

Question 1

1.The CHAIR: Last November a major rain event on the site caused sediment material and other debris to flow into nearby waterways and creeks that are vital for local fauna and flora. Why was that allowed to happen and what steps are you taking to make sure that does not happen again?

Mr REGAN: I would have to take on notice the specific details of what has happened in that event.

The CHAIR: Are you aware of that situation, Minister Toole?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: No. It is before my time as Minister. I am not aware of it, but we will take it on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Transport for NSW takes its commitment to minimising impact on the local environment very seriously.

Prior to the major rain event on 28 November 2018, the contractor completed inspections to ensure that the erosion and sediment controls were installed in accordance with best practice guidelines. The rain event saw 140mm fall over a 24 hour period.

Following the storm, the erosion and sediment controls were inspected and repaired where needed.

The NSW Environmental Protection Authority was notified of the event.

Question 2

2.The CHAIR: Thank you. The area is home to the foraging habitats of two critically endangered birds, the regent honeyeater and the swift parrot. Again, has the Government taken any steps to ensure the protection of those species?

Mr REGAN: Again, I am happy to come back with the specific details. We are, as far as I am aware, undertaking all of the requirements that were in the planning conditions. But I am happy to take on notice the specific details around those two birds.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Potential impacts to threatened species have been assessed by TfNSW in accordance with relevant NSW and Commonwealth legislative requirements, including Reviews of Environmental Factors and Species Impact Statements.

To minimise the environmental impact, a number of mitigation measures covering the construction and operation of the facility have been identified in the:

- Reviews of Environmental Factors and Species Impact Statements
- Conditions of Approval issued under respective Commonwealth and NSW legislation
- Conservation Management Plan for the Mahony's Toadlet and Wallum Froglet.

Question 3

3.The CHAIR: Okay. But do you believe that that Kangy Angy site was the most direct spot for all of those trains on the different lines?

Mr STAPLES: There are a range of factors that you have to take into account of the site location itself in terms of the size of the site, the topography of the site and then also the operational considerations as we rotate trains through an operational pattern. Mr Allaway would certainly be able to talk more about this.

The CHAIR: Are you able to provide on notice some information as to why the Kangy Angy option was chosen?

Mr STAPLES: I am happy to take on notice to provide some more background on absolutely the selection process for that site.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

This information is available on the Transport for NSW website, in the New Intercity Fleet Maintenance Facility Project Review of Environmental Factors document.

Question 4

4.The CHAIR: That would be really useful and maybe then we can pick it up again in supplementary hearings, if indeed we have them—pre-empting slightly! Coming back to the Intercity fleet, \$2.3 billion does not include the Kangy Angy site. It also does not include that new train order, does it? There was an additional amount.

Mr STAPLES: Yes, there was an additional amount, which Mr Regan may be able to speak to. I will have to take the cost of the Kangy Angy site on notice but we did make some additional orders last year, which Mr Regan can talk to.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The \$2.3 billion does not include the Kangy Angy maintenance facility nor the additional 42 carriages.

In August 2016, a \$2.3 billion contract for the new fleet of intercity trains was awarded to RailConnect to design, build and maintain the new fleet for 15 years.

In February 2019, RailConnect was contracted to build and maintain an additional 42 carriages, increasing the contract value to \$2.43 billion. This includes the cost of 554 carriages and maintenance for the first 15 years.

The contract with John Holland to design and built the New Intercity Fleet maintenance facility at Kangy Angy is available on the NSW Government eTenders website.

Question 5

5.The CHAIR: Okay. That took it to \$2.43 billion, I understand, without taking into account the maintenance facility?

Mr REGAN: My apologies: It is an additional 42 carriages, not 142.

The CHAIR: Yes. It took it to \$2.43 billion. Is that right?

Mr REGAN: I believe that that number is correct but I will take it on notice to confirm.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Yes.

Question 6

6.The CHAIR: Last year the New South Wales Auditor-General warned that the total cost could rise to as much as \$3.9 billion. Are you aware of any increase in the cost for the project since that \$2.43 billion estimate?

Mr REGAN: Certainly I am not aware of that number and the forecasts that we are currently working to are not consistent with that, no.

Mr STAPLES: I am sorry, could you reference which document you are quoting that from?

The CHAIR: I am actually looking at a news report from 18 August 2016 from The Sydney Morning Herald saying that the New South Wales Auditor-General has warned that the total cost of the project, including the new maintenance facility, would rise to as much as \$3.9 billion. At the time, Minister Constance had said that he did not think it would come to \$3.9 billion but did not deny there could be a blowout. Are you aware of any blowout in costs on the Intercity fleet?

Mr STAPLES: No, but we are happy to take it on notice and update on the project costs, if that is what you are looking for.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The \$2.43 billion is the total value of the contract with RailConnect, to build and maintain the trains for 15 years. I refer you to the answer to Question 4 for further information.

The project overall remains within its total budget.

Question 7

7.The CHAIR: I do not think you touched on the Armidale to Tenterfield line or the Casino to Murwillumbah line. Have you got any?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: I do not have anything on them here today, unless Mr Allaway has any information on those particular lines, otherwise we would have to take it on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

There are no plans to reinstate rail services to the north of Armidale, however the government would consider proposals to do so should a sound business case be presented.

In regard to rail services north of Casino, a study has found that a quality bus network would provide people with frequent, cost-effective public transport rather than a reinstated rail line. In 2014 the NSW Government released the Northern Rivers Regional Transport Plan to improve services and create better public transport connections for Northern Rivers customers. As part of this plan, the government has delivered 24 additional Friday and Saturday night Byron Bay bus services, 125 extra bus services connecting Ballina and Byron Bay to Brunswick Heads and Mullumbimby, and 214 extra bus services in Lismore.

Question 8

8.The CHAIR: Are there any plans to fix the transport connections into Byron?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: I am not aware of that. For that regional document I would have to take that question on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Future Transport 2056 Regional NSW Services and Infrastructure Plan identifies Lismore as a hub of the North Coast providing essential services and facilities to neighbouring towns such as Byron Bay, Lennox Head and Ballina. A number of initiatives were identified in the plan to improve connectivity for all customers on the North Coast - local communities and business, the freight industry and the tourism sector.

Specifically the NSW Government has committed to roll out improved local services within key regional cities and for their surrounding catchment area. Work is due to commence in Lismore during 2020 and will seek input from a range of local stakeholders.

In the meantime in response to consultation during the development of Future Transport 2056, an express bus service trial was introduced connecting the hub of Lismore to Byron Bay via Lennox Head and Ballina. The service connected health facilities and a major regional hospital, the university and other services in Lismore and aimed to provide an alternative to car travel, enabling customers to get to Lismore before 9am and return home after 5pm. Transport for NSW has recently

approved funding for the Byron to Lismore Express service to be provided under contract on a permanent basis.

Question 9

9.The CHAIR: Minister, the New South Wales Government has committed to zero emissions by 2050. Transport accounts for around 20 per cent of all greenhouse gas emissions. What are you doing to achieve net zero emissions in regional transport by that date?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: I might ask Mr Allaway if he can answer that question in relation to that particular target.

Mr ALLAWAY: What I can say around the particular target is there are a number of different initiatives that take place across regional to reduce the emission levels. From my own position for an operator if you take the new regional fleet, how that is driving, although it is diesel, is actually more efficient in the way in which it is undertaking what it does. I am conscious that on many of our stations at the moment there is a program across Transport for NSW that is looking at things like electric charging points as well across the network.

The CHAIR: But is there a plan in place? If we know that we need zero emissions by 2050, Transport is a large part of that. Where is the plan that has the goals, the targets and how we are going to get there?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: We will take it on notice and provide a response back to you.

The CHAIR: So there is not a plan?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: There is but I will take on notice to get the right information.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Future Transport 2056 outlines the Government's commitment to develop a resilient transport system that contributes to the NSW Government's objective of net-zero carbon emissions by 2050.

Transport for NSW is taking a holistic approach to embed carbon considerations into decision making across the cluster, and facilitate innovation and investment from the private sector through trials of new technology and co-investment in new services. For example Sydney Metro is purchasing an equivalent of 100 per cent of its operational electricity needs of the new Sydney Metro Northwest railway as green power produced by the recently opened Beryl Solar Farm at Gulgong.

The Electric and Hybrid Vehicle Plan was released in January 2019 and sets a target that 10 per cent of passenger vehicles purchased or leased by NSW Government agencies will be electric or hybrid vehicles from 2020/21. The Plan also includes \$3 million to support the expansion of fast Electric Vehicle chargers into regional NSW, and \$2 million to roll out slow chargers in commuter carparks across the Greater Sydney Metropolitan Region. Both programs will be delivered through collaborative investments with industry and local government.

NSW's first fully electric bus trial commenced in July 2019, integrating four fully electric buses in a regular bus route service in Sydney's Inner West region. In March

2019, the Government committed an additional \$10 million to trial electric buses and associated infrastructure upgrades at Randwick bus depot. NSW's first electric and automated Smart Shuttle is being trialled at Sydney Olympic Park in partnership with industry. Further regional trials of electric and automated passenger shuttles are under way at Coffs Harbour and Armidale.

The NSW Government's new Regional Rail Fleet will be the first fleet of trains in Australia to use bi-mode technology. Bi-mode is a diesel-electric hybrid which will allow the fleet to run on overhead power when operating on the electrified section of the train network. Operating the trains in bi-mode configuration will reduce carbon emissions by more than 540 tonnes annually.

Transport for NSW is continuing to develop the framework to reduce emissions from the transport sector, with a Future Energy Strategy and Five-Year Action Plan anticipated being complete by mid-2020.

Question 10

10.The CHAIR: That would be very useful. Can you tell me how much money has been budgeted for programs to reduce emissions in the transport sector?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: We will take that on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

As Transport for NSW is taking a holistic approach to embed carbon considerations into decision making across the cluster, most actions underway to reduce emissions are integrated within programs and do not have a separate budget. It should be noted that the total budget cost would not be an accurate indication of activity in any case, as actions to reduce emissions can also reduce costs, and so have a positive financial impact.

Question 11

11.The CHAIR: Are there any plans for the regional train network to be powered by 100 per cent renewables?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: I think with the way in which technology is moving I am not going to say anything is ruled out into the future because it is pretty exciting what we are seeing with electric vehicles and I think that is something that into the future trains will be a part of. So I am not going to sit here today and say to you, "No, that is something that will not be occurring," because, importantly with new technology coming online and at the rapid rate that it is, I think we are going to see a real transformation with public transport into the future.

The CHAIR: Is the Government just waiting for the market to get us to that target? Or are there actual plans of the Government to get us to net zero emissions?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: Importantly the Government has its plans towards driving down emissions and, as I said, we will provide a response back to you in relation to that.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the response to question on notice 9.

Question 12

12.The CHAIR: A survey released today showed that the number of people in Australia who are concerned about climate change has increased again: 81 per cent of people are concerned about climate-related events and there is, I think it is fair to say, a perception in the community broadly that there is a lack of action from governments in relation to tackling climate change, both the mitigation aspects and adaptation. Minister, are you concerned about climate change?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: I think everybody has a role to play when it comes to climate change. Whether they be governments or whether they be individuals, everybody has a part to play. Mr Staples outlined that we are working on an additional document here at the moment in relation to that, and I think the survey probably shows what I thought people would be thinking today as well.

The CHAIR: But today we are over a year from when we last heard the department was working on a strategy. Given the level of concern in the community, what assurance could you give people that your department is actually taking this seriously?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: We are taking this seriously and I am sure, as Mr Staples has already indicated, that will be forthcoming in the future as well. So I look forward to seeing that document.

The CHAIR: Do we have a timeline for having that document, given the urgency of the situation?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: I would have to ask Mr Staples in relation to that.

Mr STAPLES: I would have to take it on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the response to question on notice 9.

Question 13

13.The CHAIR: I have a quick question on freight. What percentage of freight now travels by rail?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: I will just see if I have that information here for you. We are expecting freight to grow so I can tell you that it is going to grow by about 28 per cent between 2016 and 2036. The volume of freight moving on roads is set to increase by nearly 90 per cent between now and 2056. In relation to rail, I do not have that information there so I will have to take that on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The question asked during estimates referenced rail mode share of '18 per cent' This is not the state-wide NSW rail mode share – the question relates to rail mode share of containers at Port Botany.

In 2016, the NSW rail network mode share was estimated at 39% of the total freight task.

The 2016 estimates included the very high rail modal share associated with bulk (non-containerised) movements of coal (87%) and agriculture (46%).

The Port Botany freight rail mode share was 17.8% in 2018-19, compared to 18.2% in 2017-18.

Rail modal share at Port Botany is reported and published via the Transport for NSW 'Freight Hub' - <https://www.transport.nsw.gov.au/operations/freight-hub> .

Rail mode is influenced by seasonal issues including the harsh drought conditions impacting export agriculture commodity volumes that are mostly moved by rail.

A higher proportion of exports to Port Botany are moved by rail, so the drought directly impacts rail modal share.

Question 14

14.THE CHAIR: Can you tell me how many stations in the New South Wales trains network operate regularly without staff?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: No. I do not know if Mr Allaway has that information; otherwise, we will have to take it on notice. We will take it on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

There are 192 NSW TrainLink intercity and regional stations. Ninety five of these are unattended. Of these unattended stations 77% are remote monitored by Regional Customer Support Centres located at Maitland and Wollongong. All intercity stations are fitted with help points and CCTV while 62 regional stations have CCTV and/or Customer Information Help points.

Question 15

15.The Hon. MICK VEITCH: One is that I was out at Menindee last week and I was asked this question: The Pooncarie to Menindee Road, that final strip, when will that be completed?

Mr PAUL TOOLE: Yes. Look, I will probably have to take that on notice at the moment.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The NSW and Commonwealth governments have provided \$25 million (\$12.5 million each) to seal and upgrade 70 kilometres of Pooncarie Road between Pooncarie and Menindee in the Central Darling Shire Local Government Area. The project will be delivered by Central Darling Shire Council and is estimated to be completed in June 2023.

Question 16 - 17

16. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Thank you. I have a question for Mr Gulaptis. As the Parliamentary Secretary, do you have a formal written agreement with the Minister regarding the allocation of your responsibilities?

Mr CHRISTOPHER GULAPTIS: Yes, I do. I have a charter letter.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Thank you. Would you be prepared to table that for the Committee so that we can understand your duties?

Mr CHRISTOPHER GULAPTIS: Look, I do have that letter with me and I will take that on notice.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Just table it.

Mr CHRISTOPHER GULAPTIS: I will take that on notice.

17. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Well, if you change your mind. Mr Bromhead, you also have a written agreement?

Mr STEPHEN BROMHEAD: Yes, I do.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Would you be prepared to table yours?

Mr STEPHEN BROMHEAD: I will take it on notice.

ANSWER:

Please see below.



The Hon. Paul Toole MP
Minister for Regional Transport and Roads

The Hon Christopher Gulaptis MP
Parliamentary Secretary for Regional Roads and Infrastructure
11 Prince Street
GRAFTON NSW 2460

Dear Mr Gulaptis,

I am writing to outline your responsibilities as a Parliamentary Secretary for Regional Roads and Infrastructure in the Transport cluster.

Your role is to provide support as required, including:

- Providing policy and general support to me in my capacity as the Minister for Regional Transport and Roads, as agreed, on specific projects
- Attending meetings and functions as my representative
- Actioning and signing correspondence on my behalf
- Supporting the passage of legislation in Parliament relevant to the Cluster.

You are also required to comply with the relevant provisions of the NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct and Lobbyist Code of Conduct at all times.

Procedural guidance about the role of Parliamentary Secretaries in the House is enclosed at **Attachment A** for your reference.

I look forward to working with you as we strive to deliver great opportunities and quality of life for all citizens across NSW no matter where they live or what their circumstances may be.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Paul Toole'.

THE HON PAUL TOOLE MP

CC: The Hon Gladys Berejiklian MP, Premier
The Hon Andrew Constance MP, Transport Cluster Minister

Attachment A – Extract from *NSW Legislative Assembly Practice, Procedure and Privilege*

Part 4A of the *Constitution Act 1902* (NSW) provides for the appointment by the Premier of Parliamentary Secretaries to perform such functions as the Premier, from time to time, determines. The Act does not authorise Parliamentary Secretaries to perform any function that by any law may only be performed by some other person.

Standing order 386 permits Parliamentary Secretaries to act on behalf of Ministers and for references to Ministers in the standing and sessional orders to be taken to include references to Parliamentary Secretaries except in respect of certain standing orders.

Parliamentary Secretaries, acting on behalf of Ministers, are able to

- give notice of, introduce and have carriage of the Government's business;
- be seated at the Table in order to undertake the functions undertaken by Ministers in this role. The Speaker has ruled that the requirement for a Minister to be seated at the Table during debate is a convention rather than a rule;
- have the same time limits apply to their contributions as apply to Ministers (S O 85);
- table papers and, if desired, move motions to restrict inspection (S O s 264, 266 and 267);
- reply to a private member's statement (S O 108);
- give consecutive notices of motion (S O 138), and
- move a motion, without leave, to suspend standing and sessional orders to deal with any item or items of business before the House (S O 365).

Parliamentary Secretaries are not able to:

- inform the House when the Governor will give reasons for opening of Parliament (S O 2(9));
- inform the House when the Governor will receive the House with its new Speaker (S O 11(3));
- sit on the front bench during Question Time (S O 26);
- move a motion for the days and times of meeting and adjournment (S O 34);
- adjourn the House (S O 46);
- issue a notification for the allocation of time (guiltine) (S O 90);
- arrange government business (S O 101);
- receive notices of matters of public importance (S O 110(3));
- be the subject of a no confidence motion in a Minister or speak for the Minister (S O 112);
- receive copies of petitions sent to Ministers (S O 125);
- answer questions either on notice or without notice (S O 126, S O 131(5) and S O 132);
- declare a bill urgent (S O 189);
- introduce a money or taxing bill (see also s 46(2) of the *Constitution Act*) (S O 190 and S O 243);
- appoint estimates committees (S O 246(1));
- be the subject of an order for papers (S O 269);
- be required to provide resources to a legislation committee (S O 323(10)); or
- speak in response to a motion for the suspension of standing orders (S O 365(4)).



The Hon. Paul Toole MP
Minister for Regional Transport and Roads

The Hon Stephen Bromhead MP
Parliamentary Secretary for Regional Transport
PO Box 272
TUNCURRY NSW 2428

Dear Mr Bromhead,

I am writing to outline your responsibilities as a Parliamentary Secretary for Regional Transport in the Transport cluster.

Your role is to provide support as required, including:

- Providing policy and general support to me in my capacity as the Minister for Regional Transport and Roads, as agreed, on specific projects
- Attending meetings and functions as my representative
- Actioning and signing correspondence on my behalf
- Supporting the passage of legislation in Parliament relevant to the Cluster.

You are also required to comply with the relevant provisions of the NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct and Lobbyist Code of Conduct at all times.

Procedural guidance about the role of Parliamentary Secretaries in the House is enclosed at **Attachment A** for your reference.

I look forward to working with you as we strive to deliver great opportunities and quality of life for all citizens across NSW no matter where they live or what their circumstances may be.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Paul Toole'.

THE HON PAUL TOOLE MP

CC: The Hon Gladys Berejiklian MP, Premier
The Hon Andrew Constance MP, Transport Cluster Minister

Attachment A – Extract from *NSW Legislative Assembly Practice, Procedure and Privilege*

Part 4A of the *Constitution Act 1902* (NSW) provides for the appointment by the Premier of Parliamentary Secretaries to perform such functions as the Premier, from time to time, determines. The Act does not authorise Parliamentary Secretaries to perform any function that by any law may only be performed by some other person.

Standing order 366 permits Parliamentary Secretaries to act on behalf of Ministers and for references to Ministers in the standing and sessional orders to be taken to include references to Parliamentary Secretaries except in respect of certain standing orders.

Parliamentary Secretaries, acting on behalf of Ministers, are able to

- give notice of, introduce and have carriage of the Government's business;
- be seated at the Table in order to undertake the functions undertaken by Ministers in this role. The Speaker has ruled that the requirement for a Minister to be seated at the Table during debate is a convention rather than a rule;
- have the same time limits apply to their contributions as apply to Ministers (S O 85);
- table papers and, if desired, move motions to restrict inspection (S O s 264, 266 and 267);
- reply to a private member's statement (S O 108);
- give consecutive notices of motion (S O 136), and
- move a motion, without leave, to suspend standing and sessional orders to deal with any item or items of business before the House (S O 365).

Parliamentary Secretaries are not able to:

- inform the House when the Governor will give reasons for opening of Parliament (S O 2(9));
- inform the House when the Governor will receive the House with its new Speaker (S O 11(3));
- sit on the front bench during Question Time (S O 26);
- move a motion for the days and times of meeting and adjournment (S O 34);
- adjourn the House (S O 46);
- issue a notification for the allocation of time (quillotine) (S O 90);
- arrange government business (S O 101);
- receive notices of matters of public importance (S O 110(3));
- be the subject of a no confidence motion in a Minister or speak for the Minister (S O 112);
- receive copies of petitions sent to Ministers (S O 125);
- answer questions either on notice or without notice (S O 126, S O 131(5) and S O 132);
- declare a bill urgent (S O 189);
- introduce a money or taxing bill (see also s 46(2) of the *Constitution Act*) (S O 190 and S O 243);
- appoint estimates committees (S O 246(1));
- be the subject of an order for papers (S O 269);
- be required to provide resources to a legislation committee (S O 323(10)), or
- speak in response to a motion for the suspension of standing orders (S O 365(4)).

Question 18

18. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Just so you know, this is the part that I actually like in the new model. I think this is a good way of doing things. Welcome to this afternoon. I just want to go back to some of the questions I asked the Minister this morning, which I flagged that I would do. My first question would be—and some of these, you may need to take on notice—which of the timber bridges on our State roads has had a weight or load limit applied to it the longest at this point in time?

Mr STAPLES: I will refer to Mr Wakelin-King. Just to explain, if we could, for just 30 seconds—

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Yes, okay.

Mr STAPLES: So Mr Fuller, as deputy secretary, looks after for me essentially the outer metropolitan area of Wollongong and Newcastle as well as regional New South Wales in terms of the day-to-day service delivery of all transport. Underneath Mr Fuller is Mr Wakelin-King, who is largely focused on the road network. Mr Allaway is largely focused on the rail service delivery in that area. Mr Regan is deputy secretary for Infrastructure and Place and he is responsible for delivery of projects broadly across the State, including the Greater Sydney area as well. Just to understand who they are.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Okay.

Mr STAPLES: So I guess given you were asking about bridges and regional New South Wales roads, I will refer this to Mr Wakelin-King. If you are unsure of who to ask, I am happy to sort of just channel today and help give you as quick a direction as possible.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Thanks, Mr Secretary. In terms of which bridge has had the longest load restrictions, I would have to take that one on notice and come back to you.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the answer given at the Hearing.

Question 19

19. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: How big is 15,000 kilometres as a proportion of the road network? I have seen one report that councils control 166,000 kilometres of 185,000 kilometres in the road network. That is around 90 per cent. I assume that is across the State, though, not just in regional areas. How much of the council-owned road network is 15,000 kilometres?

Mr STAPLES: I will ask Mr Wakelin-King whether he has some more detail on that but certainly there is no doubt the councils themselves own the bulk of the road network in kilometre distance.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, understood.

Mr STAPLES: Not necessarily maintained or the same quality as the State roads and so forth.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Understood. I think they would agree with you.

Mr STAPLES: I will ask Mr Wakelin-King if he has any numbers on that; otherwise, we will take it on notice.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: There are approximately 200,000 kilometres of road within the New South Wales area. The approximate figures are about 18,000 within the State road network.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: There is about an equivalent amount—a little bit less in terms of regional roads—and then the residual are local roads. They are the three broad classifications under the Roads Act, if I may.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: How much of that is in regional New South Wales as opposed to being a regional road?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: In terms of regional roads, which is between a State and a local road, the predominance of that is in regional New South Wales in accordance with the Restart classification of what regional New South Wales is.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I will be happy to take a bit more on notice but I would just be interested to know of the 15,000—how much of the roads in regional New South Wales as defined by Restart NSW will this 15,000 kilometres transfer?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: It is the vast majority but I can take it on notice and give you some more specific figures around that. But it is definitely the vast majority.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The percentage of council owned roads subject to this initiative is approximately 81%.

Question 20

20. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Does the department maintain an asbestos register?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: I believe it should, yes, but I will need to confirm that. But, yes, it should.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Yes, I think you should. My question in relation to asbestos is: Has there been any asbestos identified in the structures at the RMS depots?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: If I may, a number of the depots are quite old and have been around for some time so there would be some material that may have asbestos in them, but it depends. We would have asbestos management plans in place for those and making sure that we are dealing with them accordingly—cordoning them off from staff et cetera. But given the age of the depots there may be a risk of some of them having asbestos in them.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: And loose fuel asbestos in some of the depots that are in a colder climate?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: I would need to take that on notice.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: I would appreciate it if you would do that.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The Department maintains a centralised (consolidated) Asbestos Register for sites under its management. As per regulations HAZMAT assessments are to be undertaken every 5 years. The next is due in 2024

Friable, non-friable and bonded asbestos has been identified in structures at RMS sites.

None of the hazards identified fall under category P1 requiring immediate remedial works.

The minor remedial works required for the 4 sites that fall under P2 will be completed by end of November 2019. The majority of remaining sites fall under P3 & P4 category and do not require any remedial action. However, when site improvement/demolition works or routine Facilities Management maintenance are undertaken and if the areas identified under P3 & P4 category are to be disturbed, appropriate remedial/treatment works are done on a case by case basis and the individual reports are amended/re-issued accordingly.

Question 21

21.The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: In the brief amount of time we have, I might ask about—returning to that set of questions about the regional fleet replacement program—the selection of Dubbo as the rail maintenance facility. What was the final cost-benefit ratio for that decision?

Mr STAPLES: For the actual decision around the depot itself?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr STAPLES: The overall business case for the procurement of the fleet would have had within that a subset around the depot and whether there was a specific benefit cost to that element of it. I would have to have a look at that.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes. That is okay.

Mr STAPLES: Certainly we would have released a summary, I think, around the business case as an overall but I am not sure that it will break down to the individual.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: But they are discrete decisions. I am happy for you to take it on notice, but if you are able to come back with a view about what the benefit-cost ratio was for that particular decision.

Mr STAPLES: Yes. I am not sure whether we will have a specific BCR as you would normally see for a total project, but I am happy to take that on notice and see what we can provide in relation to that.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the response to supplementary questions 1 - 3.

Question 22

22.The Hon. MICK VEITCH: I have a couple of localised questions. You may or may not know but I live in Tumut. I have a question about the Gocup Road and Snowy Mountains Highway intersection in Tumut. Recently there was yet another accident

there. The locals are quite concerned. What happens is they come off the Gocup Road, people are travelling at a pretty fair speed because they think it is a State Road. They then come around a bend, they get to the intersection with the Snowy Mountains Highway—another State road—and they have got to give way. They actually think the give way would be the other way because of the road they are on and they tend to belt through the intersection. There have been a number of accidents at that intersection. What work is being done within the agency to start looking at rehabilitating that intersection?

Mr STAPLES: I am not personally familiar with that one. I certainly know the Tumut area but I do not know that particular intersection. Obviously any road safety issue is a concern for us. I might ask Mr Wakelin-King whether he has any specific knowledge of that location.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Thank you, Mr Secretary. Not on the specific intersection per se, although anywhere where there is a series of accidents happening anywhere on our network does drive a process around looking at that from a safety review point of view. I will take the specifics of the intersection on notice. However, I would also like to add that, as you are probably aware, we have just completed the upgrade of Gocup Road from Gundagai into Tumut itself.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Is it completed?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: It is complete. There might be some minor landscaping issues.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: There is a little bit more to be done, but it is close.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Yes. It certainly officially opened last week. There might be some minor contractual clean-up issues. So that makes a big difference, particularly getting timber trucks into the busy mill there just near Tumut, as you know. That has been a great upgrade from a safety point of view and a network reliability point of view. On the specifics of that intersection, I will get the team to have a look at it and we will come back to you.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Transport for NSW has carried out improvements to line marking and the road surface in recent years at the Snowy Mountains Highway and Gocup Road intersection.

Question 23

23. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Thank you. I will move on to—and this is really for Rural Roads—but grids and gates on State roads, particularly those that have been installed and maintained to an acceptable standard on public roads. This is more an issue for the Far West of the State. I have been told by a local council that it received some drought support money and thought it would start replacing the grids on the roads. Subsequently it was pulled up because of the history of how these things come about. They are not just on council roads; they are on State roads as well. What work is the department doing about replacing these grids—often cattle grids or "ramps" as they are sometimes referred to? What is the process for replacing them and how many do we have on State and regional roads?

Mr STAPLES: I might hand that one to Mr Wakelin-King and see whether he has got any knowledge of it.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: That is very good, Mr Staples.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: In terms of the actual number of grids I would definitely have to take that on notice. As a general rule grids are quite an old technology in controlling cattle. We tend to not replace them. We look to other technologies in terms of controlling cattle. It also does have some safety implications, particularly when travelling at speed. You will see that we put reduce speed signs on approach to those locations. We are working with local councils and, indeed, local farmers around when those things may be replaced or may be upgraded or repaired, because obviously they get damaged as well.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: The history is they used to be gates.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Yes.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: And people used to stop and open the gate. As vehicles got faster we took the gates out and we put the grids in. There is a suggestion that they may actually still be owned by the farmer rather than the State because if you go back into history they actually were gates, not grids.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: The actual farmers—depending on where the grid is, who owns the grid—maybe responsible for the grid themselves. It depends on where it is and who owns it. It is not necessarily a one size fits all. But in terms of the number, I will come back to you.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: The other part of the question then is if any of the farmers or local landholders are responsible, how far either side of the grid are they also responsible for? Because it will not just be the grid, is my understanding. If you could take that on notice and find out that—

Mr WAKELIN-KING: I will. However, as a general principle there is a road reserve and then there is the private land outside of the road reserve. Once again, the specifics around it will vary from grid to grid. A lot of them also align with creeks and other natural features. On the specifics I am happy to take that on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

There are 295 cattle grids on State-managed roads in regional NSW. Transport for NSW own, maintain and replace grids where needed, in part due to WHS traffic management concerns. This includes cleaning out the grids.

Question 24

24. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Mr Staples, I am going to firstly return to the question around the costings relating to the replacing country bridges program and then I have some other issues. I am going to hand up a couple of documents that might assist this discussion, which are just the PBO election policy costings that I believe have driven the Treasury commitments in the budget. There are two costings there. I am referring firstly to the replacing country bridges costings, if you have got that one in front of you. In the budget this is a \$25.5 million commitment and it is part of a \$500 million total commitment for the Fixing Country Bridges program.

You can see here that there are two sorts of costs: There is the capital expenditure—actually fixing the bridges—but then there is also in this election policy costing some expenses that really relate to the fact that you have then got to maintain the bridges once you have fixed them. There is also depreciation—put that aside for the minute.

The policy commitment was for \$25 million—that was to fix the bridges. Then in the first year the expenses—the cost of then maintaining bridges—was \$500,000, half a million dollars. Over the page you can see in the second part of that a policy costing. It is actually spelt out over time. This looks at the nominal 30-year allocation of these bridges.

What you can see are two things. The capital expenditure, spelt out—a lot of it is in the back years, not surprisingly; that is often how these things are done—but the total is \$500 million. That was the commitment. On top of that is the operation and maintenance money and that ramps up rapidly from \$500,000, half a million dollars this year to \$2½ million to \$4½ million to \$7 million to \$10 million—rapidly increasing, unsurprisingly. The budget has allocated the \$25.5 million. What I want to confirm with you is that figure, I assume, incorporates both the capital expenditure and also this operational expenditure—that is, it includes fixing the bridge and maintaining the bridge. Can you shed any light on that?

Mr STAPLES: As in does this policy costing include that or what does our budget actually have at the moment? I am sorry, I am just trying to—

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: You can see the policy costing is \$25½ million.

Mr STAPLES: Yes.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: And that includes fixing the bridge and maintaining the bridge. The budget has \$25½ million; I assume that includes fixing the bridge and maintaining the bridge. That bit is not the bit I am worried about, by the way, just to give you some reassurance.

Mr STAPLES: So if I look at the assumptions down the bottom it talks about ongoing maintenance costs and depreciation being included.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes. So it is really the ongoing maintenance. The reason I am concerned is that the budget says \$25.5 million as part of a \$500 million total commitment. So that \$500 million in the budget, unlike the \$25.5 million, is not repairing and maintaining because that number would be higher. The \$500 million total commitment is just for repairing. If you look over the page, the total cost of repairing and maintaining will add up to about \$524½ million, I think you will find the number is. Has this commitment been cut in the budget? That is really my concern, when you look at that.

Mr STAPLES: I would not expect that would have been any cut to the commitment. It is just a question of how we may have ended up deciding to fund those relative parts. I think the best thing is for us to take that on notice and provide you with clarity on that.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes. I would be happy for you to take it on notice. If it is possible to come back I would appreciate it but otherwise take it on notice.

Mr STAPLES: Sure.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: The concern is that appropriately there is money for both elements of this—the capex and the opex—but I want to be assured that the commitment the Government took to the election that \$500 million would be spent repairing country bridges, not repairing and maintaining country bridges, is going to be spent over the five years. Because on the face of it that is not what the budget says. If you are able to shed any light one way or the other that would be helpful.

Mr STAPLES: We have been given really clear direction to get on and get going with repairing and fixing these bridges so we will get on with that.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I just want to know that Treasury has been as well.

Mr STAPLES: Yes. We are happy to take that on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The Government has committed \$500 million in capital funding for the Fixing Country Bridges Program to repair/replace bridges in regional and rural communities.

In addition to the \$500 million, funding for maintenance of the bridges has been included in the operating expenditure budget.

Question 25

25. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Mr Staples, I want to go back to some of the questions regarding Kangy Angy. There has been public media that the bridge cost \$50 million. Is that correct? Is that close to the mark?

Mr STAPLES: It is part of a broader contract so I do not have a specific figure around the bridge. It is good to call the bridge out because it is an important part of the work in terms of providing access for locals and basically providing them with more flood-proof access into their local area. There has been a lot of engagement with the local community. It would be fair to say I am aware that there are a number of concerns from local community groups in that area around some of the impacts of that. We will continue to work with them as closely as we can to try to mitigate and manage those as much as possible.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Are we able to work out how much the bridge has cost, Mr Staples? Is that possible?

Mr STAPLES: It would be difficult to do because it would have been part of an overall tendered price and we would not necessarily have got a separate breakdown for the bridge. It would be part of an overall bundle.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The maintenance facility at Kangy Angy will include access for local residents via a new flood free bridge that will connect Enterprise Drive to Orchard Road.

The new access bridge will be the main access route into and out of the maintenance facility site.

The cost of the access bridge forms part of the maintenance facility design and construct contract, and is not available as a separate price.

Question 26

26. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Once Kangy Angy is up and running are there any proposals to redeploy the workforce from, say, Eveleigh to Kangy Angy?

Mr STAPLES: I would have to take that on notice in terms of the specifics but certainly I can ask Mr Regan whether he has any knowledge on that because he is involved in the procurement of the fleet. But obviously as we transition from one fleet type to another we will take approaches in terms of resource management around

that. I would expect that there will be some changes in workforce in different locations as a result.

Mr REGAN: I could add to that. The arrangements that have been put in place for that new Intercity fleet also include maintenance to be undertaken at that facility. That maintenance is to be undertaken by the consortium that is supplying the trains. They supply the trains and then they maintain the trains. The maintenance facility itself is being separately delivered under a different contract. I am not aware of the employment arrangements but they will be undertaken by that consortium as distinct from the current arrangements at Eveleigh.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The New Intercity Fleet will be maintained by the private sector consortium RailConnect at a purpose built facility in Kangy Angy.

Sydney Trains has no proposal to redeploy employees to RailConnect. Any opportunities for staff to make that transition would be via RailConnect publicly advertising positions and seeking applications from the labour market.

Question 27

27. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Did the State buy the parcel of land that is being used?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Yes, I believe that is the case.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Are you able to reveal what we paid?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: I do not have that information at hand.

Mr STAPLES: We will take that on notice and see what we can provide.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: That would be good, thanks. Prior to the purchase were there independent evaluations of the site to determine what it was worth?

Mr STAPLES: I do not have the detail of the process that was followed for that.

Typically we would run through a process of evaluation and so forth but—

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Normally as a part of the process you would obtain a valuation?

Mr STAPLES: Yes.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Would those valuations be available for the Committee?

Mr STAPLES: I am happy to take on notice your question about the value and also what process we followed to determine that.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

To build the maintenance facility, we needed to acquire land to accommodate all permanent work, including access roads, fleet maintenance facility buildings, rail tracks, new rail bridges, and environmental drainage and control measures.

Most of the land was purchased from Central Coast Council. The majority of other property acquisitions were completed by agreement.

Transport for NSW has finalised compulsory acquisition with other private property owners.

Question 28

28. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: On a completely separate matter, I have some questions around the status of the attenuator at Port of Eden. It was due to be completed, as I understand it, in the first part of this year. Has it been completed and, if not, when will it be completed?

Mr STAPLES: I am happy to check with Mr Fuller as to whether he has any detail on that. Otherwise, it might be something that I have to take on notice because I do not have much knowledge of that one myself.

Mr FULLER: The specific detail we might take on notice but I know that we are working very closely with the Department of Primary Industries [DPI] in terms of the coastal infrastructure management which sits in their area. We have been working closely with them but I think we should take further detail on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the response to supplementary question 20.

Question 29

29. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Is it correct that at the moment the XPT trains are still running with sleeper carriages?

Mr STAPLES: Yes, it is.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Will you guarantee they will continue under the new train arrangements?

Mr STAPLES: Actually we will not be having sleeper carriages in the new trains. I am happy for Mr Allaway to give you a little more about the customer views that we have around that if you would like?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, thank you.

Mr ALLAWAY: Just on that particular point, we have undertaken customer engagement when we were going through the procurement process and worked with communities around what would be priorities and what would not. Comfort comes up an awful lot, particularly on longer-distance services. The new fleet themselves will have two different classes and a reduction, particularly in the premium economy class they will have a one by two seating arrangement. Comfort and the ability to be able to relax or recline in those seats was seen as important. The other thing that was very compelling with it as well was obviously sleeper cars take up an amount of room and that is much lower in the capacity. If you can offer more comfort in the new regional fleet, therefore you can have more capacity on that train. That is more of a priority that has come from our customers.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: How many sleeper cars are there at the moment?

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

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I think there may be eight.

Mr ALLAWAY: It is not a huge amount.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, if you could come back on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the response given at the Hearing.

Question 30

30. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Surely the department would have obligations under the Dividing Fences Act?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: I would need to take the specifics of that on notice. However, what I would say is that a lot of fencing obviously is the responsibility of the landowners, the farmers et cetera. If it is our fencing which we have owned and installed, clearly that would be our responsibility. There would be disaster funding arrangements that may be applied to local communities as a consequence of bushfires and flooding. It depends on the circumstances as to how that would be applied, and therefore what role we would have—indeed, obviously not just on our roads but local roads as well. Once again, we work with the Office of Emergency Management in those arrangements and funding arrangements where they apply, and also obviously there are a number of insurance claims that come into this in terms of the local landowners as well.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The *Dividing Fences Act 1991* does not impose liability on Roads and Maritime to do anything with respect to fences. The responsibility for replacing fences on privately-owned land along road corridors post bushfire generally lies with landowners.

Question 31

31. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Thank you for that. I want to move on to the next item. Last year I put in a GIPAA request—I am prone to putting in a lot of GIPAs. This was in relation to weeds and how much the agencies spend on weeds and weed control. When the GIPAA came back—again, you will have to forgive me; I am from regional New South Wales—I was a little startled to find out that we can report how much we spend on controlling ground vegetation via mowing and slashing and we can do that for control of ground vegetation via chemicals for Sydney—in north-east Sydney, western Sydney and southern Sydney—but there is no data available for the same actions on regional roads. Why is that—because you would do it, would you not? You would do the same thing on regional roads.

Mr STAPLES: Yes, we certainly do that.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: And on rail lines.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Yes.

Mr STAPLES: It probably has got a little bit to do with the way that the organisations are set up and what is done by different organisations. So in the Sydney area we have got a contract in place. You know that that activity is outsourced. So through that outsourcing process we have improved the way that we report on those sorts of

things. I am happy to hand it to Mr Wakelin-King to maybe give you a little bit more on what we are doing regionally.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: As you would be aware, and as I indicated earlier, we actually do quite a lot of vegetation control right along our road corridors. It is not only obviously for bushfire management and other concerns—

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Yes, I am talking about weed control now.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Weed control, and also we do it for safety reasons because, when it grows, it can affect line-of-sight issues. So we actually do engage in a program in respect of weed control spraying. The specifics in terms of how much and the exact amounts and locations, I will have to take on notice. But I can say that that is an area we have had a look at as a consequence of that question, and we will be looking at it a bit further.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

GIPA application 19R-0002 was a request for information on the 'amount spent on weed eradication and prevention by Roads and Maritime Services annually since 2010-11'. The tables provided show a breakdown of spending on vegetation control by region and are current as at September 2019; changes in reporting over time mean that these figures will not meet the totals previously provided in the table on regional spending in response to the GIPA application.

Table 1 (NON-RMCC) provides spending on vegetation control by Direct Delivery (i.e. Roads and Maritime staff), and Table 2 (RMCC) provides spending on vegetation control by Council partners.

Regional & Freight Division Annual Vegetation Control Expenditure FY2011 - FY2018

Non-RMCC	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
HUNTER	4,399,980	2,713,512	3,385,877	4,142,121	3,177,029	1,678,222	1,689,284	1,464,315	1,865,071
NORTHERN	4,945,949	4,499,404	4,866,502	6,256,944	6,470,043	2,729,427	4,541,312	2,923,222	4,294,397
SOUTHWEST	958,208	831,053	1,132,939	1,232,586	1,838,035	1,427,506	1,231,763	1,565,258	1,595,008
SOUTHERN	1,769,950	2,608,864	4,829,139	6,460,385	4,476,140	3,497,304	3,288,772	3,517,840	3,355,367
WESTERN	455,492	606,040	892,926	960,162	880,390	950,749	1,231,902	1,488,301	1,332,683
Total Regional & Freight	12,529,579	11,258,872	15,107,383	19,052,197	16,841,638	10,283,208	11,983,033	10,958,935	12,442,527

RMCC	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011
HUNTER	1,200,476	1,097,814	1,359,249	1,407,714	1,396,472	1,279,839	1,225,058	1,185,757	1,190,232
NORTHERN	1,163,069	1,618,542	1,642,526	1,533,507	1,402,393	1,463,922	1,498,660	1,233,325	1,068,972
SOUTHWEST	635,052	840,718	677,569	681,572	774,672	710,146	558,712	615,946	651,624
SOUTHERN	271,466	227,688	188,449	204,115	244,207	144,712	178,326	192,885	169,239
WESTERN	1,262,968	1,010,787	730,460	1,300,934	1,283,455	1,038,309	1,166,083	1,493,064	1,302,427
Total Regional & Freight	4,533,031	4,795,549	4,598,253	5,127,842	5,101,199	4,636,928	4,626,839	4,720,977	4,382,494

Question 32

32. The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Mr Staples, you may have to defer to the others on this, but have on-the-ground employees in your agencies been instructed of their obligations under the Biosecurity Act?

Mr STAPLES: The Biosecurity Act?

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: The New South Wales Biosecurity Act 2015.

Mr STAPLES: I am happy to ask Mr Wakelin-King if he has got any specific details on that for his frontline workforce.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: We obviously train our staff in all aspects of the maintenance on the road corridor. I will need to confirm, but I understand that we have actually done specific training around weed and vegetation control. In terms of specifically in accordance with the Act, I will need to take that on notice and come back to you.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: When you take that on notice, will you also take on notice what is the training regime for the employees and where you conducted that training?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Certainly.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Transport for NSW supports employees to manage biosecurity risks associated with infrastructure development and operation.

Our Biodiversity Guidelines provide the over-arching framework for managing weeds and pathogens for infrastructure projects. Relevant guides are available on the Roads and Maritime Services website.

Question 33

33. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Just to recap on the things we agree on: Your advice last time was that you did not advise the local member, who is also the Minister for Transport and Roads. I accept that. Also, it was approved at agency level. I accept that. My question and the thing I am surprised at is that the local member, the Minister for Transport and Roads, was not advised by any of your officers or in writing. Having had the chance to reflect on that, do you have any other advice for the Committee?

Mr STAPLES: I do not have any information to suggest there were. I am happy to take it on notice to see whether there was any formal brief given around that, and specifically in relation to the one you are talking about. But to my knowledge, there was not.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: The Minister launched this trial in his own electorate. It would be usual practice for a brief to be requested and a note to go up or some notes in relation to any Minister or local member doing this in their electorate.

Mr STAPLES: Yes, but I think there is—probably just to be really clear—a difference between going through and making a policy decision about whether to implement something versus then moving into, "We're going to announce something".

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, correct.

Mr STAPLES: And we are going to inform an MP about the fact that we are making an announcement around that.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: My question to the Minister was: "Minister, has this trial been raised with you verbally or in writing by the agency?" And he said no. I am surprised by that answer. I am happy for you to take that on notice, but I just wanted to press the details of that.

Mr STAPLES: Yes. I will take that on notice. In terms of the overall program, I am not surprised that we have not had engagement particularly with him directly, given the nature of it and the way that it is being overseen within the organisation. We have actually been trying to give some of our smartest people the space to go and look at where these things are best applied and give them the freedom to do that on the basis of the merits. Clearly, we had engaged with stakeholders as we had gone through that but the Minister, the conversation we have had, has been more about the concept of on demand and where the opportunities lie for transport long term.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: And the trial did not come up in his own electorate?

Mr STAPLES: No.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I encourage you to—I accept that is the case.

Mr STAPLES: As I said, I will do a final check internally.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The Sapphire Coast was one of 11 contracts awarded between August and December 2018 to deliver on-demand public transport pilots in locations across rural and regional NSW.

A panel reviews each pilot, and considers a range of operational and customer feedback data, as well as whether there are still learnings to be obtained should a

pilot be continued. No minimum patronage numbers have been set as part of this evaluation.

The evaluation panel's findings and recommendations are presented to a Transport for NSW Steering Committee for endorsement.

The Minister for Transport and Roads was not informed of the pilot evaluation outcome by any TfNSW officer, either verbally or in writing.

A verbal update on the pilot evaluation outcome was provided on 2 May 2019 by phone to the office of Minister Constance.

Question 34

34. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I encourage you to check with your officers. Thank you. On that specific trial, I will not be pressing this in a whole lot of detail; I have already done so with the Minister. But is that trial first in Eden and Candelo now expanded to two other sites. That trial is still running? It has not been halted?

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The Candelo service has now concluded.

A revamped Eden service will commence in mid-October 2019, at which time the current Eden service will end.

Question 35

35. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Good. We are obviously under a bit of time pressure trying to ask some questions, but I was pleased to be able to indicate that we strongly support the idea of trialling these things around the State. The only question has been should this trial still be running, given the results? You have given us some new updated figures for August—520 to 530, so up again—and unlike July, I think, that did not include any fare-free days?

Mr FULLER: I am not sure about that. I am going to have to take that on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Could you take that on notice? Of the two original locations—that is, Eden and Candelo—of the 520 to 530, are those locations up?

Mr FULLER: I would have to check the specifics. I am talking overall numbers and what has been happening since the reset. Obviously, as I pointed out, what we want to do is continue to refine the service. With some of those pre-existing services that have been running it sometimes is hard to compare like for like, because we actually start down a completely different path.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes. Because the nature of the two services that have been added are qualitatively different to the two original ones.

Mr FULLER: Yes, correct.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: If you could take on notice where the trip numbers for Eden and Candelo are at for July and August, that would be helpful. These are being reviewed month to month?

Mr FULLER: That is right.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: At the moment. This is still one of the lowest-performing trials, though, even on those numbers. When do you think this will come to a head? I mean, it may improve dramatically from here.

Mr FULLER: Sure.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the answer given at the Hearing.

Question 36 - 37

36. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: That is very wise. Can I ask you about the services at Dubbo, the Central West On Demand service. I was interested in two of those particular routes—that is, Ivanhoe to Hay and Collarenebri to Narrabri. These are quite different to any of the trials that are going on elsewhere in that for most of these other places you are paying generally a very low fare for what it is then an improved service subsidised by the Government. Ivanhoe to Hay is running fortnightly every Thursday and the full fare return is \$70, so it is quite different. Similarly, Collarenebri to Narrabri is weekly every Friday. It is pretty much a set route and return, again \$70. What is the patronage like on those two routes?

Mr FULLER: I would have to take the patronage on notice. What you have highlighted there is one of the great challenges that we face in providing routed services—bus and coach services—in the regions in terms of providing equivalent access and equity in pricing for our regional customers. Obviously, as Mr Staples said, now that we have a regional transport division that is able to consider how all of the components of transport come together I think what you will see in the next 12 months is us reconsidering all our services—how they connect together, how we make those contribute to providing the greatest value service and, hopefully, being able to extend the number of services.

37. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: The numbers are not too bad for this trial overall. There are four services. The numbers are not terrible overall for this trial. However, those two routes are quite different to anywhere else. This is a large amount of money to pay for a return trip and it is pretty infrequent—once a fortnight this bus is going there and back. That is why I ask about those.

Mr STAPLES: Yes, I think that highlights that we do not have a firm view on how this should work at the moment.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr STAPLES: The fact that we are taking different approaches—and bear in mind we did not sit down in a dark corner and come up with these ideas. These things came from the operators themselves who were working in the areas thinking: Based on the customers I know and conversations they are having, we think this could be a product that people will buy into.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Is that how this trial came about?

Mr STAPLES: I would have to look at the specifics of it. Generally speaking, we have looked very much towards the operators to come up with the concepts and so forth, that, "Actually, there is something different. We can try that elsewhere. If we try that, maybe we will learn something from that that we could apply elsewhere as an approach." If anything, the fact that it is different is a real positive, from my point of view, because it is an opportunity to learn differently.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes. I mean, \$70 return seems like quite a lot. It seems like almost the price an operator would be able to run a bus over that route. What is the subsidy for those couple of routes in the design of this trial?

Mr STAPLES: Again, we would have to take that on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

This On Demand Public Transport service is operated by Livebetter and offers four village to town connections (under one contract) across NSW, including Collarenebri to Narrabri, Tullamore to Dubbo, Portland to Lithgow and Ivanhoe to Hay. The services rolled out progressively between 7 March to 18 April 2019 and the contract is still in its initial 6 month term.

In respect to the Livebetter services in question:

- Ivanhoe to Hay – total of 41 trips to end July.
- Collarenebri to Narrabri – total of 12 trips to end July
- In relation to fares, they are set by TfNSW and are based on the iPART recommended fares for rural and regional NSW.

Question 38

38.The Hon. MICK VEITCH: So what is the fare from Broken Hill to Mildura?

Mr ALLAWAY: I will have to take it on notice.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Not to Mildura, just the Adelaide.

Mr ALLAWAY: Just to Adelaide.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Broken Hill to Adelaide, Adult Fare: \$88.77

Broken Hill to Adelaide, Concession Fare: \$44.38

Question 39

39.The Hon. MICK VEITCH: And Broken Hill, Wagga and Gobbagombalin. There was a brochure circulated to the community of Dubbo relating to the bridge and looking at Wiradjuri Park, the Newell Highway and the flood bypass. I just wanted to know who put that out?

Mr STAPLES: Would you be able to table that?

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Yes, I can table it. It was actually handed to me when I was out at Dubbo. I just wanted to know who circulated it because it says: Building a Better Dubbo is a \$195 million NSW Government vision to support the rapidly growing Dubbo economy.

Then it goes on about essentially looking at myths and facts around the bridge. It looks like a bit more than just—I mean, if it came from the local member I would understand, but if it is a departmental thing I would be a little bit concerned.

Mr STAPLES: Can you table that so I can just have a look at it?

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: I will table that, yes. I am not saying it is, but I would just like to know if the department had any input at all or any involvement in circulating that particular document? I am not saying you have; I just want to know if you have it would be good. I am happy to leave that with you, Mr Staples.

Mr STAPLES: Sorry, is that just the one document? I just want to clarify whether that is two pages.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Yes, it is the one document. It has been photocopied but it was back-to-back originally. I am happy to leave that with you, Mr Staples, to get back to us about the document.

Mr STAPLES: Certainly, yes. Happy to take on notice about whether we have had any role in it.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The RMS flyer for the Building a Better Dubbo projects was distributed to residents in Dubbo, made available at key public locations, and provided to the media.

It was distributed the week commencing 26 June, towards the end of the consultation for the New Dubbo bridge and other projects in Dubbo. The aim was to inform the community about facts and dispel myths on the project.

Question 40

40. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I want to turn back to where my colleague was on the regional travel card. Are we still on track as a start date for that of January 2020? That is the published start date.

Mr STAPLES: Mr Fuller probably has a little bit more information on that. It is certainly being run by technology and transactions people within the organisation, none of whom is in detail here today. But Mr Fuller has some understanding of that, so I will let him update you.

Mr FULLER: My understanding is that, as Mr Staples says, our customer strategy and technology area are well placed and working very closely with the Minister's office to achieve that targeted date of early in 2020 to get that rolled out and make that available to our regional seniors.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Is it 1 January 2020 or is it early 2020? Which of those two are we—

Mr FULLER: I would take the actual physical date on notice but I know that they are certainly targeting a very early date in 2020 and I believe they are on track for some point in time in January.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: If you could take that on notice. Up till now the discussions have been around kicking off at the start of that calendar year, so let us know any change to that. On the details, the Minister got through quite a few of the details in rapid order but I did not get to all of them. If there are pensioners in a couple, will they be eligible for individual cards, the two of them?

Mr FULLER: I might take that on notice. I think the intent here is to make this as broadly available as possible and also as easily accessible as possible and to try not to make this in any way administratively burdensome. So I might just take the detail of individual eligibility on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to response for supplementary questions 23 - 31.

Question 41

41.Mr FULLER: I think their intent is to make that as transparent as possible and for people to have visibility about what they have spent to date and what is available to them to spend from there.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Good. Feel free to take this on notice but does the card include the GST on any purchases? What are the GST arrangements that apply?

Mr FULLER: That is a good question. I am not an accountant but I will take that on notice and we will provide that information.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I encourage you to take that one on notice. Sensibly the regional definition is the same as the Restart NSW funding allocation definitions. Just explain to me what that means though for a place like the Hunter. If I am living in the Hunter, where will I be eligible to get this card? Where is the boundary?

Mr FULLER: I would clarify that against, as you say, the Restart definitions. My understanding is that it is pretty clean, that it extends to Lake Macquarie and the areas beyond and into the Hunter.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: So if I am in Lake Macquarie or some of those surrounding areas, maybe heading out west of Wallsend, I will have access to this but if I am in closer to town then I will not. There will be a dividing line somewhere in, for example, Newcastle, where on one side of the street people are getting it and on the other side they will not. That is just the nature of a regional card like this, is it not?

Mr STAPLES: The focus of the Government's policy is regional New South Wales.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes. So there has to be a line somewhere.

Mr STAPLES: We need to draw a boundary. Then I think as we roll it out we will get the information in the community's hands about what is in and out of scope. As Mr Fuller indicated, we are just going through the really practical things about how to implement it. Some of those questions will come up and we will get those resolved so that when we do go out there is no confusion in advance of the rollout—how they can use it and all those sorts of things like who is eligible and where.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: If you could take that particular Hunter question on notice I would appreciate it.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

GST is included. i.e. \$250 is inclusive of GST.

The definition of Regional NSW is consistent with that used for Restart NSW (LGAs outside of Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong City Council boundaries).

Question 42

42. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I accept that. I think the Minister was pretty upfront about that.

Mr STAPLES: If there is a shortfall in the funding as it rolls out we will have to deal with that like we have from time to time.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I asked the question the other way, Mr Staples. We are relying on the PBO for this costing. Have you done any modelling since?

Mr STAPLES: When you say "modelling", all you can really do is scenarios of different percentage take-up rates. We are not into a sophisticated—because you are into human behaviour then about how many people are going to do that. We have not done it at that level. You could very simply do different proportional analysis of: If you had a larger take up what would that be?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes and that work has been done.

Mr STAPLES: I am sure we would have done some estimates around that.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: And that is included.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Did you do that in-house or did you engage external consultants to assist?

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

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Costs for different uptake rates have been estimated by Transport for New South Wales, without assistance from external consultants.

Question 43

43. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Are trains on the Newcastle to Central Coast line and the Illawarra line still speed reduced?

Mr STAPLES: What do you mean, sorry?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: As a result of those recommendations my understanding is there were speed reductions on those lines. I am asking you about those two particular lines. Are there still speed reductions?

Mr STAPLES: I do not have a detailed knowledge of that. I will ask Mr Allaway whether he has got specific knowledge. That goes back a fair way in terms of that recommendation.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Understood.

Mr ALLAWAY: I am going to have to take it on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I am happy for you to take that on notice. Could you also take on notice whether there is any plans to change that? If that is the case that

those restrictions are in place, are there any plans to change those? I am asking what is the current status? Are there plans to change the current status?
Mr STAPLES: Yes. Happy to take that on notice.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the answer for supplementary question 19.

Question 44

44.The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Thank you for that. That was very good. It is one of the reasons why this process works well. Can I just go to Woy Woy underpass. What was the final cost of the Rawson Road, Woy Woy underpass?

Mr STAPLES: I do not have any knowledge of that.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: I need to take that one on notice if I may.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: I will let you leave that. While you take on notice, can you break down the expenditures, the State's allocation and the council's allocation? That would be good.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: We will do.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

I refer you to the answer for supplementary question 185.

Question 45

45.The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Just a question about the planning for the Pacific Highway route through Wyong. Where is that up to?

Mr STAPLES: Mr Wakelin-King might take that.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Thanks, Mr Secretary. We are currently in the detailed design phase for that. We have, again, funding through to the completion of the development stage. It is, as you are probably aware, a complex project because it is very close to the rail corridor. This may or may not be a factor that is influenced by the fast rail planning. That is subject to further consideration. It is also a key urban area, as you would be aware, in terms of an interchange with bus transport. So we are finalising the detailed design. Further development and, in fact, delivery of the project will be subject to a funding decision.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Okay. So when did the work start, Mr Wakelin-King, on that process?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: The process has been ongoing for some time. The specific start date I could not give you now.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Could you take that on notice?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: I am happy to take that on notice. It has been going for a number of years. It is a complex site, as I said, because of its constraints—and its geographical constraints as well as its urban constraints. So we have had to revisit this on a number of occasions, particularly in terms of future rail development as well

as the highway. So it is a good project in terms of bringing the modes together but just in the context of the environment it does make it a bit challenging.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: And you have taken on notice when that work started. Can you also take on notice how much has been spent to date on that?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Yes, certainly.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The planning (strategic phase) commenced around 2006 and included public display of route options.

A Review of Environmental Factors was approved for the project in 2015.

Expenditure to date (up to the end of August 2019) is \$29.4 million.

Question 46

46. Mr FULLER: Perhaps just in terms of further context for the Committee: In terms of the pipeline of work, Mr Wakelin-King's area of our business, working with Mr Regan's area, is delivering a very large number of projects. We are talking about a delivery area currently that has 512 projects greater than \$500,000, which we report through to the delivery and performance committee of Cabinet. Within those we have 76 that are greater than \$10 million and 17 greater than \$100 million. There is a considerable amount of work on foot, a record level of investment and, with that, a balance of managing the delivery and planning as we have talked about on some of these individual examples.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Thank you. I might as finish up this individual example with two other quick questions. Are there any known planning issues that are slowing this down or might slow this down?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: There are no known planning issues. What I would say—

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Are there any known unknowns?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I did not want to go there.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: What I would say is that as you would be aware this area is an area that has been heavily mined.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: We just needed to be conscious of that in our searches that we have done at this stage. We believe that we have catered for those risks but we will continue to be doing our due diligence on the way through in terms of the planning and development phase.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Lastly, what was the benefit-cost ratio for this project?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: I will need to take that on notice. Can I please come back to you on that?

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The benefit-cost ratio for the Muswellbrook Bypass project is 1.3.

Question 47

47.The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Thank you. I appreciate it.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: I just want to go back to the flood works on the Newell. I have a long-held issue with the betterment arrangements after flood. As I understand this State has repaired the road, the Newell Highway, after the floods but we cannot improve it to a better standard; we can only repair it to the standard it was. Is that correct?

Mr WAKELIN-KING: That is correct.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: We would have spent how much money doing that in the Bland? You can take that on notice. Now we are going to look at improving the road but we could not do the obvious improvements that are required back when the road was damaged. Is that right?

ANSWER:

I am advised:

The NSW Government is investing \$700 million in the upgrade of the Newell Highway. The Federal Government has also announced it will invest \$700 million in the Newell Highway. This \$1.4 billion investment will be undertaken in accordance with the NSW and Australian Government Newell Highway Corridor Strategies.

All works carried out under this upgrade program will have flood immunity benefits as the works will be carried out to the necessary hydrology requirements.

Furthermore, in the 2017 fiscal year, \$1,344,696 was spent on flood repair on the Newell Highway in the Bland Shire. Bland Shire Council has approval to undertake restoration works on local roads associated with damages resulting from the Winter-Spring flood events of 2016 (up to \$19.6 million).

These works are being delivered by Council over a number of years and are funded under the Commonwealth and State Government Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements. Due to the large amount of damage sustained to Bland Shire Local Roads, Council received an approved extension until 30 June 2021 to complete all works.

Question 48

48.The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I want to ask about some specific road projects that were committed to. Feel free to take this detail on notice but I want to ask about the funding source for the \$10 million to upgrade Werris Creek Road, over \$8 million towards sealing Rangari Road between Manilla and Boggabri and the \$4.4 million to upgrade Federation Way in Albury, which are all local roads that I understand are not funded under the Fixing Local Roads project. What was the funding source for those?

Mr STAPLES: Obviously we have a multibillion-dollar delivery program here so we do not necessarily come with the detail on every individual project at hand.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, understood.

Mr STAPLES: But I will ask Mr Wakelin-King to see whether he has anything specific on those.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Obviously we will come back with the specifics on each particular project and their funding source. The funding sources are the Special Purpose Grant, the Regional Rural Road Fund program is another source and there could be sources under Fixing Country Roads as opposed to Fixing Local Roads.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I am simply happy for you to clarify the funding source.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Yes, certainly.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I would be very comfortable with that.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: We will take those on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Again, you might want to take this on notice but under the Fixing Country Bridges program one of the bridges that there is an expectation might be fixed is the Cedar Party Creek Bridge in Wingham. I think the hope for the MidCoast Council is that they may receive the funding. Where is this up to? Is that funding likely to flow to the council or not?

Mr STAPLES: I think we might have to take that on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, I appreciate it. Thirdly, a very specific question: the new commuter car parking being set out in a range of places, a fair bit of it is in Sydney, but I will ask in relation to Tuggerah—

The Hon. WES FANG: Is it regional?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes, exactly. How many additional commuter car parking spaces will be created at the new commuter car park at Tuggerah as a result of the additional funding that has been announced?

Mr STAPLES: Obviously we have a really significant commuter car parking program in delivery. I will ask Mr Regan whether he has any particular detail on that one, otherwise we will take it on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I would be very happy with it on notice.

Mr REGAN: I do not have the specifics of Tuggerah but I will happily take it on notice and provide that detail for you.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Funding for roads in regional NSW, that form part of an established or recently announced program, will be subject to the guidelines and evaluation criteria within each program.

The NSW Government has committed to, and will deliver, the upgrade of Werris Creek Road and Rangari Road. Funding for these upgrades will be allocated from an appropriate program. The upgrade of Federation Way in Albury is being funded under the Fixing Country Roads Program.

The NSW Government has committed to provide funding for the Cedar Party Creek Bridge in Wingham as part of the Fixing Country Bridges program, due to open in early 2020.

I refer you to the answer given at the Hearing regarding Tuggerah car parking.

Question 49

49.The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Great. Okay.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: And on Mr Veitch's question around which timber truss bridges have been load limited, I can advise that I have advice that it goes back to 1964—the Victoria Bridge in Picton. There are a number of others more recently in relative terms: Monkerai Bridge, Clarence Town and Briner bridges, and McKanes bridge, all of which are under our Fixing Country Bridges program.

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: And McKanes bridge is now on the program, as I understand it, to be done.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: Yes. As is Briner, as is Monkerai, as is Clarence Town. I will provide the—

The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Nineteen-sixty-four—I did not think it was that far back, anyway.

Mr WAKELIN-KING: It went down to 15 tonnes and for the avoidance of doubt went down to five tonnes in 1992. I will come back to the Committee via taking it on notice in relation to our next steps in respect of that bridge.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

Following approval from the OEH of the Victoria Bridge Conservation Management Plan in February 2019, the next steps of work for the Victoria Bridge include the replacement of the timber western abutment (2019/20 FY), the replacement of various timber truss elements (2021/22 FY) and additional protection around the bridge piers (2021/22 FY).

In addition, the NSW Government has allocated \$3 million to investigate and plan a suitable bypass linking Remembrance Driveway and the Hume Highway via Picton Road. A future bypass would ease congestion through Picton and also on Victoria Bridge (Prince Street) and provide a suitable route for heavy vehicles.

Question 50 – 51

50.The Hon. MICK VEITCH: Okay. That would be very good.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I want to move to 2017. One of the reports is that there has been a reduction since then of 15 per cent in compliance operations inspectors in relation to heavy vehicles. Firstly, is that the case? Are those reports correct?

Mr STAPLES: Sorry, where are you drawing that? Are you able to table a document that gives something around that?

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I am not able to table a document but that is the suggestion that has been made to me. I firstly want to clarify is there a view about, since 2017, what the number of compliance operations inspectors is?

Mr STAPLES: We are obviously very focused on heavy vehicle inspections—a really committed workforce out on the ground across the State in various mobile as well as permanent heavy vehicle inspection stations. New South Wales uniquely has a challenge around heavy vehicles not just because we have a lot of activity within the State but because of the movement from Victoria and Queensland. As a through State we have been more active than any across the country in terms of that. And

obviously we have the role of the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator that we are working with as well. In terms of any specifics on the numbers around inspections I would have to take that particular one on notice.

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: Yes. I am comfortable with that.

51. The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: When you take that on notice can you also tell us how many truck intercepts were performed at heavy vehicle safety stations for each of the last two years. There had been a drop apparently of 17,000 from 2013 over the three years that followed that. Can you tell us what the figures are for the last two years?

Mr STAPLES: I am happy to have a look at what data we can provide in relation to that. I think

The Hon. JOHN GRAHAM: I accept that framework. I encourage you to take all these on notice. I am interested in four things: how many inspectors, how many truck intercepts, how many on-road or enforcement truck intercepts—these are in the last two years—and how many fatalities have there been from heavy vehicle crashes in those two years as well. I think your context is important but if you could then give us those figures.

Mr STAPLES: I am certainly happy to take those numbers on notice. The only caution I would offer is starting to try to correlate those things year on year.

ANSWER:

I am advised:

NSW has a comprehensive approach to supporting safety on our roads, and has the most active heavy vehicle safety compliance and enforcement program in Australia.

There are 241 heavy vehicle inspector positions in NSW with a current vacancy rate of 17.8%. There has been an increase in the number of vacancies by approximately 13% since 2017. There are several reasons for this, including staff promotions, retirements, and resignations.

Compliance rates in heavy vehicle inspections undertaken under the Heavy Vehicle National Law remain steady at around 87% compliance. The range of Compliance enforcement functions conducted by heavy vehicle inspectors has not decreased, and inspectors are supported by an extensive technology program that monitors heavy vehicles travelling across the NSW road network to ensure that the activity of inspectors is risk based for maximum results.

I also refer you to the Minister for Transport and Road's response to Transport and Roads supplementary questions 666 – 670.