis of that methodology, there must be the possibility of establishing a league table in relation to which projects—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Mr Deegan has indicated that there was not a league table prepared so</p>

				<p>he cannot answer questions or supply you with information that was not prepared.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Just because it was not prepared, Minister, does not mean that the Department cannot go back, work out the raw numbers and provide us with a league table. The information is clearly there. If the Government, as a policy decision, refuses to allow that, it will allow us to beg the question as to why the Government refuses to do that. I would have thought if the information is there then it can be worked through and provided for us.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—As I said, I believe the question you are asking goes to the formulation of policy advice. There is a long-standing tradition where officers do not have to answer about formulation and content of policy advice.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Of course they do. What you have said is, quite frankly, gobbledegook and is not in any way in line with Senate Committee practice at Estimates.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—If that is how you feel, Senator Abetz, I will happily take it on notice and see whether there is any further information that the Minister would like to provide.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—No, not ‘would like to provide’; needs to provide. This is not discretionary. I know this is how Labor treats us. It will provide us with answers if it would like to. We are actually entitled to information in this process. The raw information is there. Just tell us what it is: ‘One project got 99 out of 100 and another got 51 out of 100 but they still passed the hurdle. Good luck; they are going to get the money.’ I think we are entitled to know which projects were better than others. I will pass over to my colleagues, but do not think that I have given up on this issue.</p>
IA 02	27/05/09	30	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—What do you mean by ‘pipeline’, sorry?</p> <p>Mr Deegan—In the diagram you might have before you, the second column is where we considered the action was ready to proceed and others that either required further work or some other decisions. The Mount Isa-Townsville rail corridor is clearly a project with real potential but we need to do more work with the proponent, which we will be undertaking in the next little while.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Who is the proponent?</p> <p>Mr Deegan—I would need to check for you the exact proponent. I think it is the Mount Isa economic development people, but I can check that for you.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—MITEZ, the Mount Isa to Townsville Economic Development Zone—</p> <p>Mr Deegan—I think that is right.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—It was not the Queensland Government?</p> <p>Mr Deegan—No, it was not the Queensland Government.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—That is odd.</p> <p>Mr Deegan—It may have been as part of the broad freight strategy for the Queensland Government, but I can check that for you. There were a range of proponents including the Government or local government or other groups which worked together on how that might go forward.</p>

IA 03	27/05/09	38	Back	<p>Senator BACK—If I can then just ask some questions about specific projects including firstly, if I may, the Northbridge rail link in Perth. I understand there has been a tick on that. I think the commitment is \$236 million. Is this the correct time to be asking questions about this particular project?</p> <p>Mr Deegan—That is partly for me and then partly for the Department under item 4. I will do what I can here, Senator.</p> <p>Senator BACK—My first question is: given the fact that it is actually an urban development project—in the sense that once the railway line has been sunk underground there therefore becomes land available—can you assist me by advising if the Commonwealth’s contribution of \$236 million is being directed purely towards the undergrounding of the rail or is there also some of the urban land development on top of what would then become the land available part of the project?</p> <p>Mr Deegan—I might need to take that on notice to get you an accurate answer. Certainly there has been a lot of discussion with the West Australian Government about the detail, a combination of the urban rail sinking and issues to do with the bus zone. I think there is an old bus station there that was a temporary station 25 years ago.</p> <p>Senator BACK—There is.</p> <p>Mr Deegan—There are a host of those public issues associated with the development of the Northbridge development site. The West Australian Government has had a series of meetings internally about how it wants this project to proceed, and we think, in terms of one of our themes being transforming our cities, Northbridge is worthy of support. The details of the funding might come through in the discussions in item 4.</p> <p>Senator BACK—I wonder, when you do provide us with that answer, if you could also give us an indication of what the Western Australian Government’s contribution to that project would be.</p> <p>Mr Deegan—Sure. It may be that officers appearing later will have the detail, but we will certainly take that and get you an answer one way or another.</p>
IA 04	27/05/09	38	Back	<p>Senator BACK—The second relates to the Oakajee Port project north of Geraldton, where I understand the Federal Government is committing about \$339 million. Could you give us some advice as to whether this project would only go ahead in the event that the Western Australian Government was also financially committed?</p> <p>Mr Deegan—Again, my understanding is that both the Western Australian and Commonwealth Governments are determined that this project proceed. There are discussions going on about the funding breakup. What Infrastructure Australia has been asked to do is work with the Western Australian Government, and we are in the process of convening a working party to take this complete project forward. Again, we can provide detail, as that comes to hand, of the funding agreements that are established. There may be</p>

				a range of things that need to be determined including the industrial estate, the common user berths, what is happening with the proponent OPR for the Oakajee Port and Rail effort—just having clarity about who is funding which parts. But that is a well-advanced discussion. I am happy to take that and provide further detail.
IA 05	27/05/09	44	Ludlam	<p>Senator LUDLAM—Has your office referred to the <i>World Energy Outlook 2008</i>—the report published in November 2008? It looks at—</p> <p>Mr Deegan—I will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator LUDLAM—If you would. The reason I raise that one in particular is that obviously the International Energy Agency are a pretty credible authority on these sorts of matters. They have pointed out fairly severe shortfalls opening up in the order of four per cent per annum in oil supplies in the near term. I am looking for whether that sort of thinking is being incorporated into your model, or is that still down the track somewhere?</p> <p>Mr Deegan—I will take it on notice. It is probably still down the track as part of our consideration.</p>
IA 06	27/05/09	48	Milne	<p>Senator MILNE—So, for all of the projects that you have reported to Government about, there is a greenhouse gas assessment on that high-to-low rating but it is not to be made public. Is that what you are saying?</p> <p>Mr Deegan—That is a matter for Government.</p> <p>Senator MILNE—Minister, will the Government now make available the rating that Infrastructure Australia has made for each of the projects the Government has recommended in its infrastructure spend?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Thanks, Senator Milne. I will happily take that on notice and seek further information from the Minister.</p> <p>Senator MILNE—Minister, I find that extraordinary because if you go back to the Senate debate you will recall the very long engagement you and I had, and you gave the Senate an undertaking that these things would be assessed. There was a clear understanding that the public would be able to make a judgment about that, and now we are being told that there is no requirement to make that public.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—There are two points there. Firstly, I think Mr Deegan has indicated that we kept that commitment we had in that long dialogue, so I do not think you were suggesting we had not kept our commitment on that.</p> <p>Senator MILNE—No.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You are now seeking information about whether or not we were going to release it, and what I have said is that I do not know the answer to that. I will happily take it on notice and seek further information from the Minister and make it available as soon as possible.</p> <p>Senator MILNE—What I am asking on notice is that you provide the greenhouse gas rating for all of the projects that you have recommended. Is that fully understood?</p>

				<p>Senator Conroy—That is understood.</p> <p>Senator MILNE—Thank you, Chair.</p>
IA 07	27/05/09	53	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—Can you tell us, in relation to the pipeline list, which of those projects were considered to not have enough analysis to be sure of their economic underpinning?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Senator Abetz, I think you are now seeking to drill down into issues that we use to formulate the advice to government. So it would be fair to say that I think you are again possibly crossing the line of seeking information that goes to advice to government. I am happy to take it on notice and check with the minister as to whether or not he feels that you have crossed that line. Up until now, again, you have been on the other side of that line, but I think I might err on the cautious side by taking that one on notice and seeking the advice of the Minister about whether it constitutes crossing the line in his opinion.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—It was very interesting that Mr Deegan had no difficulty in telling us his advice in relation to some of the projects which you guys did fund but when I asked—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I thought he was trying to be as helpful as possible.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—I have talked about the Oakajee port project and the Northbridge rail project.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I think he gave a general guide as to the advice. As I said, I will err on the conservative side here. We will take that on notice and seek the Minister’s advice on whether he believes that information is across the line.</p>
IA 08	27/05/09	57	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—Right, but the next area that I want to go into is, was there a differentiation between the quality of submissions from the various State Governments? And please do not say they all had good and bad and indifferent ones.</p> <p>Mr Deegan—No, I understand, and I am genuinely trying to help, because the council’s view is that we should be seeking to lift the standard across the nation and, indeed, have a national approach to some of these issues. Some of the issues to do with the State Government proposals are around timing. We went out for public submissions September-October 2008, which may seem a long time to good Senators. It is a relatively short time for us.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Yes.</p> <p>Mr Deegan—And there were some projects in some jurisdictions that were well-advanced and prepared because they had been working on them for a number of years, and that would be across jurisdictions. Others, this was the first time they had had the opportunity to stop and think about what they might do.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—But that would apply to States equally.</p> <p>Mr Deegan—Indeed it does.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—So what I am asking is: in relation to the States, did one State stand out</p>

as having, for want of a better term, best practice in relation to its submissions that might be of benefit to be shared with other States as to how they go about their applications in the future, and if so, which State?

Mr Deegan—There were elements of best practice in each State.

Senator ABETZ—I am sure there was.

Mr Deegan—For example, while I was not privy to the submission from Tasmania on telecommunications, it was clear the Tasmanian Government had a very clear strategy on what they might do with telecommunications—from our discussions with them; we did not get involved in that appraisal. It is also fair to say that Tasmania are also thinking through, as part of our continuing process, the water issues associated with one of our States receiving 14 per cent of Australia's rainfall. They have already done a lot of work. We are working with them on further work in that area. Victoria was well advanced on their two major rail projects.

Senator ABETZ—I understand and accept that, but would there be a State that overall was seen as best practice or better practice than the others?

Mr Deegan—There were elements in each State. In New South Wales, there is a lot—I know you are seeking a different answer; I have got to tell you honestly, though, that there are a range of different things in different departments in different States.

Senator ABETZ—Of course there are. But schools, at the end of the day, usually provide a dux, and they say, 'Yes, we look at sport, we look at maths, we look at English,' and at the end of the day, they make a selection that one is the dux.

Mr Deegan—Of course.

Senator ABETZ—If I can use that analogy, which one was the dux out of the States?

Mr Deegan—Let me say that all of your students have had 13 years in the school system. This process is just over six months. We are at the start of a journey.

Senator ABETZ—We even get mid-term reports in some schools, Mr Deegan, after six months; even kindergarten, I think somebody said. So, if you were the teacher, continuing this analogy, and writing reports, you know, would you say that 'John is doing well at the top of the class' or would you be saying 'David is languishing at the bottom' or—

Senator Conroy—Senator Abetz, I am entertained by what must be about your twentieth analogy, but I think Mr Deegan has not been in a position to answer your questions. I am happy to take them on notice.

Senator ABETZ—He has been.

Senator Conroy—But you are a very cunning inquisitor, and you just push the boundary a little bit each time. And each time you just go a little bit closer to that line I talk about, and I think you are perhaps going to cross the line again.

Senator ABETZ—Never near it.

				<p>Senator Conroy—So I am happy to take that question on notice and seek the advice of the Minister, whether he would like to—</p>
IA 09	27/05/09	88-89	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Ms McNally, have we committed \$365 million without knowing any of the details of the project?</p> <p>Ms McNally—No, Senator.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Which details do you have of the project that enabled us to make such a significant commitment?</p> <p>Ms McNally—The decision was made by IA, based on a significant amount of information that they received. We are in the process of going through that information. This is part of a much larger project. It is a project that will go from Helensvale down to Coolangatta. This particular amount of money, this \$365 million, funds the contributions of the component from Griffith University to Southport and then Southport to Broadbeach. We understand that the Gold Coast City Council and the Queensland Government were putting in funds. It does need to go through the normal tendering type processes—and those arrangements and details, since the decision was made a couple of weeks ago, we have been endeavouring to meet with the Queensland Government to actually finalise.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—So you do not have any details of the tendering process?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Senator Macdonald, as has been indicated, that is exactly why the meeting is taking place on Monday. If you would like, I am happy to take on notice to give you a fuller answer so that you have further information. There is an important meeting, as we indicated, on Monday. I am happy to take it on notice and give you the further information, if that is what you would prefer.</p>
IA 10	27/05/09	88	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Sir Rod Eddington completed a study for the Victorian State Government of improving the east-west transport connections across Melbourne. That report was submitted to the Victorian State Government in March 2008 and it contained as its second recommendation the construction of the rail link from West Werribee to Sunshine. I understand that the same project has now been recommended by Infrastructure Australia, of which he is the Chair. I am just wondering what part he had in the assessment by Infrastructure Australia of the work he obviously did as a consultant to the Victorian Government for the same project, or did he excuse himself from that?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Mr Deegan was here for four hours answering any and all questions on matters to do with Sir Rod Eddington and Infrastructure Australia.</p> <p>Senator NASH—To be clear, Minister, this was actually raised when Mr Deegan was here, I think, by Senator Macdonald, who was then told that this was specifically fitting in this area. It was specifically this project.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—That is why I am raising it.</p>

				<p>Senator Conroy—What Senator Macdonald is now asking is not about the project. He is now asking about the processes of Infrastructure Australia. He is asking about governance issues around Infrastructure Australia. If he wants to ask about the actual project itself, this is the right spot. But if he wants to ask a rhetorical question about the governance processes involved and the selection process engaged in by Infrastructure Australia—and I am not trying to be cute—that probably was a question for Mr Deegan.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—This is a way, obviously, to avoid answering questions. You have the relevant officer. You were particularly asked and, between the lot of you, you said it was a question for later on.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Some Senators have stayed in the room the whole time, Senator Macdonald. I know you have got many commitments.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—It is one way you can certainly escape and avoid scrutiny of some very questionable decisions.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—If you would just like to ask you about the specific project, there are officers at the table awaiting your questions, Senator Macdonald.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—You had better take this on notice, then, to Infrastructure Australia.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Okay, I will.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I have asked did he excuse himself from that assessment. Could I also ask what analysis was used by Mr Eddington to justify the recommendation of that West Werribee to Sunshine project to the Victorian Government and was that analysis the same as was used by Infrastructure Australia? If it was different, how was it different? When can we expect to see that particular analysis?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will put those on notice and get you as much information as we have available.</p>
IA 11	28/05/09	29	Back	<p>Senator BACK—If I could just then refer again to the <i>National Infrastructure Priorities</i> publication, the Perth airport multi-modal link roads were identified as one of the most pressing and significant requirements of infrastructure for the state. As we have tried to indicate, they are critically important to the viability of Perth and the surrounds. I just wonder why it was not funded as a priority project in this Budget. Perhaps a question to the Minister: are you aware, Minister, why that particular project fell off the perch—\$530 million, I think?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—As was explained at considerable length by Mr Deegan yesterday, there are projects that I have described as priority infrastructure pipeline projects with real potential—they include the Perth airport multi-modal links. I am sure if Mr Deegan was here or you were to put these questions to Mr Deegan, he would explain to you where that project was in terms of developments since then. I am happy to take that on notice.</p>

				<p>Senator BACK—If you would I would be appreciative because yesterday I was asked by Mr Deegan and, I thought, others to defer the question of this particular project until today.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No, the question you have just asked is: why is it in one of these two columns? Mr Deegan could have given you some advice on that one. If you want to ask other questions about it, officers at the table might be able to answer, but what you have asked is actually about why is it in which column, and Mr Deegan’s organisation put them in the two columns.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Can I then ask or should I have asked of Mr Deegan what the likely fate of that particular project is over time?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—That is a question for the Government and I think, as Mr Deegan outlined yesterday, Infrastructure Australia will continue its work with various proponents on some of these—what are known as—pipeline projects.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am happy to take on notice for you, Senator Back, what further developments have happened since the classification by Mr Deegan’s Infrastructure Australia organisation.</p> <p>Senator BACK—That would be of enormous interest to us in Western Australia, Minister. Thank you very much. A related project is the Tonkin highway upgrade between Roe highway and Leach highway. Are those topics upon which you can comment?</p>
IA 12 [Repeated question – see IA 95]	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When will Infrastructure Australia release its analysis it has undertaken on the Bruce Highway? 2. In which financial year?
IA 13	N/A	Written	Bushby	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I presume that the Tasmanian State Government put forward projects for consideration for funding by Infrastructure Australia in Tasmania. When did Infrastructure Australia receive details of these projects? 2. Were they all in one proposal or a series of proposals? 3. Did these (this) project proposal meet all process requirements, contain all necessary details to be considered on their merits or did any fall short on the basis that they were incomplete, or not able to be considered? 4. If so, which ones? How did they fail?
IA 14	N/A	Written	Bushby	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specifically, what new road funding was sought? 2. What assistance with bridges? 3. What assistance with water infrastructure upgrades? 4. What assistance with maintenance and upgrade of Tasmania’s rail network aside from the money already allocated for that purpose?
IA 15	N/A	Written	Bushby	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In regard to the new public hospital needed for Hobart to replace the Royal Hobart Hospital, the Tasmanian Premier has said that no major hospital has been built in the State without significant Federal funding.

				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Did the State Government make applications to Infrastructure Australia for funding assistance towards this project? 3. If so, can you provide to the Committee details of the Tasmanian Government's request for infrastructure funding for that hospital? 4. Is there any remaining opportunity to seek funding for a new Hobart public hospital from Infrastructure Australia?
IA 16	N/A	Written	Bushby	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are you able to advise exactly what work Mr Mark Addis, who is on leave on a Tasmanian Department Secretary's salary, does for Infrastructure Australia? 2. Where is Mr Addis based – Canberra, or somewhere else? 3. If his home base remains Tasmania, does he receive accommodation assistance when in Canberra or interstate? 4. Will you confirm that those costs are not in fact borne by the Commonwealth but are paid by the Tasmanian Government?
IA 17	N/A	Written	Bushby	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please list all submitted Tasmanian projects, as at the time of this question, submission that may not have been approved yet, the proposed cost of those projects and the delivery timeframes? 2. Also please include the "off network" projects as they were described to me during my questioning?
IA 18	N/A	Written	Parry	With container traffic expected to double at the port of Bell Bay by the year 2023, the State Government put in a bid for \$150M for expansion works at that port. The Infrastructure Minister, Mr Albanese, said that the \$150M bid for Federal funds for expansion at Bell Bay was not in the end included in the budget – why?
IA 19	N/A	Written	Williams	Referring to transport infrastructure proposals, are projects recommended by IA to proceed, or stay as projects with “real potential”?
IA 20	N/A	Written	Williams	Can you provide a list of the projects to proceed and the projects with “real potential”.
IA 21	N/A	Written	Williams	Will Infrastructure Australia release its modelling and analysis so the people of Australia can see for themselves why these projects have been selected and not others?
IA 22	N/A	Written	Williams	Can you explain why “commercial in confidence “as cited by the Minister as the reason for not releasing this data is an acceptable answer to the taxpayer?
IA 23	N/A	Written	Williams	Why cannot the Government release this data when a private company would have to release it to its shareholders?
IA 24	N/A	Written	Williams	Has the Minister been shown the modelling and analysis conducted by Infrastructure Australia?
IA 25	N/A	Written	Williams	Has Infrastructure Australia pursued a private sector contribution? And if so, with whom?
IA 26	N/A	Written	Williams	Sir Rod Eddington completed a study into improving east – west transport connections across Melbourne. The study's 2 nd recommendation the construction of a rail link from

				West Werribee to Sunshine this project has been recommended by Infrastructure Australia. Did Sir Rod Eddington stand aside from the assessment by Infrastructure Australia or did he assess his own work?
IA 27 [Repeated question – see IA 67]	N/A	Written	Williams	Was the analysis used by Mr Rod Eddington to justify in his recommendation of West Werribee to Sunshine project to the Victorian Government in March 2008 the same as that used by Infrastructure Australia?
IA 28 [Repeated question – see IA 68]	N/A	Written	Williams	How was the analysis different?
IA 29 [Repeated question – see IA 69]	N/A	Written	Williams	When will the Australian people see this analysis?
IA 30	N/A	Written	Williams	The cost of 1900-kilometre inland rail project between Melbourne and Brisbane is \$2.6 billion. How come 50-kilometre of track is so expensive?
IA 31 [Repeated question – see IA 71]	N/A	Written	Williams	Will the Government release the costing of Regional Express project so the taxpayer can understand the basis for the extraordinary estimate?
IA 32 [Repeated question – see IA 46, 51 & IA 93]	N/A	Written	Williams	The Federal Government commitment to the Gold Coast Light Rail involves a possible equity contribution of \$365 million (page 415 budget paper no 2). Does this mean if no possible equity contribution is forth coming by 1 st July 2010 the offer is removed?
IA 33	N/A	Written	Williams	What progress is being made to secure this equity contribution?
IA 34	N/A	Written	Williams	What business analysis has been undertaken by Infrastructure Australia to justify this offer by the Federal Government?
IA 35	N/A	Written	Williams	The West Metro Rail project in Sydney will cost \$8 billion the Brisbane Inner City Rail \$14 billion the Government has provided \$91 million for a study and for Brisbane Inner City \$20 Million for a study. Will the Government commit to funding the full cost of these projects
IA 36	N/A	Written	Williams	Can the Government give assurance these projects will ever be built?
IA 37	N/A	Written	Williams	What is the current status of the development of the Nationals Ports Strategy?
IA 38	N/A	Written	Williams	When will the Strategy be finalised and made public?
IA 39	N/A	Written	Williams	Which agencies will be involved in the creation of the National Ports Strategy?

IA 40	N/A	Written	Williams	What consultation will be undertaken in the formulation of this plan?
IA 41	N/A	Written	Williams	In Infrastructure Australia's National Infrastructure Priorities Report, has released 12 gateway projects as priorities but in 2008 – 09 only Darwin port extension and Oakajee port were funded. When will the remaining projects be funded?
IA 42	N/A	Written	Williams	In which year will the remaining projects be funded?
IA 43	N/A	Written	Williams	What percentage of the total project cost will be funded?
IA 44 [Repeated – see IA 87]	N/A	Written	Williams	Page 19 of the Infrastructure Australia report also indicates that the cost of the Oakajee port is “TBA” The Government has committed \$339 million towards the development of the port. How was this figure reached in light of the fact that no figure was listed in the report?
IA 45 [Repeated question – see IA 88]	N/A	Written	Williams	Media reports state that the \$399Million is an equity injection but what exactly will this money be spent on?
IA 46 [Repeated question – see IA 51, 89 & IA 93]	N/A	Written	Williams	What specific conditions (if Any) has Infrastructure Australia placed in the funds?
IA 47 [Repeated question – see IA 90]	N/A	Written	Williams	With construction to start in 2011, when will the money be advanced to the WA State Government or the Geraldton Port Authority?
IA 48 [Repeated question – see IA 91]	N/A	Written	Williams	Will Infrastructure Australia consider a further allocation of funds after the completion of the feasibility study?
IA 49 [Repeated question – see IA 92]	N/A	Written	Williams	Infrastructure Australia's report indicates that the Darwin port expansion will cost \$325 million with the Federal Government contributing \$50 million. Where will the balance of the money come from?
IA 50	N/A	Written	Williams	What exactly will this money be spent on?
IA 51 [Repeated question – see IA 46, 89 & IA 93]	N/A	Written	Williams	What specific conditions (if any) has Infrastructure Aust put on the funds?
IA 52	N/A	Written	Williams	The funding is subject to the outcome of further work currently under way, when is it anticipated this work will be finished?
IA 53	N/A	Written	Williams	What projects didn't get funding in the Budget which are high on the priority list?
IA 54	N/A	Written	Williams	Is Infrastructure Australia surprised that Sydney received just \$91million for a study? And was this a reflection of the submissions?

IA 55	N/A	Written	Williams	Does Infrastructure Australia believe the National Broadband Network can work either in funding or technically?
IA 56	N/A	Written	Nash	I refer to a number of transport infrastructure proposals to be funded by the Government in this budget. I notice that almost all of them, with the exemption of the O-Bahn track extension in the south of Adelaide, are projects recommended by Infrastructure Australia to proceed or as projects with 'real potential'. Is this correct?
IA 57	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>These projects, covering a number of metropolitan rail, roads and ports projects, are flagged by Infrastructure Australia as priority projects or priority pipeline projects with 'real potential'. I refer to Table 2 in the Infrastructure Australia National Infrastructure Priorities dated May 2009 on page 11.</p> <p>These projects are expensive and involve the expenditure of the Commonwealth taxpayers' money of nearly \$8.5 billion and State taxpayers' money of over \$600 million. Given that these projects are so dependent on the taxpayer, when will Infrastructure Australia release its modelling and analysis so the people of Australia can see for themselves why these projects have been selected and not others?</p>
IA 58	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you please explain why "commercial-in-confidence" as cited by the Minister as the reason for not releasing this data is an acceptable answer to the taxpayer?
IA 59	N/A	Written	Nash	Why cannot the Government release this data, when if a private company was to embark on a large scale infrastructure project it would most certainly release its justification to its shareholders. Why is the taxpayer different?
IA 60	N/A	Written	Nash	The Government has also claimed that a purpose of Infrastructure Australia was to provide a transparent and open process of project selection. How can the Government make this claim if the Government will not release the data?
IA 61	N/A	Written	Nash	Has the Minister been shown the modelling and analysis conducted by Infrastructure Australia?
IA 62	N/A	Written	Nash	I notice a number of projects have a significant shortfall of investment. I refer to the Regional Rail Express – the construction of a rail link from Werribee to Sunshine in Melbourne. The Federal Government has committed \$3.2 billion over the next six years to this project. Given that this project will cost around \$4.3 billion – where will the remaining \$1.1 billion come from?
IA 63	N/A	Written	Nash	I notice that the Victorian Brumby Government in its Victorian Transport Plan has included the Regional Express as a priority. The State Government of Victoria is silent on its funding commitment. That is, at present it has allocated no State funds to the project. What agreements have been established between the Commonwealth and Victorian Government regarding Victoria's contribution?

IA 64 [Repeated question – see IA 25]	N/A	Written	Nash	Has Infrastructure Australia pursued a private sector contribution?
IA 65	N/A	Written	Nash	With whom? How are those negotiations proceeding?
IA 66	N/A	Written	Nash	I notice that Sir Rod Eddington completed a study into improving east-west transport connections across Melbourne. This report was submitted to the Victorian State Government in March 2008 and contained as its second recommendation the construction of a rail link from West Werribee to Sunshine. I notice that the same project has been recommended by Infrastructure Australia. Did Sir Rod Eddington stand aside from the assessment by Infrastructure Australia of the Regional Express project, or did he assess his own work?
IA 67 [Repeated question – see IA 27]	N/A	Written	Nash	Was the analysis used by Mr Rod Eddington to justify in his recommendation of West Werribee to Sunshine project to the Victorian Government in March 2008 the same as that used by Infrastructure Australia?
IA 68 [Repeated question – see IA 28]	N/A	Written	Nash	How was it different?
IA 69 [Repeated question – see IA 29]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the Australian people see this analysis?
IA 70	N/A	Written	Nash	I notice that the total cost of the Regional Express is \$4.3 billion. This means that the cost of 50 kilometres of track is four times the cost of the Adelaide to Darwin rail link – that is \$1.3 billion to lay 1400 kilometres of rail. I also notice that the cost of the 1900 kilometre inland rail project between Melbourne and Brisbane is around \$2.6 billion. Can anyone explain to me how 50 kilometres of track can be so expensive?
IA 71 [Repeated question – see IA 31]	N/A	Written	Nash	Will the Government release the costing of the Regional Express project so the taxpayer can understand the basis for this extraordinary estimate?
IA 72	N/A	Written	Nash	Are we just supposed to accept the assurance of Infrastructure Australia that the Victorian costings are fine?

IA 73	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I also notice with interest that the Federal Government's commitment to the Gold Coast Light Rail in fact only involves, and I quote from page 415 of Budget Paper No.2, <i>a possible equity contribution of \$365 million in 2009-10.</i></p> <p>Does that mean if no possible equity contribution is forthcoming by 1 July 2010 the offer is removed?</p>
IA 74	N/A	Written	Nash	What progress is being made to secure this equity contribution?
IA 75	N/A	Written	Nash	What business analysis has been undertaken by Infrastructure Australia to justify this offer by the Federal Government?
IA 76	N/A	Written	Nash	I notice that the West Metro Rail project in Sydney will cost around \$8 billion and the Brisbane Inner City Rail around \$14 billion. For the West Metro, the Government has provided \$91 million for a study and for the Brisbane Inner City Rail, \$20 million for a study. Will the Federal Government commit to funding the full cost of these projects?
IA 77	N/A	Written	Nash	What about some of the cost? How much?
IA 78	N/A	Written	Nash	What assurance can the Government give that these projects will ever be built?
IA 79	N/A	Written	Nash	What modelling and business analysis has been undertaken by Infrastructure Australia to give the taxpayer any confidence they will be built?
IA 80	N/A	Written	Nash	I refer to the Coastal Shipping Inquiry conducted by the Infrastructure Committee and Infrastructure Australia's recent National Infrastructure Priorities Report which both discuss the development of a National Ports Strategy. What is the current status of the development of the National Ports Strategy?
IA 81	N/A	Written	Nash	When will it be finalised and made public?
IA 82	N/A	Written	Nash	Which agencies will be involved in the creation of the National Ports Strategy?
IA 83	N/A	Written	Nash	What consultation will be undertaken in the formulation of this plan?
IA 84	N/A	Written	Nash	In Infrastructure Australia's <i>National Infrastructure Priorities Report</i> which has recently been released 12 'gateway' projects were identified as priorities, but in the 2008-2009 Budget only the Darwin Port extension and Oakajee port were funded. When will the remaining projects be funded?
IA 85	N/A	Written	Nash	In which financial year?
IA 86	N/A	Written	Nash	What percentage of the total project cost will be funded?

IA 87 [Repeated question – see IA 44]	N/A	Written	Nash	Oakajee Port Page 19 of the Infrastructure Australia Report also indicates that the cost of the Oakajee port is “TBA”. The Government has committed \$339 M towards the development of the port. How was this figure reached in light of the fact that no figure was listed in the report?
IA 88 [Repeated question – see IA 45]	N/A	Written	Nash	Media reports state that the \$399 M is an ‘equity injection’ but what exactly will this money be spent on?
IA 89 [Repeated question – see IA 46, 51 & IA 93]	N/A	Written	Nash	What specific conditions (if any) has Infrastructure Australia put on the funds?
IA 90 [Repeated question – see IA 47]	N/A	Written	Nash	With construction to start in 2011, when will the money be advanced to the WA State Government or the Geraldton Port Authority?
IA 91 [Repeated question – see IA 48]	N/A	Written	Nash	Will Infrastructure Australia consider a further allocation of funds after the completion of the feasibility study in 2010?
IA 92 [Repeated question – see IA 49]	N/A	Written	Nash	Darwin Port Expansion Infrastructure Australia’s Report indicates that the Darwin Port Expansion will cost \$325 M with the Federal Government contributing \$50 M. Where will the balance of the money come from? What exactly will this money be spent on?
IA 93 [Repeated question – see IA 46, 51 & IA 89]	N/A	Written	Nash	What specific conditions (if any) has Infrastructure Australia put on the funds?
IA 94	N/A	Written	Nash	I understand that the funding is subject to the outcome of further work currently underway, when is it anticipated this work will be finished?
IA 95 [Repeated question – see IA 12]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will Infrastructure Australia release its analysis it has undertaken on the Bruce highway?
IA 96 [Repeated question – see IA 12]	N/A	Written	Nash	In which financial year?
IA 97	N/A	Written	Ludlam	I refer to the Melbourne Rail link, the largest single rail funding commitment announced in the 2009/10 budget, and ask: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the Minister outline his understanding of the origins of this proposal? 2. Is the Minister aware that the original proposal was peer reviewed by Mr Ed Dotson, and is the Minister familiar with this review? 3. Is the Minister aware that Mr Dotson outlined serious concerns in relation to this

				<p>proposal, and if so, can the Minister describe the nature of these concerns?</p> <p>4. Is the Minister aware of whether or not any of Mr Dotson's concerns were addressed in the Victorian Government's bid to Infrastructure Australia and, if so, how these concerns were addressed?</p> <p>5. Did Infrastructure Australia consider alternatives to this proposal which would not involve duplication of the existing V/Line rail track?</p> <p>6. If not, why not, given the serious nature of the concerns raised by Mr Dotson?</p> <p>7. Is the Minister aware that Mr Rod Eddington played a significant role in the development of this proposal, which was then assessed by Infrastructure Australia of which Mr Rod Eddington is the Chairman?</p> <p>8. Can the Minister outline his understanding of how Infrastructure Australia managed to avoid the appearance of a conflict-of-interest in this matter?</p>
ISTP 01	27/05/09	141	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—What motivated that?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—It came out of the review process, which was initiated with the Productivity Commission Review back in 2005-06. As you may recall, that PC Review recommended quite major changes to the scheme. The Government announced last year that it would be leaving the parameters under which the funding assistance is determined unchanged to prevent significant falls in assistance. If the parameters of the policy under which the scheme was underpinned had been implemented, it would have resulted in significant reductions in overall expenditure under the scheme. The Government announced that it would be leaving the parameters intact; hence, preventing any reductions in assistance being provided. As part of that announcement, the Government indicated that there would be administrative reforms to the scheme considered so that the underlying parameters of the scheme would remain unchanged but that there would be consideration given to improving the transparency and accountability mechanisms under the scheme.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—For that purpose, a discussion paper was prepared.</p> <p>Mr Sutton—That is correct.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—And that is dated 11 to 12 February 2009?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—That was a paper that certainly looked at some possible administrative changes, and we used it as the basis for consultations with stakeholders in Tasmania.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—So the Department developed that?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—We did.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—The purpose of developing that paper was for consultations?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—That is correct.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Was that discussion paper approved by the Minister prior to its circulation?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—I cannot recall the specifics. The Minister's office was certainly aware that</p>

				<p>the paper was under development.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Under development? Was the Minister’s office aware that this final version had been prepared and was going to be circulated and sent for consultation?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—I would have to check on that. I cannot recall the specifics of the process. The paper was a consultation paper. It did not contain any final positions or decisions on the part of the Government. It was to be used in assisting final briefing.</p>
ISTP 02	27/05/09	141	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—To whom has this document been circulated?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—It was circulated to a range of people with a key interest in possible administrative reforms. We were discussing it with people like freight forwarders, logistics carriers—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Are you able to give us a list of to whom it was sent?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Yes, we could certainly do that.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—In rough terms, how many do you think it was sent out to?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—I would have to take that on notice.</p>
ISTP 03	27/05/09	142	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—Thank you. The discussion paper does have a questionnaire in it. Is that correct? It asks questions?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—It certainly asks questions.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Which it encourages people to respond to.</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Yes, indeed.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—How many have responded?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Again, I would have to take that on notice. We certainly received some responses to the paper.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Once again, an indicative figure?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—I would not like to guess on that, sorry. I will have to take that one on notice.</p>
ISTP 04	27/05/09	142	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—Would the responses have gone over your desk?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—We have a standard response line—an email box—that they come into. I was certainly aware of some of them, but I would have to take on notice the full number of responses that were received.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—I accept that, but I was seeking an indicative number. Have any companies or individuals been interviewed face-to-face about this discussion paper?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Yes. As part of the process, we saw it as important to have face-to-face meetings with people who we knew had a strong interest in the scheme and were able to offer insights into the operation of the scheme that would assist us in framing advice for the Minister on the changes.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Are you able to tell us how many you have had face-to-face interviews with?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Again, sorry, I was not involved in all of the discussions. I would have to take</p>

				<p>that on notice.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—If you could and, if you are able to, a list of those people with whom face-to-face interviews have been conducted.</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Yes.</p>
ISTP 05	27/05/09	142-143	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—It has been two months since that official date of 13 March. Have recommendations gone to the minister as a result of the discussion paper and the consultations?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Not at this stage.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—So nothing has gone forward to the Minister’s office?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Not at this stage. We are in the process of finalising briefing.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—All right.</p> <p>Mr Sutton—I should explain: the consultations are to assist in revising the Ministerial directions. The program is not administered under a piece of legislation; it is administered under a set of Ministerial directions. This process is about feeding into a redrafting of the Ministerial directions flowing from the Government’s announcement last year and also the administrative issues that were identified in the PC Report. So,``+ we are in the process of finalising some initial advice to the Minister on those changes to the Ministerial directions.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Do you have anybody with you this evening who could in fact give us a better idea of some of the numbers involved with questionnaires and who was interviewed?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—No, I am afraid not.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Nobody?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—We will have to take that on notice.</p>
ISTP 06	27/05/09	143	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—When was the first visit undertaken in relation to this discussion paper?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—Again, I would have to take that on notice. I do not recall the detail of when those meetings and discussions took place.</p>
ISTP 07	27/05/09	143	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—Would you agree with me, at least in principle, that you would have had a more worthwhile, valuable exercise and undertaking if you had at least faxed or even emailed the discussion paper, even 24 hours beforehand, rather than turning up and saying, ‘Here’s a discussion paper,’ which they had not been pre-warned about and discussed?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—I would like to go back and check on the specifics of the situation.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I think you are asking the officers to comment on speculation rather than a question, Senator Abetz. I am sure if you refine your question—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—No, it is not speculation. They either deny the circumstance or accept the circumstance. It is not speculation. Something like this either happened or did not happen. I have been told that it did happen. If the evidence is that it did not happen, we cannot take it any further. It is not an issue of speculation or a hypothetical situation.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You are asking them to confirm something that in your opinion happened.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—This is not an opinion.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You have tried on a number of occasions—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—You will have to go away sometime, Minister, and understand the</p>

				<p>difference between putting a proposition to a witness and asking for an opinion from a witness. It is like: ‘The allegation is that Senator Colbeck went through a red traffic light. Are you able to confirm that you saw that happen?’ It is not speculation. He either saw it or he did not, and he tells us accordingly. Similarly with this, I have been told, right or wrong, that an officer or officers came along to one of these people that was interviewed and said, ‘Here’s a discussion paper. Let’s go through it now,’ without any prior warning that a discussion paper was going to be discussed at this meeting or questions were going to be asked. Right? That is the allegation. Take it on notice and tell us whether that did occur. If it did occur, I would like to know why it occurred, because I would have thought, in general terms, it is better practice to give people the benefit of what was, I think, a fairly tightly typed four-page document.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—As you have indicated, we will take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Thank you very much.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I do think the <i>Hansard</i> will bear out that again, even though you believed you were putting a proposition, you actually used the words ‘would you not agree’, which is—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Yes, ‘Would you not agree that it is better practice to undertake an interview on a discussion paper after’—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No, that is asking an opinion. But we have taken it on notice and we can move on.</p>
ISTP 08	27/05/09	144-145	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—We will accept that as the Labor Party’s approach to community consultation. Can I ask you to confirm that, in fact, a Mr Peter Heyne flew to Tasmania, or is he Tasmanian based?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—No, he is based in Canberra. He is part of my branch.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—He went to Tasmania to discuss this issue with Net Sea Freight Tasmania Pty Ltd?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—I can confirm that.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Yes, and he visited them on 12 February 2009.</p> <p>Mr Sutton—I cannot confirm the specific date, but I am fairly confident it was around that time, yes.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Which of course is the same date the discussion paper bears, which is 11 to 12 February 2009. I assume it bears that date because that is when the discussion paper was finalised.</p> <p>Mr Sutton—That would be a reasonable assumption. I will confirm that.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—No, the question was: on this particular day, 12 February 2009, who else was consulted with in Tasmania by Mr Heyne?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—We will provide an answer to that question.</p>

				<p>Senator ABETZ—Here specifically?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Can I just again stress—and I know you have already acknowledged this, Senator Abetz—that the advice to government has not even been finalised yet. I just wanted to stress that again.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—You can stress it 100 times but it is not going to take us any further in these estimates, Senator Conroy. Could Mr Heyne advise us what reason he stated or provided to Net Sea Freight for the purpose of this visit. Thank you. That completes my questions.</p>
ISTP 09	27/05/09	145	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—If I am doing it justice, what Net Sea Freight has indicated to me is that a different pretext was given for the meeting and they were ready for that meeting. The issue for which the meeting was actually called was not discussed, but this discussion paper was placed on the table and the people from Net Sea Freight were asked to comment on it. If that is the case—and I have been around long enough to accept that there are two sides to a story—then I respectfully suggest that that is not a good way to do business. Mr Heyne is not here to defend himself, so I do not want to put that as an absolute given on the <i>Hansard</i> record. I accept there might be a different version of events, but I would like a detailed answer in relation to whether telephone calls were made or emails sent to Net Sea Freight setting up this 12 February appointment and what reasons were given for the seeking of that appointment with Net Sea Freight Tasmania.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Senator, could I dive in here? I am a little bit cautious about one of our more junior officers engaging with stakeholders here. With the best will in the world, as you say, sometimes two people can have a conversation and take different things out of it. We will endeavour to answer the thrust of your questions, but none of us were privy to the conversation—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—That is right.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—and I would be cautious too. I do not think Mr Sutton has described a sinister process, or a closed process where we have been driving to some outcome that would disadvantage a particular stakeholder. I think it has been a fairly open process.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—I am not sure I have even hinted at that, but it is interesting that you should feel constrained or required to make that comment.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Well, I think an external observer might draw from this line of questioning that something happened that should not have happened, and I do not think we have established that. But we will endeavour to answer your questions as openly as we can.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—I have agreed with you that nothing has been established, and that is why I have been at pains to indicate that I accept that there are always two sides to a story.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I appreciate that, Senator.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—And that is why I was wanting Mr Heyne’s version of events, but a</p>

				<p>detailed version of events. If I could ask for that, please, that would be very helpful. Who else was visited by Mr Heyne on 12 February in Tasmania?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—We will provide a list of the people who have been consulted in relation to the paper.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—No, the question was: on this particular day, 12 February 2009, who else was consulted with in Tasmania by Mr Heyne?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—We will provide an answer to that question.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Here specifically?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Can I just again stress—and I know you have already acknowledged this, Senator Abetz—that the advice to Government has not even been finalised yet. I just wanted to stress that again.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—You can stress it 100 times but it is not going to take us any further in these Estimates, Senator Conroy. Could Mr Heyne advise us what reason he stated or provided to Net Sea Freight for the purpose of this visit. Thank you. That completes my questions.</p>
ISTP 10	27/05/09	146	Colbeck	<p>Senator COLBECK—The paper was relatively well-targeted at issues that you would like to address. I have seen the paper, so I understand that. But there were not any additional things that came out of it that you did not expect to see?</p> <p>Mr Sutton—No, I suppose because this whole set of issues, as you are well aware, was considered in depth by the Productivity Commission several years ago. Since the PC review, we have certainly been consulting further, but I do not think there have been any new issues identified apart from the ones that were in the PC Report.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—Is the Government considering any other changes to the scheme at this point in time?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I think that is a matter for government. I will take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—So it is not denied?</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—So you are not denying that you are considering changes? There is a serious matter in the marketplace and I am just asking whether you are going to do that?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am happy to take that on notice and come back to you.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—I have another issue that is live, which Mr Sutton has—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am not saying we are not going to answer. I am saying that that is rightfully a question for the Minister.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—It is also a good way to stop giving an answer until after a decision is made, so that you can announce it as a surprise. I have been to Estimates before.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take that on notice.</p>

ISTP 11	N/A	Written	Brown	<p>Infrastructure and Surface Transport Policy Please list the Tasmanian companies that use the <i>Freight Equalisation Scheme</i> as part of their transport activities to/from Tasmania.</p>
IOTS 01	28/05/09	5	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—At a convenient time and on notice, you might just give us the breakdown of the travel budget. Mr Pearsall—This financial year, Senator? Senator HEFFERNAN—I guess so; since July 2008. Mr Palmer—Sure. Senator HEFFERNAN—It has always been a bit of a mystery. Mr Palmer—I can answer part of that right now, if you wish. Senator HEFFERNAN—You can if you want to. Mr Palmer—So far the expenditure has been \$850,484 for the year, which includes all domestic and international travel, all employee expenses, training and conferences, and the office operating costs, including this current inquiry.</p>
IOTS 02	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is your role as the Inspector of Transport Security and what sort of work have you been engaged in? 2. How many actual days have you been engaged during the last financial year please (from 1 July 2008)? 3. Are you Canberra based or do you still reside on north coast of NSW? (If he doesn't reside in Canberra, ask these questions)? 4. Do you have to travel to Canberra often to meet with Secretary and/or Minister? 5. How often? 6. Does your office receive a budget? 7. If so, how much? 8. If it isn't expended, do you return any of that budget to the Department? 9. What is the cost of maintaining your office? 10. What travel costs have been incurred during the period from 1 July 2008 until now? 11. How many international trips have there been since 1 July 08? 12. What was the purpose of these trips? 13. Could we have a breakdown of all your expenses, travel, staffing, salary, office maintenance etc, since 1 July 2008 to now?
IOTS 03 [Same question as below]	28/05/09	6	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—We think of the pirates in sailing ships and we have modern pirates in rubber dinghies! Will you be inquiring into the Sydney airport incident on 22 March 2009? Mr Palmer—I have not been asked or directed to inquire into that incident. Senator HEFFERNAN—Do you think it is within your role if they ask you to inquire into it?</p>

				<p>Mr Palmer—It is within the role if I am asked to inquire into it, yes. I suspect so, on the facts as I understand them.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Were you a bit surprised? Maybe you cannot answer that. I am a bit surprised that you have not been asked to take a look at that, because I think it fits perfectly into your role here and your history in your previous job. Given the description earlier on, this fits perfectly into what would be an independent inquiry into what happened at the airport. Mr Tongue, is there a reason that he was not asked to inquire into it?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We track incidents across the system—minor ones through to major ones—and there are literally hundreds a year. The vast majority of them are benign. The role of the inspector is about system-based investigation. That incident was the subject of an AFP investigation, a New South Wales Police investigation and an independent investigation by the Secretary of the Attorney-General’s Department. Looking at that number of investigations, the fact that they are still court matters and that the New South Wales Police investigation is ongoing, the question we often face is: what more would we learn? Also, at the moment, Mick is largely full-time on the piracy inquiry, which is clearly a matter of strategic international concern. So judgments need to be made about the use of the Inspector and the best use of his time. Those judgments are made constantly.</p>
IOTS 03 [Same question as above]	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<p>Airport Incident – 22 March 2009</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will you be inquiring into the Sydney Airport incident on Sunday, 22 March 2009? 2. What is your role in the inquiry and what will be your input? 3. Will you be producing a report for the Minister?
LGRD 01	28/05/09	98	Nash	<p>Senator NASH—I am addressing the electorates written there, but I am happy just to go with the project name, if that would assist the Department.</p> <p>Mr Wood—The project name?</p> <p>Senator NASH—Or the location? We will just have the location.</p> <p>Mr Wood—Certainly. Starting at the top, I do not actually have a project title for these. These are available on the website, I should say. But it is a project purpose, so I can read that. But it will be a slightly lengthy process. The first one is the Barcaldine Regional Council.</p> <p>Senator NASH—In the interests of the Committee and moving through, seeing that there is not a project title, perhaps we can just run the 20 locations that they are in.</p> <p>Mr Wood—Certainly.</p> <p>Senator NASH—And if you could take that on notice and provide that to the Committee for the entire detail.</p> <p>Mr Wood—Okay, yes. Starting off Barcaldine in Queensland; Bathurst, New South Wales; Ulverston, Tasmania; Davoren Park, South Australia; Grafton, New South Wales; Norlane, Victoria; Rockhampton, Queensland; Rockhampton, Queensland; Waroona,</p>

				Western Australia; Leichhardt, Queensland; Booval, Queensland; Yamba, New South Wales; Moorooka, Queensland; Bannockburn, Victoria; Erina, New South Wales; South Grafton, New South Wales; Lake Macquarie, New South Wales; Launceston, Tasmania, Townsville, Queensland; and Dennes Point in Tasmania.
LGRD 02	28/05/09	110	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—So, out of what the Department has for Regional Development Australia, you will be able to continue funding the ACCs should you choose.</p> <p>Mr James—We have sufficient there, we think, to cover the transition period.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Okay. For what period of time will that money last? Are you expecting this will be a week, a month, half of them for a month, a third of them for two months? On what basis have you got this money put aside and what have you assessed it at?</p> <p>Ms Foster—We have an allocation going out over the forward estimates period for RDAs. We are expecting that we will have most of the transition arrangements concluded within a short period. I am thinking two or three months.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We would like to make sure we give you the exact information on that, Senator Macdonald. We are happy to take it on notice and make sure we get you a more exact response.</p>
LGRD 03	28/05/09	110	McGauran	<p>Senator McGAURAN—It is about costings. The Budget papers are showing that Regional Development Australia saves \$4 million a year in comparison to the ACCs. Is that correct?</p> <p>Ms Foster—That is correct.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—Where is that saving coming from?</p> <p>Ms Foster—In establishing the RDA network we are concluding agreements with each state and territory on the operation of the RDA network. We are entering into a collaborative arrangement with each of the states and territories. We are in the process of finalising the funding arrangements between us and the states and territories and we will allocate the money that we have available for the RDA network in that process.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—But it is confirmed that there is a \$4 million saving. You are telling me that you are finalising everything now, but you are already noting you have saved \$4 million. Where is that?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We are forecasting to save \$4 million.</p> <p>Ms Foster—We are forecasting that. We have allocated an amount of money and we—</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—You are guessing you will save \$4 million.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No, we have a target of \$4 million that we have to reach.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—Where will that saving come from?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—The indication from the officer is that they have not been made yet because we are in consultations with the state governments, but we will happily provide you that information of targets more specifically over the next Estimates. We are happy to take it on notice. They have not been made yet, Senator McGauran.</p>

LGRD 04	28/05/09	112	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Minister, listen to what your officer is saying. She just said that the Commonwealth and the States had negotiated arrangements and so some of the people knew what they were going to do. Now I am asking details of which people in which states know what is going to happen on 30 June.</p> <p>Ms Foster—We have MOUs signed with New South Wales, ACT and Queensland. I might ask Mr James to run through the specific answer to that question.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Thank you.</p> <p>Mr James—In the case of New South Wales, the new RDA bodies will be established and the new boards appointed before 1 July. Then they will consider what their business plan and staffing arrangements will be. The current approach is that new boards have been encouraged to maintain their staffing to the end of this calendar year, but that is still a matter for the Boards in question.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Okay, so in New South Wales there is no arrangement except that they will look at it?</p> <p>Mr James—Basically, continue.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We are happy to get you any further information from the State Government.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Mr James is doing a very good job, thank you. Continue, Mr James.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We are happy to take on notice and get you absolutely up-to-date information from the State Governments. If there is anything more the officers can give you, they are welcome to, but you are asking about a series that are almost hypothetical issues that have not been settled. If there is more information that the Department can give then we are happy to.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Minister, thank you. It has already been given. I have been told that there are three States that have these arrangements in place. I have now heard about the New South Wales arrangements. Can you tell me what the arrangements are in the other two States?</p> <p>Ms Foster—We do not have precise details of what each State will agree in terms of staffing.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I thought you said you had the agreement with each State.</p>
LGRD 05	28/05/09	113	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Which Queensland regional development bodies are joining with the former ACCs to form Regional Development Australia?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Do you mean individual ACCs with relevant regional development organisations?</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Yes.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Can we take that one on notice?</p>

				<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I would have thought you would have come prepared for that, knowing my particular interest in, for example, Townsville Enterprise, which comprises the regional development body which is funded jointly by Ergon Energy, an agency of the Queensland Government, by the Townsville City Council, which is certainly not an agency of the Queensland government, by individual members like Senator Ian Macdonald who pay \$150 a year to Townsville Enterprise, and lots of other companies in between. Are you telling me that in Townsville the Federal Government is weaving the ACC into my organisation, Townsville Enterprise and, what, giving us some money?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You do not really believe that we should all be quite as focused on your interests as you are, Senator Macdonald, but even I did not guess that you would want to go to this depth of detail and, as Mr Tongue has offered, we are happy to get you the information and pass it on to you; but you are going to quite a degree of detail and just because, ‘Hey, Macca’s coming,’ we do not automatically assume that you are going to want that level of detail.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Do you mean to tell me no-one in your Department, Mr Tongue, knows what is happening? I have mentioned Townsville. The same applies right up and down the coast.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—And we said we would take it on notice and get you the information, Senator Macdonald.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I would like the information now, thanks, Minister, and someone in the Department must have that information.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We have offered to take it on notice. You are asking a degree of detail that is quite substantial. He does not have it in front of him now.</p>
LGRD 06	28/05/09	114	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Isn’t it true that there will now be 12 so-called regional bodies in Queensland? I can read the Minister’s media release. I certainly hope—in fact I know—your officers can help. Why they are being gagged I am not quite sure.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I will refer that to Mr James.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—You and I can both read the Minister’s press release but you have been part of the negotiation, so you must know that there are 12 ACCs in Queensland—is that right? Sorry, there were 13 ACCs; there are now 12 Regional Development Australia projections.</p> <p>Mr James—That is correct.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—You are not aware of what is going to happen with the Cairns, Townsville, Mount Isa, Rockhampton and Gladstone ones?</p> <p>Mr James—They are not involved. Sorry, are you talking about the ACCs?</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Yes. They are going into RDAs.</p>

				<p>Senator McGAURAN—The Minister does know. He is now wondering whether he should answer it.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—No, keep out of it, please.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Senator, we have said we will take the detail on notice.</p>
LGRD 07	28/05/09	114	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—And I am saying there are 12 in Queensland and your officers do know what the arrangements are. Why will you not let them tell us?</p> <p>Ms Foster—I think some of the confusion might be because, whilst the MOU, for example, will establish the broad arrangements—and as you noticed, the press statement notes that there will be 12 RDAs within Queensland—an EOI, expression of interest, process will actually start at the end of May to start the appointments to those RDAs.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—But what is the RDA? It is joining with which Queensland regional development organisation in the cities of Rockhampton, Mackay, Gladstone, Townsville and Cairns?</p> <p>Ms Foster—I do not know. We will need to find that information.</p>
LGRD 08	28/05/09	115	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Can you tell me why it was that the Torres Strait ACC was shut down?</p> <p>Ms Foster—I would have to take that on notice. I do not know.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Nobody knows? Do you know where the Torres Strait is?</p> <p>Ms Foster—Yes.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—It is up in the north of Queensland. It had its own area consultative committee because it is a special area. It is some distance, quite remote from Cairns. You are aware of that? Ms Foster—Yes.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—As I understand it, Torres Strait and Cairns are being joined together in an RDA. I am not sure who they are partnering with, but we will find that out in the next five weeks, I guess. Is that the intention—that Torres Strait is to join with Cairns?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We have just had a discussion about Townsville—and I appreciate you have a legitimate question about Cairns and Torres Strait, but the same applies. That level of detail the officers do not have at the table, and they are happy to take it on notice and get you the information. It was only completed in the last few days. They are now working. I am sure, hard on the ones that are not complete. It is a perfectly reasonable question that you are asking, Senator Macdonald, and we will get you the information. We are happy to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I repeat the question: is it the fact that Torres Strait will now be incorporated into Cairns? If you do not know, please say you do not know.</p> <p>Ms Foster—I do not know.</p>
LGRD 09	28/05/09	117	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Just show your fairness in chairmanship—</p> <p>CHAIR—Truth hurts.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—by making derogatory comments—</p> <p>CHAIR—Have you got a question, Senator Macdonald, or are you just going to sit here and listen to your own voice? I hope you have a question. Put it to the officers or the</p>

minister please, Senator Macdonald, or we will go to your colleague.

Senator IAN MACDONALD—Thank you for your fairness in your chairmanship, Mr Chairman.

CHAIR—You are welcome.

Senator IAN MACDONALD—Typical Labor stuff, so I appreciate that. These are clerical questions, which I will put on notice, about things like staffing presently, funding presently. Will you be able to get me that information, if I put those on notice?

Mr Tongue—We will endeavour to answer them. Without having seen them, I cannot guarantee that we will have answers to them—

Senator IAN MACDONALD—Things like what staff have been right across Australia. Before I finish on this and pass over to my colleagues, who might have questions on Regional Development Australia—and good luck to them; I hope they do better than I did—what have these ACCs been doing since the election in November of 2007?

Mr James—They have conducted, last year, a range of consultations as part of inputting design of the future arrangements. The first consultation was on RDA arrangements going forward and what community views were about those. The second was about priorities for designing any new infrastructure programs, community infrastructure programs, and the third was about those priorities. They were all public consultation processes.

Senator IAN MACDONALD—You told me earlier that, in the past, a major part of their work was assisting people make applications for funding.

Mr James—Correct.

Senator IAN MACDONALD—I take it they have not been doing that since November 2007.

Mr James—No, they have not. They have also been continuing to run workshops, as they do for communities, to participate in regional planning activities with local government and other agencies, and continue to administer contracts that they may have with state or other government agencies, as well as ad hoc consultations.

Senator IAN MACDONALD—These are contracts put in place under formal Federal Government programs?

Mr James—And/or State Government.

Senator IAN MACDONALD—In State Government programs?

Mr James—Yes. They are independent bodies. They can take work and tender for work from all levels of government.

Senator IAN MACDONALD—Did they generate their own funding outside of Federal Government grants?

Mr James—Some from other contracts, but it does not form a large proportion of their budgets.

				<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—You are saying that they would have got them from State Governments, being the administrator, so to speak, for State Government projects?</p> <p>Mr James—In the main, yes.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Is there anywhere else where they would have got money?</p> <p>Mr James—Not to my knowledge, but I could take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Certainly.....</p>
LGRD 10	28/05/09	119	Back	<p>Senator BACK—.....Are you aware that the Australian Local Government Association did make a submission in the budget for funding?</p> <p>Ms Foster—Yes.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Do you know what those levels of funds were that they were seeking?</p> <p>Ms Foster—From memory, it was some \$30 million—is that right? \$13 million.</p> <p>Senator BACK—The figure I had was less than \$30 million. The figure I had was \$20 million, over four years, but I do not know if that is accurate.</p> <p>Ms Foster—I thought that it was \$13 million over four years.</p> <p>Mr McRandle—I think the ALGA submission in the budget was \$13 million for one component and a further \$7 million for data collection, which gave a total of \$20 million, but the asset management and financial planning aspects, in my understanding, was \$13 million of that \$20 million.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Can you tell us what the fate of the application was? Were they successful fully or partially in either the \$13 million or the component of the \$13 million or the \$7 million?</p> <p>Mr McRandle—That is a decision for the Government.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Yes, I know. But the budget is down, and I am asking do we know what the outcome was?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—There was no specific budget allocation in these terms, but it is always open to the Government, in the vast range of programs that it has, to pick up those issues. In terms of what we are doing with local governments, for example, we are currently in a tendering process for the \$8 million Centre of Excellence for Local Government, which I expect will, amongst other things, touch on those issues. So we have a fairly broad engagement with local government from our portfolio, and local government in turn has a much broader engagement across the whole Australian Government. Whilst it is not in there, there are a range of buckets for local government.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—From a government perspective, all of these issues are still under active consideration.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Excuse my ignorance; I am new at this process. Because there is no evidence in the actual budget papers of an allocation—and I cannot find it either, so I am</p>

				<p>pleased to the extent that at least I am not that ignorant—you are saying that— Senator Conroy—It is still under consideration. Senator BACK—it is still under consideration and it is possible that there may be— Senator Conroy—I could not speculate. Senator BACK—Sure. When would local government be likely— Senator Conroy—Could I take that on notice and ask the Minister to give you some further information on that? Senator BACK—Yes, of course.....</p>
LGRD 11	28/05/09	122	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—So there is no requirement for the recipients to spent it in the 2008-09 year; it is just the requirement for the Commonwealth to get rid of the money out of its bank account by 30 June. Ms Foster—This means that we need to expend that money, and we would do that by paying the States when, for example, contracts are signed. Mr Tongue—And there are specific contractual requirements for councils in terms of the expenditure, such that on the \$250 million program all of it is spent between now and September. Then for the other component there will be specific milestone payments. Senator IAN MACDONALD—We are talking about the same thing, though, are we? That is for the \$800 million Community Infrastructure Program? Ms Foster—That is right. There are two components. Senator IAN MACDONALD—There are two components of it, yes. You are saying that the \$250 million going to individual councils has been expended because you have got rid of it out of your bank account and councils have to spend it by 30 September. Mr Tongue—Yes. Senator IAN MACDONALD—What happens if they don't? Can they apply for extensions? Ms Foster—We will work with them to ensure that they are in a position to complete their projects. One of the conditions of that program was that the projects were ready to start and were able to be completed by September. Senator IAN MACDONALD—Can you tell me the date on which the first funding agreement with the local authority was signed? Ms Foster—I would have to take that on notice. Senator IAN MACDONALD—I appreciate that.....</p>
LGRD 12	28/05/09	124	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I see. All right. Are you aware of what, if any, of the projects that have been approved for this funding have actually been sod-turned—construction has started? Ms Foster—We are just in the process of negotiating the contracts with those proponents, with those councils. Senator IAN MACDONALD—That means none of them would have started? Ms Foster—Not the stage we are funding. It is possible that we might be funding a stage in a project which is already under way. Mr Tongue—Can I just clarify: that relates to the 550, not the 250.</p>

				<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Yes, I know, the 550. The deadline for applications under that 550 program, if I can call it that—you see, I am picking that up too: saying ‘550’ instead of saying ‘550 million’ or ‘billion’.</p> <p>Senator BACK—We need to get back to some honesty in some of those—</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Yes, okay. I will still use the ‘550’. I have been taught by my Prime Minister. In that program, the deadline for applications was set at 6 March. Were there any applications received after that date?</p> <p>Ms Foster—My memory is—and I am just trying to make sure I have got the right program—that we made, again, some special arrangements for the disaster affected councils.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—It might be better to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Yes, we are happy to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—What, if any, came in late? Were they dealt with? If so, why? For the ‘why?’ it would be ‘because they were’, and perhaps you could just give us details of which ones they were.</p> <p>Ms Foster—Certainly.</p>
LGRD 13	28/05/09	130	McGauran	<p>Senator McGAURAN—The locals hate what has been built by the architect. How much was the architect paid? Was there a tender process or a competition process, and how did that win?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I do not think we have that information to hand. We would need to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—How was that design chosen and how much was the architect paid?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take it on notice.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—We are probably in the wrong area. We probably should have dealt with this when we were dealing with the Australian Heritage Council in the estimates committee. But could you take on notice a question to the Heritage Council—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Certainly.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—referring them to that and getting their investigation.</p>
LGRD 14	28/05/09	131	McGauran	<p>Senator McGAURAN—Just confirming: there was no more than \$2.6 million spent of Federal Government funding, and that would include the procurement and the trip to Brisbane that it took.</p> <p>Ms Foster—The funding that we provided was \$2.6 million.</p> <p>Senator McGAURAN—And that includes the procurement of the stump and the transporting of the stump to Brisbane, does it—the preserving of the stump?</p> <p>Ms Foster—I will have to take on notice the detail of what that \$2.6 million funded.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Thank you, Senator McGauran.</p>
LGRD 15	28/05/09	133	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Can you tell me how many applications were received?</p> <p>Ms Foster—I am not sure that I can do that while the process of considering the applications is under way.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—No, I am not asking you to tell me who they were or what</p>

				<p>they were. I am saying: can you tell me how many were received?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No. We do not necessarily reveal the number either while the process is under way, Senator Macdonald. I never publicly confirmed how many people bid for the broadband tender.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I would not go there, Minister—I just would not. Take my advice. Can you tell me if there was more than one?</p> <p>Ms Foster—Yes.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No.</p> <p>Ms Foster—No.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—No, there were not more than one or, no, you cannot tell me.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No, we cannot tell you.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I cannot see what the secret is.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—It is just a normal tender process rule. I am actually not trying to be—</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Hang on. I suppose it is a tender, but—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You just described it as one.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I mean, it is for a centre of excellence for the Labor Government. Was it enthusiastically pursued, Minister, if you do not want to give me numbers? There was a bit of interest in it, was there?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am sure there was, but I will happily take that on notice and give you any further information that the Minister can provide.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I am quite sure that, when you take it on notice, there will be no problem in saying you have got six or whatever.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Considerable interest.</p>
LGRD 16	28/05/09	134	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—You have told me that at nationbuilding.com I would see the Townsville mall mentioned.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am sure it is .gov.au as well.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—First of all, there is no such site. You simply click on it and it goes to the department's website.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I think I said that to you a moment ago.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Why didn't you just use the Department's website, Minister? Wasting a bit more money perhaps? No response? Why did you get an address www.nationbuilding.com if, when you click on it, it just goes straight to the—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I will take that on notice, Senator Macdonald.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Thanks. I will be fascinated. I know you will be, too, as Communications Minister. But then I was told I would see the list there. I have seen Mr Garrett's press release, but I had that anyhow. Is that the only reference I am going to see to</p>

				<p>the Townsville mall, or am I missing something on the website?</p> <p>Ms Foster—I understand that the press releases are on Minister Albanese’s website.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—No. I wish my machine was quick enough to be doing this as we talk.</p> <p>When I do ‘nationbuilding.gov.au’, it goes to your website, and on your website I cannot see anything about the Townsville mall. I type in, in the search thing, ‘Townsville mall’, and it brings up Mr Albanese’s media release. Is that all we can expect?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—All the releases are on the minister’s site. We can provide projects on notice, if they are not on the economic stimulus site already.</p>
LGRD 17	28/05/09	135	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—What about the \$550 million?</p> <p>Ms Foster—I am not sure that the \$550 million is there. I know it was tabled in Parliament yesterday.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—If I am right—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—It perhaps has not been uploaded yet, Senator Macdonald.</p> <p>Ms Foster—Yes.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—So, we can expect it any day, you are telling us?</p> <p>Ms Foster—I do not know. I will have to check when that is programmed to be uploaded. I had incorrectly assumed that, once it was tabled in Parliament, it was being uploaded to the website.</p>
LGRD 18	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>ACCs</p> <p>Given that ACCs will be required to issue termination notices to their staff imminently unless they are able to operate beyond 30 June 2009, has the Department suggested to the Government that funding will be extended beyond 30 June 2009 to ACCs in these States that have not yet executed an RDA MOU or contract with the Commonwealth, so that they may continue until the RDA is established?</p>
LGRD 19	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>Why has the Government granted a 3-month funding extension to the end of September to ACCs in Queensland, but not in Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and Northern Territory?</p>
LGRD 20	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>Will any additional funding be provided to other ACCs that have not transitioned to RDAs by 30 June 2009? If so, what items would the funding cover?</p>
LGRD 21	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>What have ACCs been doing since the election of the Labor Government?</p>
LGRD 22	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What has happened to the work plans they were required to write? 2. Has the Minister read those plans and acted on the recommendations? 3. Has the Minister provided feedback to each ACC on the work plans?
LGRD 23	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>Does the Australian Government provide operational funding to ACCs to cover their administrative expenses and also the employment of staff?</p>

LGRD 24	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>Does the Department require a budget from each ACC that is included in the funding contract that is executed between the Department and each ACC that details specific line items, including staff positions and salaries?</p> <p>Accordingly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many staff were employed in each Area Consultative Committee as of November 2007? 2. How many staff are now employed in each ACC / RDA? 3. How many jobs have been lost and what are the locations of those job losses? 4. How many jobs will be lost once the transition is made from ACCs to RDA?
LGRD 25	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it true that ACCs are not able to exceed their agreed budget line items by more than 10%? 2. Given the Government provides funding for ACC staff and ACCs are unable to exceed their budget line items by more than 10%, how will ACCs fund appropriate staff redundancy payments which the Government has not made any allocation for? 3. If ACC's cannot afford to pay the legal redundancy entitlements of staff, what arrangements are in place for staff to receive their entitlements and who will fund those payments? 4. What career assistance programs and counselling services have been offered by the Commonwealth to ACC staff who may become redundant after the RDA transition process is complete?
LGRD 26	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>Why have some New South Wales ACC staff been offered an employment contract under RDA in New South Wales but ACC staff in other states have not had the same offer extended to them?</p>
LGRD 27	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What will happen to the assets of ACCs when they become RDAs? 2. Is the Government able to control the disposal of assets by ACCs? 3. Does the Government have any capacity or authority to direct or determine the disposal of assets by ACCs?
LGRD 28	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the current funding arrangements for ACCs expire on June 30 2009, what written advice has been provided by the Government to each ACC in each state, as required by their funding contracts, as to their future? 2. Has written advice been provided to each ACC outlining how they are each to be transitioned to RDA? 3. If so, what are these arrangements?
LGRD 29	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>Will any additional funding be provided to ACCs that have not transitioned to RDAs by 30th June 2009?</p> <p>If so, what items would the funding cover?</p>

LGRD 30	N/A	Written	Macdonald	What arrangements are in place for ACCs, their staff and committee members in those States which have not entered into a contract or MOU with the Commonwealth by 30 June 2009?
LGRD 31	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the absence of an agreement or an MOU between the Commonwealth and State Governments, will those ACCs become known as Regional Development Australia? 2. What will be their role? 3. Who will they be accountable to? 4. Will any be closed? 5. If so what locations will be closed? 6. How many staff will lose their jobs?
LGRD 32	N/A	Written	Macdonald	Have ACCs been provided with written advice, as required by their their contracts, how they will be further funded or transitioned into RDA if the June 30 2009 deadline passes and the transition has not been completed?
LGRD 33	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If ACCs in Queensland, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and the Northern Territory are forced to wind up because the Government has failed to provide them with any written advice about their future funding or due to insolvency, who will be responsible for delivering RDAs role from July 1st? 2. Or will there be nothing while the Federal and State Governments argue about the RDA structure in these States?
LGRD 34	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<p>Regional Development Australia Can copies of the MOU for New South Wales, Western Australia, Northern Territory and Queensland be provided?</p>
LGRD 35	N/A	Written	Macdonald	What Commonwealth resources have been or will be provided to each RDA in each State?
LGRD 36	N/A	Written	Macdonald	How much operational funding will each RDA be provided with by the Commonwealth?
LGRD 37	N/A	Written	Macdonald	How much funding has or will the Commonwealth provide to the New South Wales, Western Australian, Victorian, South Australian, Tasmanian and Northern Territory Governments for RDA?
LGRD 38	N/A	Written	Macdonald	What is or what will be the proportion of Commonwealth funding, to funding provided by the New South Wales, Western Australian, Victorian, South Australian, Tasmanian and Northern Territory Governments for each RDA in their jurisdictions?
LGRD 39	N/A	Written	Macdonald	How many FTE will each RDA have and what will be the role of each position?
LGRD 40	N/A	Written	Macdonald	What is the role of RDA in the administration, application development process and / or assessment of the Government's <i>Jobs Fund - Infrastructure Employment Projects</i> ?

LGRD 41	N/A	Written	Macdonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What progress has been made with the creation of the Government's national Regional Development Advisory Council? 2. What are the selection criteria for members of the national Regional Development Advisory Council? 3. What is the process for selection?
LGRD 42	N/A	Written	Macdonald	If RDA's in some States are going to be part of a State Government agency, is it the Federal Government's intention that those State agencies also deliver other Federal Government programs and services and third party contracts, as has been the role of the ACC network?
LGRD 43	N/A	Written	Macdonald	Why has the Government reduced its funding allocation from \$17,361m for 08/09 to \$14,704m for 09/10, \$14,936m for 10/11, \$15,250m for 11/12, and \$15,539m for 12/13 for the RDA network, after assuring the ACC network that existing funding levels would be maintained?
LGRD 44	N/A	Written	Macdonald	What is the Commonwealth's role in Regional Development Australia in Western Australia?
LGRD 45	N/A	Written	Macdonald	Why did the Commonwealth choose not to have any role in the appointment of RDA board members in Western Australia?
LGRD 46	N/A	Written	Bushby	During the Additional Estimates I asked, "What date will the \$500,000 for the Oakleigh Park pedestrian overpass in Burnie (previously announced by the then Labor Opposition on 6 September 2007) be delivered?" I also asked "When will the Oakleigh Park pedestrian overpass in Burnie be commenced and when will it be completed?" and was told the project is being funded under the <i>Better Regions</i> program. When I checked the <i>Better Regions</i> website, this project wasn't on it, in fact I have checked the list of approved projects. (The website is http://www.infrastructure.gov.au/regional/better_regions.aspx). Could you please clarify if all approved <i>Better Regions</i> projects are on the <i>Better Regions</i> website?
LGRD 47	N/A	Written	Bushby	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What date will the \$500,000 for the Oakleigh Park pedestrian overpass in Burnie (previously announced 6 September 2007 by the then Shadow Minister) be delivered? 2. Why has the delivery of the project been delayed for so long? 3. When will the Oakleigh Park pedestrian overpass in Burnie be commenced and when will it be completed?

LGRD 48	N/A	Written	Bernardi	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Government is planning to transition the former Area Consultative Committees (ACC) into the Regional Development Australia (RDA) network. I believe that there were 5 ACCs in South Australia. Would the Department be able to provide me with how much funding these South Australian ACCs received over the last few financial years (including 2008-09)? 2. Under the new RDA scheme, how much will the new SA RDA bodies receive in 2009-10? 3. What are the forward estimates for this funding, with respect to SA RDAs?
LGRD 49	N/A	Written	Adams	Is there any plan to formally inform each WA RDA regarding the visions, roles, function and reporting structure of Western Australian RDAs?
LGRD 50	N/A	Written	Adams	Are you aware that the Perth ACC has now been informed it will be 'absorbed' by the WA State Government and Development Commissions?
LGRD 51	N/A	Written	Adams	Are you also aware that Statutory Commissions are unable to host many contracts?
LGRD 52	N/A	Written	Adams	If you were aware of this, why then did you allow this to happen?
LGRD 53	N/A	Written	Adams	Is there any plan to ensure WA RDAs have a legal identity?
LGRD 54	N/A	Written	Adams	If so why not? This then means RDAs in WA will have no legal identity and therefore be unable to deliver services that require a not-for-profit status?
LGRD 55	N/A	Written	Adams	Are you aware on the 14 th May, the Perth RDA was told over the phone to close the office, two days later they were told to start working on the jobs fund. Can you please explain how this lack of communication can lead to two separate directives?
LGRD 56	N/A	Written	Adams	The funding is being reduced quite considerably, can you please tell me the breakdown of this funding?
LGRD 57	N/A	Written	Adams	What is being done about the approximately 150 jobs that will be lost based on the RDAs being absorbed by State Governments?
LGRD 58	N/A	Written	Brown	<p>Nation Building</p> <p>Please detail what activities were funded under the following budget items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NE Tasmania Innovation and Investment Fund which was funded \$2.275m in 08–09 and \$1.425 in 09–10 • NE Tasmanian Development Package—micro-capital loans which were funded \$300,000 in 2008–09.
LGRD 59	N/A	Written	Nash	How many people were employed in the Regional Services Division of the Department in November 2007?
LGRD 60	N/A	Written	Nash	How many FTE positions were allocated to the Regional Services Division of the Department in November 2007?

LGRD 61	N/A	Written	Nash	How many people are now employed in Regional Development Policy Branch of the Department? What is their role?
LGRD 62	N/A	Written	Nash	How many FTE positions are allocated to the Regional Development Policy Branch of the Department?
LGRD 63	N/A	Written	Nash	How many people are employed in the Regional Development Programs Section of the Department? What is their role?
LGRD 64	N/A	Written	Nash	How many FTE positions are allocated to the Regional Development Programs Section?
LGRD 65	N/A	Written	Nash	How many Canberra-based positions in the Regional Development Section of the Department in Canberra have been made redundant since the Government was elected?
LGRD 66	N/A	Written	Nash	How many positions in the Regional Development Programs Branch in Darwin, Townsville, Newcastle, Orange, Bendigo, Wollongong and Hobart have been made redundant since the Government was elected?
LGRD 67	N/A	Written	Nash	Given the closure of the Department's offices in Brisbane, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth, how many positions were made redundant?
LGRD 68	N/A	Written	Nash	Has any person who was made redundant been re-employed or engaged as a consultant or contractor?
LGRD 69	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the Department's role in the administration and/or assessment of the Government's <i>Jobs Fund - Infrastructure Employment Projects</i> ?
LGRD 70	N/A	Written	Nash	Why has the Government changed the name of the " <i>Regional & Local Community Infrastructure Fund</i> " to " <i>Community Infrastructure Fund</i> "?
LGRD 71	N/A	Written	Nash	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the Department still produce the publication: <i>Australian Government Regional Information Directory</i>? 2. If not, why not? 3. Will the Government publish it in the future?
LGRD 72	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Labor's Election Commitments</p> <p>Why did the Government break its promise to provide an ongoing specific regional development funding program?</p>
LGRD 73	N/A	Written	Nash	In its <i>Regional Development for a Sustainable Future</i> election policy document, Labor committed to 'require the individual portfolio budgets and the Federal Budget to identify how much is spent in each region'. Where is this information available from?
LGRD 74	N/A	Written	Nash	What is RDAs capacity to support local projects as required in Labor's <i>Regional Development for a Sustainable Future</i> election policy document?
LGRD 75	N/A	Written	Nash	Why hasn't the Government retained and enhanced the <i>Regional Partnerships</i> and <i>Sustainable Regions</i> programs as promised in Labor's <i>Regional Development for a Sustainable Future</i> election policy document?

LGRD 76	N/A	Written	Nash	Why hasn't the Government opened its <i>Better Regions</i> program that was promised in Labor's <i>Regional Development for a Sustainable Future</i> election policy document?
LGRD 77	N/A	Written	Nash	Which of Labor's commitments outlined in its <i>Regional Development for a Sustainable Future</i> election policy document has the Government actually honoured?
LGRD 78	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the role of each Regional Development Australia office in relation to the development of projects as mandated in Labor's <i>Regional Development for a Sustainable Future</i> election policy document?
LGRD 79	N/A	Written	Nash	Better Regions How many funding contracts has the Government entered into under its <i>Better Regions</i> program? What are the projects and what electorates are they in?
LGRD 80	N/A	Written	Nash	How many projects under <i>Better Regions</i> have been completed? What are the projects and what electorates are they in?
LGRD 81	N/A	Written	Nash	How many <i>Better Regions</i> projects will not gain funding under the <i>Better Regions</i> program? What are the projects and what electorates are they in?
NBII 01	27/05/09	7	Abetz	Senator ABETZ —Just, for example, Nation Building—Roads to Recovery, Roads to Recovery just seems to have a certain ring about it. Is that a continuation of something that existed before? Mr Tongue —Certainly the Roads to Recovery program has been a long-standing program. I would have to check whether— Senator ABETZ —A long-standing program initiated by the coalition? Mr Tongue —By the previous Government. Senator ABETZ —By the previous Government, yes. Mr Tongue —As I noted in my opening statement, funding for the program has been increased. Senator ABETZ —Yes, and I understand that under Auslink 2 and other coalition initiatives—and this is why I asked that earlier question and I will be looking forward to receiving the answer on notice as to what the coalition had by way of funding under Auslink 2 from 2009-10 to 2013-14 so we can actually do a genuine compare and contrast in relation to those figures—it looks as though we are busily rebadging everything from Auslink to Nation Building. Can you tell us what the costs are associated with that name change? Mr Tongue —I think I will have to take that one on notice.
NBII 02	27/05/09	7	Abetz	Senator ABETZ —So no consideration was given to the cost? New letterheads, undoubtedly, new road signs on the side of the road, re-education classes for all the officials so that they say 'Nation Building'—surely there must have been some costings done on that. Mr Tongue —Senator, that nomenclature is relatively recent.

				<p>Senator ABETZ—Yes, it is very recent. I would agree with you on that.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I would have to take on notice road signs. I am not aware that we have put up any new road signs or done any of that.</p>
NBII 03	27/05/09	7	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—No. At the most unexpected times, Senator Conroy shines. I think we have to make the most of this moment. Mr Tongue, seriously, could I be told about the costs associated with a name change? Will that require the changing of road signs, for example, where projects are ongoing and if we have projects that might go for a number of years?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Certainly, Senator. We are still working through that process. I am happy to take it on notice and provide what detail I can.</p>
NBII 04	27/05/09	9	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—It would not want to be associated with either side. But I understand the term ‘Auslink’ is thought of and then little logos and mottos etcetera are developed. Is any money being spent on ‘Nation Building’—how that ought to be written and stylised? Will it have a squiggle underneath or on top of it—</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—or a stylised map of Australia? What sort of money is being spent on that?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—We would have to go away and I would have to dig that out.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Have we got a consultant? What sorts of colours are going to be used?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am sure Mr Tongue could not possibly have that information at his fingertips.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—No, but is it occurring?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will happily take that on notice and get back to you.</p>
NBII 05	27/05/09	10	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Could I interrupt just to clarify one part. Did you say earlier—did the Government seek from your Department advice on the cost of rebadging? I am not asking what you told them or what they asked for, but did they seek advice of your Department on the cost of rebadging?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—The answer that Mr Tongue gives must, by definition, go to advice to Government which is outside the purview of the Senate Estimates.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—No, I am not asking what advice he gave them. I am asking, did the Government seek advice?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You have asked him to identify what advice he provided to Government.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—No, I am not. I am asking him if he provided advice, not what he provided.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No, but you have asked him if he provided a certain advice.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—In fact, I am not asking what he did at all. I am asking:</p>

				<p>did the government ask him for advice on the question of rebadging? I am not asking what he told them.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take that one on notice, because I am not sure that your definition is one that I agree with. I will happily take that on notice and if there is information that we can provide—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I think your question crosses the line. So just to ensure that we comply with the standing orders, we will take that on notice and we will get you whatever information is available.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Minister, you cannot get out of things that simply. I repeat: I am not asking what advice he gave. I am asking if he was asked for advice and the answer is, yes, he was or, no, he was not.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—As I said, we will take it on notice, Senator Macdonald, and we will get you the answer.</p>
NBII 06	27/05/09	79	Sterle	<p>CHAIR—Thank you, Senator O’Brien. Just before we go for the afternoon tea break in a couple of minutes, Mr Marchant, you talked about Parkes, and I have not been out to Parkes. So is Parkes becoming a freight consolidation area for freight moving between Brisbane and Perth and Melbourne, is it?</p> <p>Mr Marchant—It is progressively moving that way, not because of anything other than market forces in one sense. Linfox actually acquired one of the terminals there and they are using it for cross-freight forwarding from both the Queensland end down to Melbourne and also the Queensland end across to Perth. Two other operators have set up similar terminals, some of which is trucking across from Sydney and re-consolidating and getting across to Perth or down to Melbourne. So there are three quite reasonably sized intermodal terminals being developed or in operation in Parkes.</p> <p>CHAIR—So if there is a transport company running around picking up freight in suburban Sydney—and I know how big suburban Sydney is—you are saying it is cheaper for them to have a depot in Parkes to consolidate the freight there, rather than try and battle their way into inner Sydney. Is that right?</p> <p>Mr Marchant—No. In some cases that is right. What happens is people miss the close down for the rail movement and actually try and shoot across to get the next movement and get packed up. So if they miss a deadline at 4 or 5 o’clock for a consolidation of a rail movement, they may actually truck it through to Parkes, or plan to truck it through to Parkes, to catch the longer movement.</p> <p>CHAIR—You can take it on notice, Mr Marchant, it would be interesting to see how many tonnes of freight come out of Parkes per year.</p> <p>Mr Marchant—I would be happy to get you some stuff; I do not carry it in my pocket.</p> <p>CHAIR—No. I do not expect you do. Mr Marchant, on behalf of the Committee, thank</p>

				you very much. We will now take a break and we will be back at 4.15 and we will call Nation Building—Infrastructure Investments. Thank you.
NBII 07	27/05/09	86	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—What is the total cost of the project?</p> <p>Ms McNally—The total cost of the project that the Australian Government is contributing to is \$894 million.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—For the total cost of the light rail?</p> <p>Ms McNally—Other contributions are coming forward from the Queensland Government, the Gold Coast City Council and the private sector.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—And do you have details of what—</p> <p>Ms McNally—I do not have with me the break-up of that.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Are they available? You do not have them with you. Are they available somewhere, does that suggest?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am attempting to gather that information for you, as we speak, Senator Macdonald.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—So that information is available, we just do not have it in the room today?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No. I am attempting to get it for you.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Thank you for that.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I will keep you posted.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—And if perchance you cannot, you will take that as a question on notice. My question really was to Ms McNally. Does she have those figures somewhere but not with us today?</p> <p>Ms McNally—I do not have them with me today. I would have to go through the proposals—or get my officers to go through the proposals—to identify those figures.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Yes. So the total cost is \$894 million?</p> <p>Ms McNally—For the component of the project that the Australian Government has decided to contribute to. There are a number of stages for this particular project.</p>
NBII 08	27/05/09	86	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—No; the costings. Are the costings for the \$4.3 billion for the Regional Express project going to be released? You have given us a summary.</p> <p>Mr Williams—I do not have the costings at hand.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Sorry?</p> <p>Mr Williams—I do not have the costings at hand. I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—No, but I said: are they going to be released?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take it on notice whether or not we will release those for you.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Okay. But in allocating money for that, the Government has accepted that question and I assume, therefore, that they have had the full costing</p>

				<p>details of it and have accepted them? Mr Williams—Again, that would be done through the Infrastructure Australia process.</p>
NBII 09	27/05/09	91	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Is there an expectation that the West Metro project will actually be built, that the \$91 million we are putting into the study is a good investment into the future? Mr Williams—I think the Government has made that decision in terms of its investment of the \$91 million, and future decisions as to the construction will be a matter for the Government. Senator Conroy—Our funding commitments are appropriate for the specific project in question. For example, to progress the West Metro to the next stage—that is pre-construction work—to make the project ready for tender, we have provided the \$91 million. That is the appropriate amount for that project. Future public sector investment infrastructure will be considered in the context of future budgets, and the current \$91 million will nail down an accurate cost for the project mix for private sector funding options. Senator IAN MACDONALD—Does anyone know if the New South Wales Government going to contribute to funding on that project? Mr Williams—They have already contributed \$10 million to the first stage and— Senator IAN MACDONALD—To the first stage of the study. Mr Williams—Yes. Senator IAN MACDONALD—And the Commonwealth is putting in \$91 million. Mr Williams—Yes. Senator IAN MACDONALD—And do you know what the contribution by the state or the Brisbane City Council is to the Brisbane project? Mr Williams—I would have to take that one on notice.</p>
NBII 10	27/05/09	93	Bushby	<p>Senator BUSHBY—The upgrade of the Formby Road in Braddon, which was promised as part of the election campaign. Mr Foulds—The Formby Road redevelopment will start in October 2009. It is due to finish in 2010. The total Australian Government contribution is \$2 million. The total project cost is \$7 million. It is an off-network nation building project. Senator BUSHBY—So it is off-network—is that why it does not show up on the website? Ms McNally—It depends where you look, Senator. If you put in that project name, it should come up on the website. There is an area you can go and put— Senator BUSHBY—So it should be there somewhere; I just could not find it in the area I was looking at. When is work going to start? Mr Foulds—It is due to start in October 2009. Senator BUSHBY—When will it be completed?</p>

				<p>Mr Foulds—It is due to finish in June 2010.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—And arrangements have been finalised with the State Government on that?</p> <p>Mr Foulds—At this stage, they have, and they have agreed to contribute \$5 million in the \$7 million total project cost.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—Is there anything outstanding to be finalised with the State Government—</p> <p>Mr Foulds—It is in the planning phase at the moment. For further detail I would have to take it on notice. It is in the planning stage at the moment.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—Could you take on notice whether there is anything outstanding that has yet to be agreed in respect of that project?</p> <p>Mr Foulds—Yes.</p>
NBII 11	27/05/09	95	Bushby	<p>Mr Williams—Certainly, Minister Sturges, in Tasmania, released a release yesterday which talked about bringing forward some of the re-sleeping projects, \$21 million to replace 20 kilometres of rail, and 160,000 sleepers.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—But is that part of this project or is it part of the other agreement that has been going—</p> <p>Mr Williams—It is part of a broader Tasmanian rail rescue package.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—Sure.</p> <p>Mr Williams—Plus the funding from the State Government.</p> <p>Senator COLBECK—So there is an agreement to bring some of that forward to repair a section of track?</p> <p>Mr Williams—They are utilising some of the money from the rail rescue package.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—How much are they using to do those repairs?</p> <p>Mr Williams—\$21 million is being spent on the repairs.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—Yes. So \$20 million spent on the repairs that are being done at the moment, re-laying of the—</p> <p>Mr Williams—Yes.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—And how much is that funded by the Commonwealth?</p> <p>Mr Williams—I would have to take on notice the exact split on that.</p>
NBII 12	27/05/09	98	Bushby	<p>Senator BUSHBY—Did I hear you mention that there would also be some funding for planning for replacement?</p> <p>Mr Foulds—The Bagdad bypass and Bridgewater Bridge replacement planning is a separate project and that, next year, has \$3.82 million allocated to it, and that includes to review previous options identified for a new Bridgewater Bridge and to develop a preferred concept design for a new dual carriageway crossing of the Derwent River between Bridgewater and Granton.</p>

				<p>Senator BUSHBY—I do not know whether you can answer this question, but, as part of the proposal for that planning, does that include any criteria for ensuring that leisure craft can pass beneath it?</p> <p>Mr Foulds—I would have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—If you can, that would be good, because that is quite important to a significant proportion of Tasmanians.</p> <p>Mr Foulds—I will have to take that on notice, Senator.</p>
NBII 13	27/05/09	118	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—What we are seeing is a cost-shifting potentially. When the request was made by the State Government to transfer these funds to other projects, did the State Government say that they would be fully responsible for the Brighton intermodal or did they say that they would fully fund the Brighton intermodal? Because there is a difference, given that they can enter a public-private finance partnership or get it fully privately funded. Is there anything in the MOU or agreements or discussion?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—No-one at the table has a copy of the MOU, so we will have to take that on notice and see if there is any information that the minister wishes to forward to you.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—All right, thank you.</p>
NBII 14	27/05/09	119	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—From where, Ms McNally, did you get the list to put on the departmental website?</p> <p>Ms McNally—We were advised by the Government which projects they wanted to fund, and those projects formed the basis of the MOU—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—When were you told of those projects that they wanted to fund?</p> <p>Ms McNally—I do not have a precise date, but we worked through the course of 2008.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Could you provide that to us, because—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I will take that on notice.</p>
NBII 15	27/05/09	121	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—So, can I ask for such a ‘chronological list’ of all the Labor Party road-funding election promises.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You can ask for it, and I will take it on notice and see if—</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—The Department has told us that this list is to be found on the website—that they are all included.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will happily supply you with a copy of our Nation Building program, which honours all of our election commitments.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—No, that is different. That is different to the specific election promises that were made during the 2007 election, because there are other projects, as I understand it, on the website and other road funding projects that have come into being after the 2007 election promises. What I want to know is which ones were the election promises and which ones have come into being after. It is quite normal that that happens: as State Governments, Federal Governments have different priorities, new projects come along. I</p>

				<p>just want to know which is which because, looking at the website, I am not informed as to which one is a specific election promise and which one is not.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—As I said, we will take it on notice and see what information the Minister can make available to you.</p>
NBII 16	27/05/09	121	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—I cannot see why there is such a difficulty with that—other than the difficulty of providing election promises and accountability. Can I ask then: in relation to the funding for Infrastructure Australia, we have been provided with a split of the funding in states, and I know that Tasmania did not get a dollar, but do we have a split between rural-regional and metro areas in relation to the Nation Building funding?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I can provide you with a split across the entire \$36 billion. Regional funding, which is a subset of the \$36 billion over six years, regional road and rail, totals \$21.2 billion.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Right. Is Tasmania considered to be regional in that definition?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I do not have information to hand about the matter.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Zero is zero. I know that much.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Tasmania, you will recall, is getting \$800 million of that \$36 billion.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Yes. That was in relation to the \$8.5 billion—</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Sorry, yes.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—Mr Tongue, you are quite right. Out of the larger figure, is Tasmania, for example, considered to be regional, and so its \$800 million is included in that regional figure?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—I do not have that information to hand, but I will endeavour to get it for you.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—If it is not too difficult an exercise, if you could disaggregate and provide it to us on notice, we would appreciate that. Thank you for that.</p>
NBII 17	27/05/09	125	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—That is very useful, yes. Back to where we were. Where would I find the \$55 million for the Warrego Highway in the budget papers?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We are just seeking that information for you.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Okay. But can I just be clear here: it has actually been allocated, has it?</p> <p>Ms McNeill—Yes.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Does that mean the cheque has been sent to the Queensland Government or just that someone has said it is going to happen?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We are not sure that it is separately identified. I am just seeking to confirm that for you.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Okay.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We can take that on notice, if you would like just to allow you to go on with your questions.</p>

				<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Thank you.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take that on notice.</p>
NBII 18	27/05/09	126	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Mr Chairman, my question was very specific. The \$176 million which I was told by an officer had been allocated to the current financial year: has that been spent and, if not, what will happen to it? I am waiting for that answer.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—While the officer was gathering that information, Senator Macdonald, I was quickly updating you on some further information.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I can give a political speech too, if you like, while the officer is looking for it.</p> <p>CHAIR—Has the officer got the answer to Senator Macdonald's question?</p> <p>Ms McNally—If the money is not spent this financial year, no further funds will be paid until that money is spent.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Thank you for that. I was interested in that aspect. But you cannot tell me yet whether it has been spent or has not been spent?</p> <p>Ms McNally—I would have to take that on notice.</p>
NBII 19	27/05/09	127	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—It seems, if I follow this correctly, there is the 12-kilometre stretch of the road around the eastern buffer area of the proposed Traveston Crossing Dam—a section that will cost at least half a billion dollars—and we are left with slightly over 50 kilometres of road duplication in fairly open country. Can anyone explain to me why the remainder of this section should cost in the realm of \$5½ billion?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Probably because of the 12 years of inaction by the former Government.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—That is almost \$100 million per kilometre.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—If you had addressed it in any of the 12 years you were in government—I mean, when the Nationals were in government they only spent \$3.22 million on this stretch of road. They were in a position to fix the highway but did nothing. So when we now have to correct 12 years of slothfulness, do not sit here and think that you are able to try and claim some sort of overspending by this Government. On 14 May 2002—2002—the then Deputy Prime Minister, John Anderson, announced \$1 million for a study to examine possible future routes for the Bruce Highway over 70 kilometres between Cooroy and Curra.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Mr Chairman, my question was about the cost of \$100 million per kilometre.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—Construction is likely to be 15 to 20 years. That was the position of the Government that you served in.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Mr Chairman, can I take a point of order.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I think you may have even been a Minister at the time.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Stop this babble from—</p>

				<p>CHAIR—Sorry, Senator Macdonald. Minister, I think you have had enough time to answer. I am sorry, Senator Macdonald. If you want to, ask that question again.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Yes. It then works out at about \$100 million per kilometre, which seems, in anyone’s understanding, an extraordinarily expensive bit of roadway. Can anyone explain why that would be costed at \$100 million per kilometre?</p> <p>Ms McNally—I would have to take that on notice.</p>
NBII 20	27/05/09	128	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—In the same press release, Labor promised \$115 million for black spots between Sarina and Childers. Can anyone tell me if that has been divvied out and, if not, when it will be?</p> <p>Ms McNally—We can take that on notice in terms of where they are and what state they are at.</p>
NBII 21	27/05/09	128	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—I have a few of these questions. Perhaps if I can quickly just list them. Has the \$70 million for widening and strengthening sections of the highway between Benaraby and Rockhampton and Rockhampton and St Lawrence been allocated yet?</p> <p>Ms McNally—We will take that on notice.</p>
NBII 22	27/05/09	128	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Has the \$55 million to upgrade the Bruce Highway for the Calliope Crossroads near Gladstone been spent or allocated yet? What is the state of that?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We can take that on notice, just to speed the journey here if you are just listing them.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Similarly, \$40 million was promised to improve flood immunity on the Bruce Highway at Gairloch north of Ingham. Has that been done?</p> <p>Ms McNally—We will take that on notice.</p>
NBII 23	N/A	Written	Ludlam	<p>I refer to a press statement by Minister Albanese on 13 May 2008 relating to the granting of \$6.4 million for unincorporated areas under the <i>Roads to Recovery</i> programme.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By what processes are the acquittals of funding grants under <i>Roads to Recovery</i> programme audited by the Commonwealth Government? 2. Does the Minister concur that the un-incorporated areas in question relate to the Dundee and Marrakai districts? 3. If no to (2), can the Minister outline his understanding of the regions in question? 4. Is the Minister aware of whether this specific grant has been drawn down by the Northern Territory Government? 5. If yes, can the Minister detail any outcomes of this expenditure? 6. Does the 2009/10 budget include any related grant under <i>Roads to Recovery</i> or other relevant funding source for these areas?
NBII 24	27/05/09	133	Nash/Abetz	<p>Senator NASH—I am more than happy to accede to your intermittent questions, Chair. Can I have that New South Wales figure again, Mr Williams?</p> <p>Mr Williams—The figure?</p>

				<p>Senator NASH—The cost and the number of boom gates.</p> <p>Mr Williams—New South Wales, \$42.77 million for 55 level crossings.</p> <p>Senator NASH—What consultation do you do with the New South Wales State Government on that?</p> <p>Mr Williams—The initial allocation to states was determined by the minister. He then wrote to his state colleagues asking them to provide priority projects using the model that I referred to, and they came back with those high-priority projects.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—If I may follow up, Senator Nash: so the Minister wrote to his state counterparts after determining how much would go to each State?</p> <p>Mr Williams—Yes, correct.</p> <p>Senator ABETZ—How did he determine that?</p> <p>Mr Williams—There was a prior step in that process. We went out to the States to determine the number of level crossings in each State and we used that information, together with crash history from Australian Transport Safety Bureau data in terms of the number of crashes and collisions at level crossings across Australia, and determined an allocation having regard to those two factors.</p> <p>Senator NASH—It is particularly interesting that funding has been allocated before it is determined where. How many crashes were there in New South Wales, over the period of time that you looked at, that you based this information on?</p> <p>Mr Williams—I would have to take that on notice, sorry.</p> <p>Senator NASH—If, as you say, the allocation of funding was based—and quite rightly—on some of that information coming back to you on the number of crashes and incidents, can you supply in detail to the committee that information that you based the funding recommendation on?</p> <p>Mr Williams—I will take that on notice.</p>
NBII 25	27/05/09	134	Nash	<p>Senator NASH—I have not had one email about boom gates and flashing lights and I have had a bucket-load of ones about the rail lines closing. It is very interesting to focus on what the priorities are. One of the questions I asked earlier is apparently appropriate to ask here now. It was about the rail corridor between Melbourne and Adelaide. It was the \$105.7 million that was in the Nation Building package. As I was saying at the time, because I do not understand the geography all that well, I was trying to ascertain whether the line between Maroona and the South Australian border for \$100 million, which was announced in the budget, is the same thing as the rail corridor, Melbourne to Adelaide, that was announced in the Nation Building package?</p> <p>Mr Williams—Can you point me to the budget paper reference?</p> <p>Senator NASH—I probably cannot, actually. It is the upgrade of the rail corridor between Melbourne to Adelaide, \$105.7 million. Is that enough?</p> <p>Mr Williams—That was one that Mr Marchant talked about earlier, which was the western</p>

				<p>Victoria track upgrade. That is between Melbourne and Adelaide.</p> <p>Senator NASH—That is what I was asking him at the time.</p> <p>Mr Williams—Yes.</p> <p>Senator NASH—But it was not clear, and then I was flicked to here because I would get more detail from these officers.</p> <p>Mr Williams—Construction on that project is underway.</p> <p>Senator NASH—No. I am just trying to find out if they are the same thing, if the Melbourne to Adelaide rail corridor of \$105.7 million in the Nation Building package is the same thing as the line between Maroona and the South Australian border of \$100 million announced in the budget. I just geographically do not know where they are. I want to know if they are the same.</p> <p>Mr Williams—I cannot help you. I will have to take that on notice.</p> <p>Senator NASH—Take it on notice.</p>
NBII 26	27/05/09	135	Nash	<p>Senator NASH—I think there are 17 rail projects listed in the Nation Building document. How many are underway and how many are completed?</p> <p>Mr Williams—I believe nine are under active constructive. All 17 are underway in terms of planning and design as well.</p> <p>Senator NASH—None are actually completed as yet?</p> <p>Mr Williams—There are elements, as Mr Marchant referred to earlier today, in some of the projects. One of the passing loops on the Ulan line is already complete, and I think another passing loop in one of the other projects is also complete.</p> <p>Senator NASH—Are they all running to budget?</p> <p>Mr Williams—They are all running to budget as far as I am aware.</p> <p>Senator NASH—Can I have a list of all those projects—on notice is fine—and exactly where each project is up to?</p> <p>Mr Williams—Yes.</p>
NBII 27	27/05/09	138	Nash	<p>Senator NASH—How many members make up the task force?</p> <p>Mr Williams—The task force is made up of a number of grower groups, the New South Wales Farmers Federation; the Grain Growers Association; a number of the handlers, GrainCorp, AWB, ABB and ABA; the transporters, so Asciano or Pacific National, El Zorro, the Australian Rail Track Corporation, the Australian Livestock Transporters Association, the Rail Tram and Bus Union and representatives; and the users, Manildra Flour Mills, the New South Wales Local Government Association, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. The Secretariat is made up from this Department and the New South Wales Ministry of Transport.</p> <p>Senator NASH—When did this kick off? When did it start?</p> <p>Mr Williams—It kicked off in November last year.</p> <p>Senator NASH—How many times has the task force met?</p> <p>Mr Williams—It has met seven times. The Chair of the Review, I forgot to mention, is Mr</p>

				<p>Des Powell.</p> <p>Senator NASH—What expenses have been incurred during the process of the review?</p> <p>Mr Williams—To date, \$825,397 has been spent.</p> <p>Senator NASH—I am happy for you to take this on notice. Could you give us the breakdown of where that funding has gone?</p> <p>Mr Williams—Yes.</p>
NBII 28	27/05/09	139	Nash	<p>Senator NASH—Was the study undertaken in conjunction with the Grain Freight Review that I was just talking about? Was there any collaboration of information? They obviously would have crossed over in a number of areas.</p> <p>Mr Williams—I am certainly aware that the Grain Freight Review is aware of the Central West Transport Needs Study and has the report which has been released.</p> <p>Senator NASH—This might be something where I may well have to wait for the report to come out. Did the study just focus on the central west, or did it actually take into account the anticipated growth in Sydney and spill-out over into the central western areas? Did it look at the logistics as well?</p> <p>Ms McNally—The central west study has been published on the website. I think we would have to take the issue around the geography on notice.</p> <p>Mr Foulds—Yes, around Sydney we would have to take on notice.</p> <p>Senator NASH—Yes, that would be fine. Again, if you want to take these on notice, because I realise this might not be information that you have got right there with you. The study found that an upgrade of the Bells Line of Road expressway would not be required until 2033. That is a very interesting figure, given the population boom that there is going to be, and a whole range of reasons around that. I am happy for you to take this on notice: did the study take into account that the upgrade of the Bells Line of Road would encourage population growth, consolidate industry, and assist tourism in the west of New South Wales? Very importantly—and could you take this on notice as well if you cannot give me an answer now—did the study identify the corridor that would accommodate the upgrade of the Bells Line of Road and did it make any recommendations that the line be preserved?</p> <p>Ms McNally—We will take that on notice.</p>
NBII 29 [NBII 30 – NBII 245 are on the written questions list]	27/05/09	139	Abetz	<p>Senator ABETZ—The 13 crossings in Tasmania that are going to benefit from boom gates etcetera: can you provide us with the location and the crash history over the past decade for each one of those 13 crossings? And I do not need the figures now.</p> <p>Mr Williams—Yes, I will take that on notice.</p>
NBII 62	N/A	Written	Brown	<p>The Government is committing significant funds to Tasmania's road infrastructure. The budget committed funding to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a Midland highway safety upgrade • East Tamar highway upgrade projects:

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Batman highway junction grade separation; ▪ Dalrymple; and ▪ Egg Island Creek. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$3.2 million to eliminate 28 dangerous black spots on local roads • \$2.6 million to install boom gates and other safety measures at 13 high risk level crossings • \$800,000 to address the lack of safe, modern roadside facilities for truck drivers, including new and refurbished rest stops, parking bays and decoupling areas. <p>For each of these commitments, please provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the exact location of each project to be funded and budget for each project; b. the details of which existing or newly upgraded roads/infrastructure are regularly used by logging trucks and/or the transport of related forestry equipment, and c. the reasons for investing in road infrastructure in each of these locations.
NBII 63	N/A	Written	Brown	<p>The Government has also committed to spend \$42.7 million to maintain and upgrade local roads in Tasmania. Please provide:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the location of each project to be funded; b. the details of which existing or newly upgraded roads are regularly used by logging trucks and/or the transport of related forestry equipment, and c. the reasons for investing in road infrastructure in each of these locations.
NBII 64	N/A	Written	Parry	What specific bids were made for upgrade of secondary roads in Tasmania?
NBII 65	N/A	Written	Parry	<p>Cam River Bridge</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Member for Braddon (Mr Sidebottom) been in contact with the Minister's office to make representations about the state of, or to make requests for funding for the upgrade of the Cam river bridge? 2. Has the Mr Sidebottom made contact with the Department to make any representations (as above)? 3. For both of the above, if contact was made, please specify by what medium he contacted either the Department or Minister's office and what date contact was made. 4. Has the Minister or the Department received any representations from any group or individual about the Cam River Bridge and the concerns surrounding it? 5. If so, please list the person/group who has been in contact and on what date they made contact.
NBII 65	N/A	Written	Parry	<p>Cam River Bridge</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Has the Member for Braddon (Mr Sidebottom) been in contact with the Minister's office to make representations about the state of, or to make requests for funding for

				<p>the upgrade of the Cam river bridge?</p> <p>7. Has the Mr Sidebottom made contact with the Department to make any representations (as above)?</p> <p>8. For both of the above, if contact was made, please specify by what medium he contacted either the Department or Minister's office and what date contact was made.</p> <p>9. Has the Minister or the Department received any representations from any group or individual about the Cam River Bridge and the concerns surrounding it?</p> <p>10. If so, please list the person/group who has been in contact and on what date they made contact.</p>
NBII 66	N/A	Written	Nash	I notice that the Victorian Brumby Government in its Victorian Transport Plan has included the Regional Express as a priority. The State Government of Victoria is silent on its funding commitment. That is, at present it has allocated no State funds to the project. What agreements have been established between the Commonwealth and Victorian regarding Victoria's contribution?
NBII 67	N/A	Written	Nash	Mr Neil Williams, General Manager, Rail and Intermodal advised in the Budget Estimates hearing on Wednesday 27 May 2009 that \$825,397 of the \$3M allocated had been spent to date on the NSW Grain Freight Review. What other expenses are expected to be incurred?
NBII 68	N/A	Written	Nash	Has further funding be allocated for more detailed follow-up studies, or for projects resulting from the NSW Grain Freight Review?
NBII 69	N/A	Written	Nash	Following the release of the Central West Transport Needs Study, will the Government be further investigating an upgrade of the Bogan gate to Tottenham; Koorawatha to Greenethorpe; and Ungarie to Lake Cargelligo branch lines to alleviate the problem for the movement of rail freight within and through the central west region?
NBII 70	N/A	Written	Nash	On the Department's website, it states a further \$4M will be made available for more detailed follow up studies, or for projects resulting from this Study. Will these funds be used to further investigate the abovementioned branch lines?
NBII 71	N/A	Written	Nash	Did the Central West Transport Needs Study (CWTNS) take into consideration the effect on regional roads caused by the transport of grain during harvest times in the event of the closure of rail branch lines?
NBII 72	N/A	Written	Nash	Did the CWTNS identify that the Bells Line of Road would allow the development of a B-Double link between the major production areas of the Central West and Sydney, which would further improve efficiency and reduce transport costs for industry in the Central West?
NBII 73	N/A	Written	Nash	Was the CWTNS undertaken separately to the joint Federal and State Government study currently being undertaken of the upgrade of the Great Western highway to determine

				which section of the highway, among other things, will improve road freight efficiency, road safety and improve through and tourist traffic?
NBII 74	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the Federal Government's contribution to this joint State/Federal Government study of the upgrade of the Great Western highway?
NBII 75	N/A	Written	Nash	One of the four routes being investigated in the Great Western highway upgrade, the Newnes Plateau route, has been ruled out of the study due to a submission by the Department of Defence. What is the Department's objection?
NBII 76	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you advise what other options are being considered for the Great Western highway upgrade? And when will a final decision be made?
BITRE 03 [NBII 77 to NBII 80 are NBII input to BITRE 03 sub-questions 4-7]	N/A	Written	Ludlam	<p>I refer to predicted global oil decline rates as described by, for example, the International Energy Agency's World Energy Outlook (WEO) published in November 2008, and ask:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. How were global oil decline rates factored into decision-making on infrastructure spending, either by the Government or its advisory bodies including Infrastructure Australia? [IA input] 12. Were global oil decline rates explicitly factored into any of the infrastructure decisions announced in the 2009/10 budget? [IA input] 13. If yes to (2), will the Minister outline specific examples and table supporting documentation outlining the assumptions underlying the decisions? [IA input] 14. Is the Minister aware that the planning documents submitted for the proposed F3 Freeway extension assume +22% to +59% traffic growths in 10 years? [NBII 77] 15. Does the Minister consider these projections plausible in the light of the WEO document and related sources? [NBII 78] 16. Is the Minister aware that the planning documents submitted for the proposed Pacific Highway Kempsey bypass assume a doubling of traffic out to 2031? [NBII 79] 17. Does the Minister consider these projections plausible in the light of the WEO document and related sources? [NBII 80] 18. Is the Minister aware that the BITRE forecasts a doubling of air traffic out to 2030? [BITRE input] 19. Does the Minister consider these projections plausible in the light of the WEO document and related sources? [BITRE input] 20. Can the Minister outline whether or not future funding rounds managed through the selection process undertaken by Infrastructure Australia will explicitly include forecasted global oil decline rates? [IA input]
NBII 81	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>When was the decision made to rename AusLink the <i>Nation Building Program</i>? Why was that decision made? Is this a bit of standard Labor spin and the rewriting of history? I notice that on page 3 of the Executive Summary of the \$4.7 billion <i>Nation Building Package</i> it states, and I quote:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Government will bring forward the commencement of construction of 14 national</i></p>

				<i>road projects already announced under the Building Australia Program (formerly known as AusLink 2).</i>
NBII 82	N/A	Written	Nash	So, in December last year, the Government decided to change the name of AusLink to the <i>Building Australia Program</i> . Is that right?
NBII 83	N/A	Written	Nash	Now, it is called the Nation Building Program. Did the Government have trouble making up its mind as to what it should be called? Did a departmental official come up with the latest version over last year's summer break?
NBII 84	N/A	Written	Nash	How much will it cost to change the name AusLink to the <i>Nation Building Program</i> ?
NBII 85	N/A	Written	Nash	Will the Government run around the countryside removing and changing the signage so offensive AusLink signs are removed?
NBII 86	N/A	Written	Nash	Why does the Government consider it necessary to rewrite history?
NBII 87	N/A	Written	Nash	Is this to give the Australian people the impression that the Government is spending additional money on infrastructure?
NBII 88	N/A	Written	Nash	What was wrong with the term AusLink?
NBII 89	N/A	Written	Nash	I refer to the statement by Minister Albanese regarding this matter, as reported on page six of <u>The Australian</u> on Wednesday 6 May 2009. Minister Albanese's office maintained, and I quote from <u>The Australian</u> : <i>the Government was entitled to identify new projects under its Nation Building Program – a term it has used to describe its policies since it came into government.</i> The point is, the road projects being funded under the Government's so-called <i>Nation Building Program</i> are the AusLink projects – national projects identified as worthy of Commonwealth funding by the previous Coalition Government and simply rolled out by this Government under a new name. So, they are not 'new projects' are they?
NBII 90	N/A	Written	Nash	So, why the name change?
NBII 91	N/A	Written	Nash	I also notice that the National Building Program (National Land Transport) Amendment Bill 2009 makes a number of changes to funding arrangements that apply to projects funded under the <i>Nation Building Program</i> . For example, the amendment to Section 71 of the <i>AusLink (National Land Transport) Act 2005</i> to make it possible for <i>Black Spot</i> funding to occur for sites on the National Transport Network. Currently of course, that is not the case. What prompted this change?
NBII 92	N/A	Written	Nash	What areas of the National Transport Network will now receive <i>Black Spot</i> funding?
NBII 93	N/A	Written	Nash	How much is the Government allocating to the <i>Black Spot</i> program in 2009-10? In the four years from 2009-10 to 2012-13?

NBII 94	N/A	Written	Nash	Of all the <i>Black Spot</i> funding, how much will now be allocated to the National Transport Network?
NBII 95	N/A	Written	Nash	Will this change result in less money being spent on local roads and street <i>Blacks Spots</i> ?
NBII 96	N/A	Written	Nash	Out of all the <i>Black Spot</i> funding, what percentage is directed to regional Australia?
NBII 97	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you promise that under these amendment that will not change?
NBII 98	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you see more or less <i>Black Spot</i> funding being directed out of regional Australia?
NBII 99	N/A	Written	Nash	Given that the National Transport Network already receives enormous allocations, why subsume black spot funding into this allocation?
NBII 100	N/A	Written	Nash	Do you see that less <i>Black Spot</i> funding will now go to local roads and streets?
NBII 101	N/A	Written	Nash	I also notice that this Bill will enable the Minister to approve <i>AusLink Strategic Regional Projects</i> (now to be termed <i>National Building Program Off Network Projects</i>) for projects which are off the National Land Transport Network and which are not in regional areas of Australia. Is that correct?
NBII 102	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the purpose of the <i>National Building Program Off Network Projects</i> ?
NBII 103	N/A	Written	Nash	How much money has been allocated to what was known as the <i>National Building Program Off Network Projects</i> ? <i>Over 2009-10?</i> <i>Over the four years from 2009-10 to 2012-13?</i>
NBII 104	N/A	Written	Nash	So, is this the end of a highly significant stream of road funding for regional Australia?
NBII 105	N/A	Written	Nash	What prompted this legislative change?
NBII 106	N/A	Written	Nash	How much of this funding will now end up in urban Australia?
NBII 107	N/A	Written	Nash	What are the new criteria that will apply to obtain funding for the <i>National Building Program Off Network Projects</i> ?
NBII 108	N/A	Written	Nash	December 2008 Nation Building Package I refer to the so-called \$4.7 billion <i>Nation Building Package</i> released by the Government on 12 December last year. I notice that it will bring forward \$711 million over 2008-09 and 2009-10 into 14 national road projects already announced under AusLink – or the Nation Building Program. The fourteen projects to which the <i>Nation Building Package</i> refers are the:

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buladelah Bypass (Pacific Highway NSW); • Sextons Hill Section, Banora Point (Pacific Highway NSW); • Tarcutta Bypass (Hume Highway NSW); • Woomargama Bypass (Hume Highway NSW); • Ipswich Motorway Upgrade Dinmore to Goodna (QLD); • Duplication of the Douglas Arterial Road – Townsville (QLD); • Pacific Motorway Transit Project (Section B) – Springwood South to Daisy Hill (QLD); • Goulburn Valley Highway – Nagambie Bypass (VIC); • Princes Highway East – Traralgon to Sale Duplication (VIC); • Western Highway – Anthonys Cutting Realignment (VIC); • Western Ring Road Upgrade and Capacity Improvement (VIC); • Mandurah Entrance Road (WA); • Northern Expressway (SA), and the • Midland Highway – Brighton Bypass (TAS) <p>Could you please explain to the Committee the dispersal of the \$711 million – that is, how much money has been allocated to each project out of the \$711 million?</p>
NBII 109	N/A	Written	Nash	So, to be clear, this money is simply taking money from the out-years and loading it up on the front years. Is that correct?
NBII 110	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I refer to the \$42 billion deficit spend cash-splash, announced by the Government in its <i>February 2009 Updated Economic and Fiscal Outlook</i>. I note that the \$42 billion spend includes \$150 million allocated in 2008-09. I quote from page 70 of the document:</p> <p><i>The Government will provide funding of \$150 million in 2008-09 to repair regional links on the national highway network. In addition to preventing the deterioration of national highways this initiative will create jobs in regional Australia, including areas where jobs are being lost due to a contraction of activity in the mining sector.</i></p> <p>On what projects under AusLink has this money been spent? Can you provide the Committee with the name of each project and how much each project received from the \$150 million?</p>
NBII 111	N/A	Written	Nash	How much of that money has been spent this financial year?
NBII 112	N/A	Written	Nash	Will the monies not spent be rolled over to be spent in the following financial year of 2009-10?

NBII 113	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>F3 to Branxton</p> <p>I refer to the Government's commitment in the recent budget to spend \$1.4 billion over six years towards the construction of 40 kilometres of dual carriageway linking the F3 and the New England highway near Braxton.</p> <p>I notice that, according to the departmental website of Minister Albanese, the Government has allocated \$51 million to pre-construction activities for the F3 to Branxton link. Has that money been spent? What pre-construction activities have occurred?</p>
NBII 114	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I also note that land acquisitions by the NSW Government to reserve the corridor for the F3 to Branxton road link are on hold until the conclusion of the study into the transport needs of the Lower Hunter region.</p> <p>What is the status of this study in light of the budget announcement? Is it complete?</p>
NBII 115	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>What are its conclusions?</p>
NBII 116	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>In light of the budget announcement, have land acquisitions resumed?</p>
NBII 117	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I also notice that according to the Minister's website, and I quote:</p> <p><i>In the last five years, the estimated cost of the F3 to Branxton project has increased from \$382 million (2003 dollars) to \$765 million (2005 dollars) to \$1.2 billion (2007 dollars). The estimate of \$1.2 billion potentially translates to an out-turn cost of \$1.7 billion even if construction were to commence in 2009.</i></p> <p>Given that the Government has committed \$1.4 billion over six years to this project and the cost has blown out to \$1.7 billion, has the Government struck an agreement that NSW will fund the balance?</p>
NBII 118	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>When will that agreement occur?</p>
NBII 119	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Northern Sydney Rail Freight Corridor</p> <p>I refer to the Government's promise made on 19 November 2007 that it would provide \$840 million towards a dedicated freight rail track from North Strathfield to Gosford.</p> <p>I notice on the departmental website for Minister Albanese, that the Federal Government is providing \$15 million to undertake planning for the Northern Sydney Rail Freight Corridor. This planning involves developing a concept design, environmental assessment and development approval for infrastructure improvements along the rail corridor between North Strathfield and Broadmeadow (a suburb of Newcastle). Apparently, the focus of the planning will be on providing additional capacity for freight rail services; segregating passenger and freight services; and reducing peak period restrictions on freight services.</p>

				<p>The planning work will be undertaken by the Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation (TIDC), a NSW Government corporation.</p> <p>When will this planning be completed?</p>
NBII 120	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the Government fulfil its election promise and start building one of the most crucial rail links needed on the east coast?
NBII 121	N/A	Written	Nash	How much will it finally cost? When does the Government propose to spend its election commitment of \$840 million?
NBII 122	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Moorebank Intermodal Facility</p> <p>The Labor Party, in the 2007 election campaign promised to provide \$300 million for a state-of-the-art intermodal freight terminal at Moorebank. Obviously, this is an important project, since it could go a long way to taking trucks off Sydney's roads. Now, I understand this site has been the home of the Defence Department's School of Military Engineering.</p> <p>What progress has been made by the Government to fulfill its election promise to build this important piece of transport infrastructure?</p>
NBII 123	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Port Botany Road and Rail Access</p> <p>The Labor Party also promised during the election campaign that it would provide \$150 million to improve road and rail access for Port Botany road. Another worthwhile project I am sure, but what progress has the Government made in implementing this promise it made on 19 November 2007?</p>
NBII 124	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Northern Missing Link from the Gateway Motorway at Nudgee to the Bruce Highway</p> <p>I notice the promise made by the Labor Party on 13 November 2007 to provide \$125 million to 'get moving now' on the northern missing link from the Gateway motorway at Nudgee in Brisbane to the Bruce highway. Of that \$125 million I understand that, according to the Minister's press release dated 20 August 2008, the Government gave the Queensland Government \$10 million to complete planning on the widening of the Gateway motorway's two missing links by no later than June 2009.</p> <p>How is the planning study going? Will it meet the deadline? When will it be completed?</p>
NBII 125	N/A	Written	Nash	When does the Rudd Government propose to 'get moving now' on the northern missing link? When does it propose to spend the balance of the \$125 million to progress the project?

NBII 126	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the northern missing link from the Gateway motorway at Nudgee to the Bruce highway be built?
NBII 127	N/A	Written	Nash	I further notice that in its press release of 4 October 2007, Labor promised to spend \$125 million for the Gateway northern missing link to the Bruce highway at South Pine river. Now, South Pine river is of course in the seat of Petrie. I am curious then – are these two different promises – that Labor is in fact going to spend \$250 million on the northern missing link – that is \$125 million at Nudgee and \$125 million at South Pine rivers?
NBII 128	N/A	Written	Nash	Perhaps it is the same promise, simply recycled for release in two different seats in the election campaign?
NBII 129	N/A	Written	Nash	Is this correct?
NBII 130	N/A	Written	Nash	Northern Link Tunnel from the Western Freeway to the Inner City Bypass – Brisbane I refer to yet another infrastructure promise made by Labor in the election campaign. This is your commitment to provide \$500 million out of AusLink 2 and 3 for the \$1.5 billion Northern Link Tunnel from the Western Freeway at Toowong in west Brisbane to the Inner City Bypass at Bowen Hills. What planning has the Government undertaken to achieve this project?
NBII 131	N/A	Written	Nash	Has the Government decided how much of this money will come out of AusLink 2 and 3? What will be the respective allocations?
NBII 132	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the project be completed?
NBII 133	N/A	Written	Nash	Townsville Roads I refer to the promise made by Labor in its 5 November 2007 press release, when the then Shadow Minister for Transport, Roads and Tourism, Martin Ferguson pledged that a Rudd Government would spend \$110 million to build four lanes from Vantassel Street to the Flinders Highway, just south of Townsville. Has the Rudd Government fulfilled this promise?
NBII 134	N/A	Written	Nash	When does it intend to do so?
NBII 135	N/A	Written	Nash	What planning has taken place?
NBII 136	N/A	Written	Nash	I also note in this same enthusiastic press release that the Member for Batman also pledged that a Rudd Government would provide \$150 million to upgrade the southern approach to Cairns from Sheehy Road to Ray Jones Drive and \$40 million to raise the southern approaches to Mulgrave River bridge. What progress has the Rudd Government made in fulfilling these promises?

NBII 137	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Warrego Highway</p> <p>I refer to the promise made by the Labor candidate for Maranoa on 21 November 2007 that a Rudd Labor Government would spend \$55 million to upgrade the Warrego highway in southern Queensland. I also note that the newly elected Prime Minister on 7 December 2007 at a doorstep interview with the Minister of Agriculture, when visiting Roma, reaffirmed this promise. I quote from Mr Rudd's statement:</p> <p><i>We are confirming our commitment to invest \$55 million for the upgrade of the Roma to Mitchell highway to ensure that (inaudible) capable of taking type two-road trains comfortably. That is the undertaking we made before the election, that's the undertaking we'll stick to after the election and I'm pleased to be able to confirm that here today.</i></p> <p>So, it is crystal clear. Labor has committed to provide \$55 million to upgrade the Warrego highway.</p> <p>Do you accept that the Government made this promise?</p>
NBII 138	N/A	Written	Nash	If yes, can you tell me when works will finally begin on this section of the highway?
NBII 139	N/A	Written	Nash	Has the funding been allocated to Main Roads Queensland and is it ready for immediate spending?
NBII 140	N/A	Written	Nash	Where do we find provision for this money in the budget? Can an official show me the allocation of \$55 million to fund this promise?
NBII 141	N/A	Written	Nash	Has it been locked into the next round of the so-called <i>Nation Building program</i> – the program that Australia understands is called AusLink?
NBII 142	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Adelaide's South Road</p> <p>I refer to Labor's election promise to spend \$500 million to fix Adelaide's South Road and to create an improved north-south corridor. In a media release by Minister Albanese dated 13 May 2008 the Australian Government committed an initial \$12.6 million for planning the South Road Upgrade.</p> <p>When will the planning process be finished?</p>
NBII 143	N/A	Written	Nash	When will Labor actually commit \$500 million to upgrade the South Road?
NBII 144	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you provide an annual funding breakdown over the forward estimates?
NBII 145	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I notice that in a press release dated 19 February 2009, Minister Albanese reaffirmed the Government's commitment to provide \$500 million, and I quote:</p> <p><i>Between now and 2014 towards the construction of South Road flyovers at the major</i></p>

				<p><i>bottlenecks at Grand Junction Road; Cormack Road and the Wingfield railway line; and Sturt Road.</i></p> <p>This is a lot of money. Can any official show me in this budget the allocation for the \$500 million?</p>
NBII 146	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Why doesn't it appear in this budget if money is committed over the forward estimates? When will it appear in the budget?</p>
NBII 147	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Bruce Highway</p> <p>In the recent Budget, the Labor Government has committed to spend a further \$488 million over four years towards the duplication of a twelve-kilometre section of the Bruce highway between Cooroy to Curra to provide a four-land divided highway. This is on top of the \$200 million the Labor has already promised to the Cooroy to Curra section.</p> <p>Aside from a belated commitment by Labor to finally match the Coalition's promise to provide \$700 million towards the upgrade of the Cooroy to Curra section, I just wish to clarify the dispersal of these funds.</p> <p>According to page 347 of <i>Budget Paper No.2 2009-10</i>, the Government has allocated \$468.3 million of this total in the financial year 2008-09. Is that correct? Now, given that the financial year is nearly over, how much of this money will be spent?</p>
NBII 148	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>If it is not spent, where will this money go? To the Queensland Government account? Can an official make clear to me this process?</p>
NBII 149	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>How much money will be spent on the duplication of this section in the 2009-10 financial year?</p>
NBII 150	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I notice in your answer to a Question on Notice lodged in the February 2009 Additional Budget Estimates, you confirmed the cost of the Cooroy to Curra upgrade to be \$6.3 billion.</p> <p>Can any official explain to me this extraordinary blow out in costs, given previous estimates such as that of the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland in its October 2008 submission to Infrastructure Australia estimated this project would cost \$4 billion?</p>
NBII 151	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Now, if we set aside from the most expensive twelve-kilometre stretch or road around the eastern buffer area of the proposed Traveston crossing dam – a section that will cost at least half a billion dollars – we are left with slightly over 50 kilometres of road duplication in open country.</p> <p>Can anyone explain to me why the remainder of the section should cost in the realm of five and a half billion dollars? This is after all about \$100 million per kilometre?</p>
NBII 152 [Repeated question – see NBII 44-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Just to confirm, the Federal Government has accepted the eastern route for the Bruce Highway between Federal and Traveston road – that is to build the Bruce highway around the dam's potential inundation area. Is this correct?</p>

<p>NBII 153 [Repeated question – see NBII 44-2]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Nash</p>	<p>The final version of the Federal Government’s <i>Bruce Highway (Cooroy to Curra) Strategic Planning Study</i> was released to the public in November 2008. With regard to that report, I refer to the map contained on page seven in its introduction. This map an explanation of the proposed routes of the Bruce highway in the area potentially affected by the proposed Traveston dam. This explanation reads:</p> <p><i>Should the dam not proceed then the location of the highway may change to an alignment close to the existing Bruce highway as originally favoured by the community.</i></p> <p>Given that the report categorically states the route closer to the original highway is favoured by the community, how can the Government assert in its answers to questions on notice, and I refer to NBII 52 and NBII 53, NBII55, NBII 56, that the new route, i.e. the eastern route, is the route ‘favoured by the community’?</p>
<p>NBII 154 [Repeated question – see NBII 44-3]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Nash</p>	<p>Are these answers simply incorrect?</p>
<p>NBII 155 [Repeated question – see NBII 44-4]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Nash</p>	<p>Has the Government lied?</p>
<p>NBII 156 [Repeated question – see NBII 44-5]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Nash</p>	<p>Given that Queensland Premier Anna Bligh has shelved the Traveston Crossing dam for many years, why has the Federal Government ignored two years of community consultation and community wishes in approving the eastern route?</p>
<p>NBII 157 [Repeated questions – see NBII 44-6 and 44-7]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Nash</p>	<p>The Government has advised, in response to a Question on Notice lodged in the February 2009 Additional Budget Estimates that the Federal Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts has not been consulted about the decision to build the eastern route for the Bruce highway around the dam’s potential inundation area. When will he be consulted?</p> <p>I refer to the non-answer this Committee received to its question on notice lodged in the February 2009 Additional Budget Estimates. The question was quite clear. I quote: <i>What advice did the Federal Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government receive from his Department in approving the unpopular eastern route?</i></p>
<p>NBII 158 [Repeated question – see NBII 44-7a]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Nash</p>	<p>Making a bland assertion that eastern alignment was supported by the community is not an answer. It is an untruth. What is the answer?</p>
<p>NBII 159 [Repeated question – see NBII 45-1]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Nash</p>	<p>Given the Federal Government has confirmed the eastern route. Has the Federal Government given its approval for the Traveston Crossing dam?</p>

NBII 160 [Repeated question – see NBII 45-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the cost of the shorter route that closely follows the existing Bruce highway?
NBII 161 [Repeated question – see NBII 45-3]	N/A	Written	Nash	How much extra is the taxpayer picking up as a result of the decision to build the Traveston Crossing dam?
NBII 162 [Repeated question – see NBII 46-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	I understand that the Queensland Government will contribute \$125 million to the duplication of the Bruce highway from Cooroy to Curra. Is that correct?
NBII 163 [Repeated question – see NBII 46-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	How was that contribution calculated?
NBII 164 [Repeated question – see NBII 47-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	I notice that even though the eastern route around the area of potential inundation is longer – the Government claims that cost between this route and the shorter route along the existing site of the Bruce highway – are the same. I refer to your answer to a question on notice lodged by this Committee after the February hearings. I quote question no. NBII 58: <i>Indicative estimates provided by the Queensland Department of Main Roads show that the costs would be similar, subject to delivery and construction schedules.</i> Can anyone explain to me how a longer route can be the same cost as a shorter route? Is the topography that different?
NBII 165 [Repeated question – see NBII 47-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	Do you have the respective cost estimates provided by the Queensland Government?
NBII 166 [Repeated question – see NBII 47-3]	N/A	Written	Nash	Will you provide them to this Committee?
NBII 167 [Repeated question – see NBII 47-4]	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the basis for the answer to question on notice NBII 58?
NBII 168 [Repeated question – see NBII 48-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	Given that the Government has confirmed that this duplication will cost over six billion dollars and given Labor has promised slightly over two billion dollars, has the Queensland Government agreed to make up the four billion dollar shortfall?
NBII 169 [Repeated question – see NBII 48-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	How are negotiations proceeding with the Queensland Government to make up for this funding gap?
NBII 170 [Repeated question – see	N/A	Written	Nash	What funding arrangements regarding the upgrade of the Bruce highway have been established between the Commonwealth and the Queensland Government?

NBII 48-3]				
NBII 171 [Repeated question – see NBII 49-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the expected completion date of duplicating the Bruce highway around the expected site of the Traveston Crossing dam?
NBII 172 [Repeated question – see NBII 49-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	What about duplicating the Bruce Highway from Cooroy to Curra?
NBII 173 [Repeated question – see NBII 50-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	I further notice that elsewhere that Labor promised to spend \$2.2 billion on a better Bruce highway , delivered under Auslink 2 from 2009 to 2014. Now this \$2.2 billion includes the nearly \$700 million on the Cooroy to Curra does it not?
NBII 174 [Repeated question – see NBII 50-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	So, how will Labor spend the balance of this money on the remainder of the Bruce highway?
NBII 175 [Repeated question – see NBII 50-3]	N/A	Written	Nash	On what sections of the Bruce highway?
NBII 176 [Repeated question – see NBII 50-4]	N/A	Written	Nash	When?
NBII 177 [Repeated questions – see NBII 51-1 & 51-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	In the election campaign, Labor in its press release dated 6 November 2007, pledged to spend \$150 million in the Seat of Dawson on the Bruce highway. Well, I would be interested to know as to the success the new Member for Dawson has had in ensuring the delivery of these promises. So, as part of that, Labor promised \$50 million to duplicate the Bruce highway and improve sections on the 3.5 kilometre stretch south of Mackay. How is the implementation of that promise going?
NBII 178 [Repeated question – see NBII 51-3]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will that duplication be complete?
NBII 179 [Repeated question – see NBII 52-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	Labor promised \$50 million to flood-mitigate the Bruce highway north of Brandon. Has that promise been implemented?
NBII 180 [Repeated question – see NBII 52-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will Labor fulfil this promise?

NBI 181 [Repeated question – see NBII 53-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>The Labor Party promised, on 7 November 2007, that it would spend \$100 million to fix a dangerous section of the Bruce highway between Miriam Vale and Gin Gin. Specifically, this would involve fixing a 7.9 kilometre stretch from Cabbage Tree Creek to Carman Road and 3.6 kilometres around Back Creek Range.</p> <p>Has the Rudd Government carried out its promise to fix these sections of the Bruce highway?</p>
NBII 182 [Repeated question – see NBII 53-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will it do so?
NBII 183 [Repeated question – see NBII 54-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	Labor also promised \$20 million for more rest areas on the Bruce highway between Sarina and Childers – north of Brisbane and south of Mackay - in its press release of 6 November 2007. Have they been built yet?
NBII 184 [Repeated question – see NBII 54-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will they be built?
NBII 185 [Repeated question – see NBII 54-3]	N/A	Written	Nash	Will that \$20 million come out of the Government's \$70 million <i>Heavy Vehicle Safety Package</i> ?
NBII 186 [Repeated question – see NBII 55]	N/A	Written	Nash	I note in the same press release Labor promised \$115 million for black spots between Sarina and Childers. Where is the money and where will they be built?
NBII 187 [Repeated question – see NBII 56-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	In fact, Labor made quite a lot of promises in its media release of 6 November 2007. Has the Rudd Government provided the \$65 million it promised on new overtaking lanes between Childers and Sarina?
NBII 188 [Repeated question – see NBII 56-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will Labor fulfil these promises?
NBII 189 [Repeated question – see NBII 57-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	Has the Government spent the \$70 million it promised to widen and strengthen sections of narrow and broken highway between Benarby and Rockhampton and Rockhampton to St. Lawrence?
NBII 190 [Repeated question – see NBII 57-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the Government meet this promise?
NBII 191 [Repeated questions – see NBII 58-1 and NBII 58-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I notice that on 4 November 2007 the Labor Party promised to provide up to \$55 million to upgrade the Bruce highway for the Calliope crossroads near Gladstone.</p> <p>What stage is the Government up to in fulfilling this promise?</p>

NBII 192 [Repeated question – see NBII 59-1]	N/A	Written	Nash	In its media releases of 4 October and 5 November 2008 Labor promised \$40 million to improve flood immunity on the Bruce Highway at Gairloch, north of Ingham. Has Labor fulfilled this promise?
NBII 193 [Repeated question – see NBII 59-2]	N/A	Written	Nash	When will it do so?
NBII 194	N/A	Written	Nash	Peninsula Development Road (North of Cairns) Labor promised on 22 November 2007 that it would provide \$15 million to seal the final 15km of the Peninsula Development Road between Lakeland and Laura and improve five to ten creek crossings north of Laura, in order to provide all-weather access. I notice in the Department website that a construction timetable for the sealing works will be determined when planning is further advanced. Is planning further advanced?
NBII 195	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the sealing works be completed?
NBII 196	N/A	Written	Nash	Geelong Ring Road (Key Marginal Seat of Corangamite) According to its media release of 21 November 2007, Labor promised \$107.5 million to complete the Geelong Ring Road to the Princes highway West near Waurin Ponds. I notice that the departmental website states that: <i>Section 4A of the project involves extending the Geelong Ring Road over the existing Princes highway West and along Anglesea Road, terminating near Hams Road.</i> The website further elaborates and claims; <i>this project is jointly funded with the Australian Government contributing \$62.5 million with the Victorian Government contributing the balance.</i> Is Section 4A of the project the same project as referred to in Labor’s November 2007 media release?
NBII 197	N/A	Written	Nash	<i>If yes</i> , does this mean the Federal Government is not committing the funds to this project it promised – that is – it is providing \$62.5 million rather than \$107.5 million?
NBII 198	N/A	Written	Nash	Can anyone explain this discrepancy?
NBII 199	N/A	Written	Nash	<i>If no</i> , when will the final stage be built? At what cost? What payment arrangements are in place?
NBII 200	N/A	Written	Nash	I am also curious regarding what exactly Labor promised regarding the Princes highway. I refer to a report in the <u>Herald Sun</u> , p.13, dated Thursday 22 November 2007, where the then Shadow Transport Minister Martin Ferguson MP promised \$220 million to turn the Princes highway west from Waurin Ponds to Winchelsea into a dual carriageway of which the Federal Government would fund half.

				Now, is this promise different from Labor's promise, made on 21 November 2007, to provide \$107.5 million to complete the Geelong Ring Road to the Princes Highway near Waurin Ponds?
NBII 201	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I ask this question because obviously we are talking about a different section of road – this involves an additional 38 kilometres of highway from where the Geelong Ring Road intersects the Princes Highway at Waurin Ponds.</p> <p>So, does the Government stand by the promise made by the Member for Batman as reported by the <u>Herald Sun</u> on 22 November 2007 that it would duplicate the Princes highway from Waurin Ponds to Winchelsea?</p>
NBII 202	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the Government meet this commitment?
NBII 203	N/A	Written	Nash	Is the Government aware of a statement made by Mr Gary Liddle, the CEO of VicRoads, to the public accounts and estimates hearings of the Victorian State Parliament on 15 May 2009, that the duplication of the Princes highway from Waurin Ponds to Winchelsea will occur under AusLink 3 – i.e. the round of the so-called Nation Building program that will occur after 2013-14?
NBII 204	N/A	Written	Nash	Does that accord with your understanding – that an election commitment made by Labor in a key Federal Victorian marginal seat in November 2007 was in fact only going to start to be fulfilled seven years into the future?
NBII 205	N/A	Written	Nash	Is that a correct statement?
NBII 206	N/A	Written	Nash	So, I ask again, when will the Government fulfil its election commitment to duplicate the Princes highway from Waurin Ponds to Winchelsea?
NBII 207	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>Western Highway</p> <p>During the election campaign, according to its media release of 21 November 2007, Labor made a commitment to provide \$604 million to upgrade the Western highway from Bacchus Marsh to the South Australian border. Now, this is a perfectly worthwhile aim. What I do notice, however, is that the departmental website only discusses the construction of a four lane dual carriageway along the Western highway between Ballarat and Stawell – not quite to the South Australian border.</p> <p>I also note that the Federal Government provided five million in the 2008-09 Budget to <i>advance project planning</i>. Moreover, according to the departmental website, this planning will not be complete until 2010.</p> <p>So, Labor promised to duplicate the Western highway, but at the moment has only</p>

				provided \$5 million for a planning project to duplicate the highway between Ballarat and Stawell – a distance of 121 kilometres. Is that correct?
NBII 208	N/A	Written	Nash	When will planning commence to duplicate the remainder of the highway? That is, the remaining 181 kilometres?
NBII 209	N/A	Written	Nash	When will Labor fulfil its promise to duplicate the Western highway to the South Australian border?
NBII 210	N/A	Written	Nash	Pacific Highway – including the Banora Point/Sexton’s Hill Upgrade When will the Government duplicate the Pacific highway?
NBII 211	N/A	Written	Nash	Does the Government stand by its election commitment to complete a dual carriageway on the Pacific highway between Sydney to Brisbane by 2016?
NBII 212	N/A	Written	Nash	I am disappointed that the Government has simply ignored my specific Questions on Notice lodged by this Committee at the last hearings in February. Of course, it is no surprise that this Government has ignored its promises of openness. So, let’s try again. I note that the Government has allocated \$2.5 billion under Auslink 2 for the duplication of the Pacific highway. Is the Government aware that according to the National Roads and Motorists Association in its January 2009 budget submission to the Australian Government, that it estimates the cost of the Pacific highway duplication to be \$6.67 billion?
NBII 213	N/A	Written	Nash	Where will the remaining four billion plus dollars come from?
NBII 214	N/A	Written	Nash	Given the financial wreck, that is NSW under its incompetent Labor Government, what confidence does the Government have that NSW will be able to provide its share of the funds to upgrade the Pacific highway by 2016?
NBII 215	N/A	Written	Nash	The Government is no doubt aware that the NSW Government delivered its mini-budget in November last year. In that budget, the bankrupt NSW Labor Government slashed its contribution to Auslink 2. I understand that the NSW Government’s contribution was to be 860 million but now it has been slashed to \$500 million. Is that correct?
NBII 216	N/A	Written	Nash	So, the NSW Government’s contribution to the Pacific highway upgrade has been cut by \$360 million. Is that correct?
NBII 217	N/A	Written	Nash	Will the Australian Government make up the difference?
NBII 218	N/A	Written	Nash	Where does that leave the Government in meeting its election promise of completing the duplication of the Pacific highway by 2016?

NBII 219	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I consider now an important project to upgrade the Pacific highway at Sexton's Hill, Banora Point. I note the commitment by the Government in its so-called <i>Nation Building Stimulus Package</i> in December last year to invest \$210 million to fund this project.</p> <p>Just to be clear about this money, I quote from page 59 of the December 2008 Nation Building paper. The relevant paragraph reads:</p> <p><i>The Australian Government has committed \$210 million to upgrade the works at Banora Point, with \$2 million being accelerated in 2008-09. Additional funding to complete the project is currently being discussed with NSW.</i></p> <p>So, does that mean that between now and 30 June this year the Government is providing the sum of just \$2 million for this much needed project?</p>
NBII 220	N/A	Written	Nash	So, the balance of this amount, \$208 million is to be provided, according to the recent budget, by 2011-12. Is that correct?
NBII 221	N/A	Written	Nash	So, when will the \$208 million be spent?
NBII 222	N/A	Written	Nash	I notice that the Australian Government announced the \$210 million for the Banora Point upgrade in its December <i>Nation Building Package</i> . Now we have the same announcement in the recent budget. So, is this simply a re-announcement of a previously declared commitment?
NBII 223	N/A	Written	Nash	How is it different from what has been announced last December?
NBII 224	N/A	Written	Nash	How much is the project estimated to cost?
NBII 225	N/A	Written	Nash	How much additional funding is to be provided by NSW?
NBII 226	N/A	Written	Nash	<p>I understand that the NSW Government in its mini-budget axed its counterpart funding to the Pacific Highway projects, including Banora Point.</p> <p>In fact, in its mini-budget, delivered by the NSW Government in November 2008, the NSW Government slashed its contribution to the Pacific highway upgrade to \$500 million from \$860 million. Am I correct?</p>
NBII 227	N/A	Written	Nash	So, will the Australian Government make up the shortfall?
NBII 228	N/A	Written	Nash	How are the discussions with the NSW Government proceeding to secure their side of the funds for this project?
NBII 229	N/A	Written	Nash	Is the Government aware that a 2007 NRMA audit of the Pacific highway identified Banora Point as one of the most dangerous sections of the highway – the site of 127 crashes, two fatalities and 61 injuries between 2003 and 2007?
NBII 230	N/A	Written	Nash	Given its appalling safety record, will the Commonwealth pick up the whole tab?
NBII 231	N/A	Written	Nash	In view of the funding delays and since no tangible works have yet been done on the Banora Point upgrade, will the Government reconsider the preferred community option of

				a tunnel being built under Sexton's Hill rather than the visually-intrusive viaduct?
NBII 232	N/A	Written	Nash	When will the project be completed?
NBII 233	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the status of the Auslink/Nation Building agreements with the NSW Government, given its decision to slash its contribution to this program?
NBII 234	N/A	Written	Nash	Is the decision by the Australian Government to fund the Kempsey bypass in NSW by 2014 an acknowledgement that the incompetent NSW Labor Government is simply unable to meet its responsibilities to the Pacific highway?
NBII 235	N/A	Written	Nash	The Australian Government is tipping in \$618 million. Is that right?
NBII 236	N/A	Written	Nash	In what years will that money be spent?
NBII 237	N/A	Written	Nash	What will be the total cost of the Kempsey bypass?
NBII 238	N/A	Written	Nash	Is the NSW Government contributing the difference?
NBII 239	N/A	Written	Nash	What is the total cost to duplicate the Pacific highway?
NBII 240	N/A	Written	Nash	The Australian Government is contributing \$2.45 billion to upgrade the Pacific highway according to a response to a question on notice we asked last February. The budget media release of the Minister says \$3.1 billion. Which figure is correct? By which year?
NBII 241	N/A	Written	Nash	Has the Australian Government negotiated an agreement with NSW to fund the difference in cost to duplicate the Pacific Highway? Yes or no?
NBII 242	N/A	Written	Nash	I refer to \$150 million commitment to duplicate the Princes highway between Sale and Traralgon. Can you provide an update on the project?
NBII 243	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you explain the rationale for deciding which sections will be duplicated first – how have the priorities been arrived at?
NBII 244	N/A	Written	Nash	As I understand the total Federal commitment at this stage is \$150 million – what is the State Government contributing?
NBII 245	N/A	Written	Nash	Given we are talking about approximately 50 kilometres of road – of which some sections already have extensive passing lanes – how much work will get done with the money provided? Is the current funding commitment from State and Federal sources enough to duplicate the entire length of road between Sale and Traralgon?
NTS 01	27/05/09	148	Nash	Senator NASH —I actually had quite a few for the National Transport Strategy, but I will put those on notice. But I have one, if I can put it on notice quickly now, for you to take with you. There was some discussion at the last estimates about the Transport Commission investigating methods of payment to the heavy vehicle drivers and options to implement a payment system that encourages safe work practices, and I think from that there was some

				<p>discussion around the Whole-of-Government approach, there were to be some discussions, I think, between the three Ministers at that time, and indeed I think there were discussions to take place about a week after the last estimates. Perhaps if you could come back to the Committee with where that is now up to, and the others I will place on notice.</p> <p>Ms Riggs—We will be happy to take that on notice too.</p> <p>Senator NASH—All right. Thanks.</p>
NTS 02	N/A	Written	Williams	Which groups were consulted for the decision to establish the Single National Regulator for Heavy Vehicles?
NTS 03	N/A	Written	Williams	What will the composition of the National Regulator be?
NTS 04	N/A	Written	Williams	What will the cost be to establish this body?
NTS 05	N/A	Written	Williams	Is it introduced by regulation or legislation?
ONA 01	28/05/09	138	Macdonald	<p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—Again, I suppose the same answer will apply to the funding for the Northern Australian Land and Water Taskforce? There is no separate line item? You can tell me what it was last year, but not for the current year until you have done your budgets?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—That is right.</p> <p>Senator IAN MACDONALD—On notice, can we get details of the expenses of travel and accommodation for the task force?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Certainly. We will provide that on notice.</p>
ONA 02	28/05/09	142	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Are you funding bringing Ord 1 into compliance with the National Water Initiative—because at the present time, if you did in New South Wales what they do up there then, we would put you in jail?</p> <p>Ms Foster—The issues to do with the Ord 2 are the purview of the Western Australian Government.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Der! But we are funding it to half the extent, with \$195 million.</p> <p>Ms Foster—No.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—What are we doing with that? Is that fantasy money or something?</p> <p>Mr Angley—This is for social and economic infrastructure that will be accessible to the whole community.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Yes, obviously. We had that argument ages ago.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—You are asking a genuinely detailed question—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Yes, I am.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—and we are happy to take it on notice and come back to you with an update on that information.</p>

ONA 03	28/05/09	143	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Do we know whether they are going to include the lighter soils in Ord 2?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I am sure that the officers—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—What is the point of coming to estimates if we cannot get answers?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—If you are going to ask a detailed question like that, Senator Heffernan—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—No, but this is—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—If there is any information available, we are happy to give it to you.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—They have to report at the end of the year. They are not going to report anything, because I am aware of what is going on in the system—'no can do any more'.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take that on notice.</p>
ONA 04	28/05/09	142	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Do I just give up, do I? Have we made some contingency arrangements for the drainage down the Keep River? Do you know that?</p> <p>Mr Angley—The Western Australian Government is still finalising the details of the expansion of the irrigation side of it. The Commonwealth has offered its funding to build the social infrastructure in the region.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Yes, I know all that.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will take that on notice, Senator Heffernan.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Can we get some people who know the answers along at some stage? That would be better. It is patently obvious that if you are going to do Ord 2 of 14,000 hectares and you intend to maximise the whole scheme to 80,000 hectares—which includes the lighter soils which were excluded under the tender document for Ord stage 2, which was scrapped because it was a con job—and if you have not made the contingency for the lighter soils as you go, as you obviously have not because it is still at 14,000 hectares, and if you have not made the contingency for the channel sizes and the capacity of the system to also supply Ord 3 down the same supply line, and if you do not know what you are going to do about Ord 3 because you do not know what you are going to do about the lead mine, then this is all a farce. Do you know what I am talking about?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—I think that is a rhetorical question.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—It is not, mate. I know—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We have said we will get you the information you have asked on notice, Senator Heffernan.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Do you understand these issues?</p> <p>Mr Angley—I certainly do.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Do you know what I am talking about?</p>

				<p>Mr Angley—Yes.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—So do you know what they are doing about it?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We said we would take it on notice.</p> <p>Mr Angley—I said to you that the Western Australian Government is finalising its details on the expansion of the irrigation infrastructure and the way they are going to expand the extra 14,000 hectares.</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We said we would take it on notice.</p> <p>CHAIR—He did. He has said that on a number of occasions.</p>
ONA 05	28/05/09	144	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—They have to report by the end of the year, for God’s sake. They have closed down Land and Water, who were assembling the silos of knowledge. Have you a mission statement?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—They have indicated that they have not finalised—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Can we see your mission statement? Do you have a mission statement?</p> <p>Mr Angley—What for?</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—The purpose of the task force these days, because it has altered its purpose.</p> <p>Mr Angley—We certainly have the terms of reference, and there is a work plan—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We will make them available to you.</p>
ONA 06	28/05/09	144	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I am not too sure what the purpose of the task force is, given that they have gutted your budget etcetera and they have filled it with bureaucrats and the already existing infrastructure of the northern development officers who are up there and retitled them. That is fair enough; that is the prerogative of government. But is it the intention of your mob to look at the potential for infrastructure development in the north which value-adds to the development downstream of the minerals, the gas opportunities, the tourism opportunities and the agricultural opportunities? Is that in your terms of reference?</p> <p>Mr Angley—Yes, it is.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Can you tell us where you are up to with that?</p> <p>Mr Angley—The task force has met a couple of times and agreed on a work plan for the things it wants to—</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Can you give us a work plan?</p> <p>Mr Angley—I can certainly tell you what they have asked the CSIRO to do and the task force to invest in. Mr Tongue—We are happy to take that detail on notice and provide it to you.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—I think I had better—</p>

ONA 07	28/05/09	145	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Do you know if there have been active discussions by your mob, because that is what we were doing, with the Northern Territory government on the sovereign issues surrounding the Ord scheme to take it into the third of the potential of the scheme which is in the Northern Territory? Have you had those sovereign discussions?</p> <p>Senator Conroy—We have said we will take that on notice.</p>
OTS 01	28/05/09	14	Heffernan	<p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Is it correct that 80 per cent of Australia's domestic air cargo is carried on passenger aircraft?</p> <p>Mr Retter—That is correct.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—How much cargo—that is, in terms of tonnes or items of weight?</p> <p>Mr Retter—Senator, your question was how many tonnes by weight?</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—Yes.</p> <p>Mr Retter—I cannot give you that answer. I will have to take it on notice and check.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—In terms of the loaded plane, would the freight be more than the passengers?</p> <p>Mr Retter—I do not know. I will have to take that on notice.</p>
OTS 02	28/05/09	16	Back	<p>Senator BACK—I just want to draw attention to the checked baggage screening initiative for regional domestic airports that was announced in the 2007-08 Budget. Since the introduction of that program in December 2007, how many checks have been conducted on checked luggage at those regional airports?</p> <p>Mr Retter—I will have to take on notice the precise number. What I can say to you is that each of the airports that have been required to introduce checked bag screening has been visited numerous times by my staff to check that those systems are operating. Where we have found irregularities or issues that needed to be addressed they have been taken up with the operators of that equipment at each of the airports.</p> <p>Senator BACK—I would appreciate those numbers and percentages.</p>
OTS 03	28/05/09	16-17	Back	<p>Senator BACK—I am interested as to how you might be able to explain the incident in March of this year, when a young fellow carried a number of weapons, including a revolver and a pistol. I think he commenced his journey in Karratha and went to Perth and then on to Cairns, where I think he was detected. Can you give us some information on that particular exercise—what happened and where it might have fallen apart?</p> <p>Mr Retter—The issue here is that the nature of the screening that is conducted on checked baggage is designed to detect explosives. What was being carried in that checked baggage was, as it now appears—and I understand the individual has been charged and found guilty—a number of weapons and ammunition. The fact that the individual who was on that aircraft had no access to those weapons is one of the mitigation measures which means that we are able to focus on the real threat to checked baggage from a security perspective,</p>

				<p>which is the issue of explosives. Indeed, the X-ray machines are designed to alarm when they detect potential explosive components or actual explosives. They are not designed to alarm for, nor do the regulations require that operators report when they detect—if they detect—weapons or any other contraband in those bags. Having said that, from time to time where they are detected those matters are brought to police attention at those airports. As I understand it, the laws that would have been broken in this particular case related to dangerous goods laws and, indeed, other laws pertaining to the movement of weapons from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.</p> <p>Senator BACK—I wonder if you could tell us, then, how they were detected at Cairns. Presumably he picked up his checked bags having got off the plane and was walking out of the terminal, was he?</p> <p>Mr Retter—I am not aware of the precise circumstances in terms of how he was picked up at Cairns Airport, other than perhaps he was to go on another flight somewhere from Cairns and they were actually picked up as part of the baggage-screening process at that airport.</p> <p>Senator BACK—I would be interested to learn if that is the case.</p>
OTS 04	28/05/09	17	Back	<p>Senator BACK—...Are you aware of how many checks under the baggage-screening initiative have been undertaken in Karratha since the program started? Is that information that would be available to us?</p> <p>Mr Retter—We do not collect information on the number of bags, but we can check to see whether that information is available.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Thank you.</p>
OTS 05	28/05/09	20	Bushby	<p>Senator BUSHBY—I have a couple of questions about the security at Hobart airport, particularly in respect of freight. Are you able to tell me how many of the staff at the Hobart airport who deal with air freight have the proper regulated air cargo agent training?</p> <p>Mr Retter—I will have to take that on notice. I do not have that information at hand.</p> <p>Mr Retter—Are you talking about a lack of security in relation to air cargo?</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—Yes.</p> <p>Mr Retter—I am not aware of those incidents. I would be happy to speak to you separately and get that advice and go and chase it up.</p> <p>Senator BUSHBY—Thank you.....</p>
OTS 06	28/05/09	22	Back	<p>Senator BACK—I want to return to maritime security and particularly the identification cards. Some questions were asked earlier. I want to come back to the point that if the Attorney-General determined that an applicant was ineligible for a marine security identification card, the applicant can apply to the Secretary of the Department of Infrastructure to exercise their discretion to overturn that decision. What role, if any, does your office play in advising the Secretary on what might be appropriate action to take in that event?</p>

			<p>Mr Retter—It is correct that when an individual, <i>prima facie</i>, has been refused an MSIC as a result of a background check invariably that is due to them having committed an offence which is a prescribed offence in accordance with the <i>Maritime Transport and Offshore Facilities Security Act</i>. In terms of what we consider on behalf of the Secretary as to whether or not we subsequently agree to provide a card to that individual, we look at the nature of the offence the person was convicted of; the length of the term of the imprisonment imposed upon him or her and, if she or he has served a term or part of a term, how long it is; and his or her conduct and employment history since that sentence was imposed. In the case of where a sentence has been suspended, we also look at how long the sentence was and their conduct subsequent to that period. We also canvass any other information that is provided either by the applicant in terms of the background to the issues that related to the offence and indeed their current employment.</p> <p>Senator BACK—Can you tell us or perhaps take on notice, on an annual basis over the last four to five years, how many applicants may have appealed that decision to the secretary and how many have actually successfully appealed that decision to the Secretary?</p> <p>Mr Retter—There were the 39 which were approved unconditionally—that is, a delegate at the assistant secretary level made that determination.</p> <p>Senator BACK—This is in the last financial year?</p> <p>Mr Retter—Sorry, I will have to give you that on notice because, whilst I have some broad figures here, I am sure that they do not relate to the last financial year. They are probably since the scheme was put in place. I can give you those figures in lieu if you wish, or would you prefer—</p> <p>Senator BACK—If you could give me those figures, and I also would prefer the breakdown if you can. You were saying 39 have been approved.</p>
OTS 07	28/05/09	42	<p>Heffernan</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—There have been some issues raised about the security of aviation staff, pilots, when they come to Sydney airport. Some pilots have secure car parks and some pilots—</p> <p>Senator Conroy—How is that relevant to Senate Estimates?</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—It is very much relevant to airport security. With great respect, there are often sensitive documents, swipe cards, all sorts of things in people’s possession. Could you, not necessarily in the context of this, let us know the arrangements regarding secure parking for the captain of a 747 or whatever?</p> <p>Mr Tongue—It is not an issue covered in the transport security programs that I am aware of that we regulate. I am happy to take it on notice.</p> <p>Senator HEFFERNAN—It is an issue. There is an incident to back it up. A car was broken into in the public car park. Some airlines make provisions for security for their staff.</p> <p>Mr Tongue—Most airlines make provision for security, but I will see what I can find out</p>

				for you, Senator.
<p>OTS 08 [Sub-questions Nos. 3, 5 & 8 transferred to A-Gs Department]</p>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<p>Sydney Airport Security Incident – Sunday, 22 March 2009</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How much money does the Government spend on airport security, and specifically how much is spent at Sydney airport since July 2008? 2. I don't want to compromise any legal investigations and I don't want to make any assertions but can you update the Committee of where the Department and the Minister is up to with improving the security at Sydney airport? 3. I understand the police is preparing a report, is this the AFP or the NSW Police. 4. I assume the Department has seen the footage of the incident, I understand the altercation lasted for 15 minutes and in view of security officers and security cameras, when will the Department be delivering its own report to the Minister? (How can 20 men enter the airport, bash a man to death and then get away in a taxi and security did not stop them?) 5. I understand until Sydney Airport was privatised, the AFP were in charge, so why is it the responsibility of the NSW State police? Can you clarify who is in charge of security at Sydney airport? What is the role of the AFP now Sydney airport is privatised? 6. How many private security officers are employed at Sydney airport? I'd appreciate a breakdown of private security officers of all major airports at well (take this on notice). 7. What training do these private security officers have? Which Department vets them? 8. I understand that private security officers are not able to contact their Federal Police counterparts (AFP) directly but must radio their head office (wherever that is located?) which in turn notifies the police? What a disgrace, this is a serious, and an appalling situation.
<p>OTS 09 [Sub-questions numbers 1-7 transferred to A-Gs Department]</p>	N/A	Written	Heffernan	<p>Air Security Officer Program</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Air Security Officers, colloquially known as 'sky marshals' have been providing a security presence on selected Australian domestic flights since 2001 and two years later, according to page 34 of the Australian Federal Police July 2008 edition of their quarterly magazine, "Platypus", on selected international flights. Is that correct? 2. They are armed and are essentially there to deal with hijackings. Is that correct? 3. I understand that in the 2008 -09 Budget, the Government allocated \$8.4 million to continue funding for the Air Security Officer program. 4. I note that in spite of this funding, and in spite of the <i>Aviation Legislation Amendment (2008 Measures No.1) Bill 2008</i> that was passed last year to clarify the powers of sky marshals to lawfully discharge firearms, there have been persistent reports that the Government is cutting this essential security initiative.

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Is the Government committed to preserving the Air Security Officers program? 6. Does the Government accept comments reported in the media allegedly made by Human Services Minister Senator Joe Ludwig early last year (Herald Sun 15/02/08) that the numbers of sky marshals were to be cut by one third on a number of international flights? Does the Government agree with his comments? 7. What cuts has the Government made to the Air Security Officer program? On what basis has this decision been made? Is it based on a security assessment or purely as a budgetary measure? 8. I refer to the Aviation Security Screening Review. I understand this is a review of the screening system we have in our airports. It is looking at things like national inconsistencies, passenger experience of screening, retention and training of security personal, technological changes and challenges. Is this correct? 9. I note that the Minster, in June 2008, announced the formation of an External Advisory Group to assist this review. Is this when the review started? When did it start? How many submissions have been received? 10. The Minister's media release of 4 June 2008 stated that the review will be finished in December last year. Has it been finished? Has the report been drafted? Has the Minister considered its recommendations? 11. I note that the United States proposes to introduce 100 per cent screening of cargo transported on passenger planes by 2010. Is this correct? 12. Is it correct that 80 % of Australian domestic air cargo is carried on passenger aircraft? How much cargo is that, in terms of tonnes, items of weight? Do you have any idea? How much is screened? How much air cargo carried by Australian domestic aircraft is not screened? 13. Does the Government propose to implement the same policy as the US regarding air cargo security screening by 2010? 14. How much would such a policy cost? Has the Department done any costing should such a policy occur? Who will pay for it? 15. What sort of regulatory anomalies and national inconsistencies has the Screening Review uncovered in Australia's approach to security screening? 16. Are their jurisdictional inconsistencies that cause inefficiencies in Australia's screening processes? What are they? 17. Are their different approaches to security screening adopted by our major capital city airports, to take an example? 18. How many security staff are employed in screening operations in Australia? The current economic crisis aside, if the long-term growth in passenger numbers do average four percent a year to 2025, as stated in the Government's National Aviation |
|--|--|--|--|

				Policy Green Paper, will there be a shortfall in security screening personal? 19. What is being done to meet the recruitment and training challenges in aviation security personal, so that Australia will have sufficient numbers of aviation security staff to meet this increase in projected demand?
OTS 10	N/A	Written	Nash	Maritime Security Identification Cards (MSICs) I refer to media reports over the last few months raising concerns about links between bikie gangs and Australia's ports, what is the Department's response to these concerns in light of the risk they post to Australian maritime and aviation security?
OTS 11	N/A	Written	Nash	What scope (if any) does the legislation provide for deeming applicants with known links to bikie gangs as ineligible for an MSIC and therefore preclude them from our maritime security zones?
OTS 12	N/A	Written	Nash	So, applicants with known links to bikie gangs would not be precluded from obtaining an MSIC?
OTS13	N/A	Written	Nash	What scope does the Department have for advising issuing bodies of the suitability of applicants for MSICs that whilst not having an adverse criminal record, would not meet community expectations of those eligible to our sensitive maritime security zones?
OTS 14	N/A	Written	Nash	I understand that if AusCheck within the Attorney-General's Department deems an applicant as ineligible for an MSIC, they may apply to the Secretary of the Department of Infrastructure to exercise their discretion to overturn this decision. What role does the Office of Transport Security play in advising the Secretary on what action is appropriate?
OTS 15	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you give a breakdown by year of how many applicants have appealed their decision to the Secretary of the Department?
OTS 16	N/A	Written	Nash	Can you give a breakdown by year of how many applicants have <u>successfully</u> appealed their decision to the Secretary of the Department?
OTS 17	N/A	Written	Nash	I understand that MSIC are required to be worn at all times whilst in the relevant maritime security zone. Is this correct?
OTS 18	N/A	Written	Nash	I understand that MSIC holders are checked at the entrance to the maritime security zone to ensure they are legitimately allowed to be unaccompanied on the port or other zone. Is this correct?
OTS 19	N/A	Written	Nash	Who undertakes these checks?
OTS 20	N/A	Written	Nash	Who is responsible for ensuring that MSICs are displayed whilst on the wharf?
OTS 21	N/A	Written	Nash	Are spot checks undertaken to ensure that all people in the maritime security zone have MSICs displayed?
OTS 22	N/A	Written	Nash	How many spot checks have been undertaken in the past 12 months?

OTS 23	N/A	Written	Nash	How many Office of Transport Security employees are based in maritime security zones?
OTS 24	N/A	Written	Nash	Can the Department provide a breakdown of the number of staff per maritime security zone?
OTS 25	N/A	Written	Nash	Are MSIC holders obliged to let their issuing body know if they have been convicted of a maritime security-related offence?
OTS 26	N/A	Written	Nash	Are Aviation Security Identification Card (ASIC) holders obliged to let their Issuing Body know if they have been convicted of an aviation security relevant offence?
OTS 27	N/A	Written	Nash	Is this difference a legislative requirement or a differing interpretation of the Acts?
OTS 28	N/A	Written	Nash	So, essentially a more open and rigorous process is implemented in aviation security zones when compared to our maritime security zones which cover Australia's ports as well as on and offshore oil and gas facilities?
OTS 29	N/A	Written	Nash	Baggage Screening at Regional Airports I refer to the Checked Baggage Screening initiative for regional domestic airports announced in the 2007-2008 budget, since the introduction of this programme on 1 December 2007 how many checks have been conducted (both numerically and by percentage of checked luggage)?
OTS 30	N/A	Written	Nash	How many regional airports are covered by this programme? (Both numerically and by percentage of regional airports)?
OTS 31	N/A	Written	Nash	Can the Department explain how in March 2009 a boy was able to carry a number of weapons including a revolver and pistol on a flight from Karratha to Perth and then on to Cairns before being detected in Queensland?
OTS 32	N/A	Written	Nash	How many checks under the Checked Baggage Screening initiative have been undertaken at Karratha airport since 1 December 2007?
OTS 33	N/A	Written	Nash	How many OTS employees or sub-contractors are on hand to undertake these checks at Karratha airport?
OTS 34	N/A	Written	Nash	Screening at Airports I understand that the Office of Transport Security is responsible for overseeing the conduct of passenger screening at international airports prior to boarding. Is that correct?
OTS 35	N/A	Written	Nash	As part of this system passenger's cabin baggage is x-rayed and liquids, aerosols and gels over the specified size are identified and removed and they pass through a metal detector. Is that correct?
OTS 36	N/A	Written	Nash	Have any events occurred in the last 12 months that have prevented screening of passengers from taking place? If so, give details.
OTS 37	N/A	Written	Nash	Were any of these faults as a result of equipment or user-error? If so, give details.
OTS 38	N/A	Written	Nash	Have any events occurred in the last 12 months that have resulted in passengers being re-screened after they have entered the departures lounge? If so, give details.

OTS 39	N/A	Written	Nash	How many passengers were affected?
OTS 40	N/A	Written	Nash	Were any of these faults as a result of equipment or user error? If so, give details.
OTS 41	N/A	Written	Nash	What happens with the liquids, aerosols and gels that are confiscated from passengers prior to departure?
OTS 42	N/A	Written	Nash	Specifically, how are they disposed of?
OTS 43	N/A	Written	Nash	Where are they disposed of?
OTS 38	N/A	Written	Nash	Have any events occurred in the last 12 months that have resulted in passengers being re-screened after they have entered the departures lounge? If so, give details.
OTS 39	N/A	Written	Nash	How many passengers were affected?
OTS 40	N/A	Written	Nash	Were any of these faults as a result of equipment or user error? If so, give details.
OTS 41	N/A	Written	Nash	What happens with the liquids, aerosols and gels that are confiscated from passengers prior to departure?
OTS 42	N/A	Written	Nash	Specifically, how are they disposed of?
OTS 43	N/A	Written	Nash	Where are they disposed of?
OTS 54	N/A	Written	Nash	I understand that OTS conducted 1,149 targeted inspections of foreign-flagged ships based on security compliance checks conducted on 12,084 foreign-regulated ships seeking entry into Australian waters in 2007-2008. What percentage of ships entering into Australian waters does the 12,084 represent?
OTS 55	N/A	Written	Nash	Of the 1,149 targeted inspections, on how many occasions was further action required? And why?
OTS 56 [Sub-questions numbers 1-4 transferred to DOHA]	N/A	Written	Heffernan	AQIS installed thermal imaging scanners at airports to scan for swine flu from incoming passengers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many scanners have been purchased or did we have these in stock? 2. How much are these scanners? 3. Which departmental budget is picking up the tab for the scanners, is it DAFF (AQIS), DITRDLG, Sydney airport, 4. How accurate are these scanners? 5. I understand a QANTAS cleaner was threatened with sacking for refusing to go on board a plane carrying a passenger with possible swine flu (see media release dated 1 May 2009) – please elaborate.

<p>OTS 57 [Sub-questions numbers 2-6 transferred to A-Gs Department]</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Heffernan</p>	<p>Sydney Airport Incident on 22 March 2009</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On Sunday 22 March 2009, a man was publicly bashed to death at Sydney airport in front of horrified passengers and airport staff. At no time did security intervene to stop this event from happening, what is the Office of Transport Security doing to ensure that this does not happen again? 2. The public murder on Sunday 22 March made a mockery of our airport's security. How many Federal police and airport security guards were on hand at Sydney's domestic airport at the time of the bashing death? Was this number in line with appropriate regulations – if so, will numbers of security be increased to avoid a repeat of this? If not – why was there a shortfall? 3. How many Australian Federal Police (AFP) are required to patrol Sydney's domestic and international terminals at any one time? How many airport security guards, combined with Federal police are on duty at any particular time? In light of this killing, do you think this is enough? 4. Which types of weapons are typically carried by airport security guards and which types of weapons are carried by Federal police? Are the current weapons adequate? 5. In light of the failure at Sydney airport in March, do you believe that if there was a coordinated terrorist attack at one of our major airports, that current security arrangements would be able to deal with this problem? 6. Current airport security arrangements are clearly inadequate if a group of bikies can be allowed to bash a man to death in the middle of a terminal. Will the Government commit to more Federal police at airports with more resources to meet this threat?
<p>OTS 58</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Written</p>	<p>Heffernan</p>	<p>The <i>Aviation Green Paper</i> flags that the Government is considering a central screening authority to run screening operations in Australia's airports.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the views on such an approach by stakeholders in the aviation sector? 2. What would be its cost? 3. Would it be funded by further levies on industry?