

PARLIAMENT OF VICTORIA

**PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(HANSARD)**

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

FIFTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

FIRST SESSION

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Tuesday, 18 February 2014

(Extract from book 2)

Internet: www.parliament.vic.gov.au/downloadhansard

By authority of the Victorian Government Printer

The Governor

The Honourable ALEX CHERNOV, AC, QC

The Lieutenant-Governor

The Honourable Justice MARILYN WARREN, AC

The ministry (from 22 April 2013)

Premier, Minister for Regional Cities and Minister for Racing	The Hon. D. V. Napthine, MP
Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, and Minister for Regional and Rural Development	The Hon. P. J. Ryan, MP
Treasurer	The Hon. M. A. O'Brien, MP
Minister for Innovation, Services and Small Business, Minister for Tourism and Major Events, and Minister for Employment and Trade . . .	The Hon. Louise Asher, MP
Attorney-General, Minister for Finance and Minister for Industrial Relations	The Hon. R. W. Clark, MP
Minister for Health and Minister for Ageing	The Hon. D. M. Davis, MLC
Minister for Sport and Recreation, and Minister for Veterans' Affairs	The Hon. H. F. Delahunty, MP
Minister for Education	The Hon. M. F. Dixon, MP
Minister for Planning	The Hon. M. J. Guy, MLC
Minister for Higher Education and Skills, and Minister responsible for the Teaching Profession	The Hon. P. R. Hall, MLC
Minister for Ports, Minister for Major Projects and Minister for Manufacturing	The Hon. D. J. Hodgett, MP
Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, and Minister for Energy and Resources	The Hon. N. Kotsiras, MP
Minister for Housing, and Minister for Children and Early Childhood Development	The Hon. W. A. Lovell, MLC
Minister for Public Transport and Minister for Roads	The Hon. T. W. Mulder, MP
Minister for Liquor and Gaming Regulation, Minister for Corrections and Minister for Crime Prevention	The Hon. E. J. O'Donohue, MLC
Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal Affairs	The Hon. E. J. Powell, MP
Assistant Treasurer, Minister for Technology and Minister responsible for the Aviation Industry	The Hon. G. K. Rich-Phillips, MLC
Minister for Environment and Climate Change, and Minister for Youth Affairs	The Hon. R. Smith, MP
Minister for the Arts, Minister for Women's Affairs and Minister for Consumer Affairs	The Hon. H. Victoria, MP
Minister for Agriculture and Food Security, and Minister for Water	The Hon. P. L. Walsh, MP
Minister for Police and Emergency Services, and Minister for Bushfire Response	The Hon. K. A. Wells, MP
Minister for Mental Health, Minister for Community Services, and Minister for Disability Services and Reform	The Hon. M. L. N. Wooldridge, MP
Cabinet Secretary	Mr N. Wakeling, MP

Legislative Assembly committees

Privileges Committee — Ms Barker, Mr Clark, Ms Green, Mr Hodgett, Mr Morris, Mr Nardella, Mr O'Brien, Mr Pandazopoulos and Mr Walsh.

Standing Orders Committee — The Speaker, Ms Allan, Ms Asher, Ms Barker, Mr Hodgett, Ms Kairouz, Mr O'Brien and Mrs Powell.

Joint committees

Accountability and Oversight Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Kanis, Mr McIntosh and Ms Neville.
(*Council*): Mr O'Brien and Mr Ronalds.

Dispute Resolution Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Allan, Ms Asher, Mr Clark, Ms Hennessy, Mr Merlino, Mr O'Brien and Mr Walsh. (*Council*): Mr D. Davis, Mr Hall, Mr Lenders, Ms Lovell and Ms Pennicuik.

Economic Development, Infrastructure and Outer Suburban/Interface Services Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Burgess, Mr McGuire and Mr Shaw. (*Council*): Mrs Peulich and Mr Ronalds.

Education and Training Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Brooks and Mr Crisp. (*Council*): Mr Elasmarr and Mrs Kronberg.

Electoral Matters Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Northe. (*Council*): Mr Finn, Mrs Peulich, Mr Somyurek and Mr Tarlamis.

Environment and Natural Resources Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Bull, Ms Duncan, Mr Pandazopoulos and Ms Wreford. (*Council*): Mr Koch.

Family and Community Development Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Halfpenny, Mr Madden and Ms Ryall. (*Council*): Mrs Coote and Mr O'Brien.

House Committee — (*Assembly*): The Speaker (*ex officio*), Ms Beattie, Mr Blackwood, Mr Burgess, Ms Campbell, Ms Thomson and Mr Weller. (*Council*): The President (*ex officio*), Mr Drum, Mr Eideh, Mr Finn, Ms Hartland, and Mrs Peulich.

Independent Broad-based Anti-corruption Commission Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Hennessy, Mr McIntosh, Mr Newton-Brown and Mr Weller. (*Council*): Mr Viney.

Law Reform, Drugs and Crime Prevention Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Carroll, Mr McCurdy and Mr Southwick. (*Council*): Mr Ramsay and Mr Scheffer.

Public Accounts and Estimates Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Angus, Ms Garrett, Mr Morris, Mr Pakula and Mr Scott. (*Council*): Mr O'Brien and Mr Ondarchie.

Road Safety Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Languiller, Mr Perera, Mr Tilley and Mr Thompson. (*Council*): Mr Elsbury.

Rural and Regional Committee — (*Assembly*): Mr Howard, Mr Katos, Mr Trezise and Mr Weller. (*Council*): Mr Drum.

Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee — (*Assembly*): Ms Barker, Ms Campbell, Mr Gidley, Mr Nardella, Dr Sykes and Mr Watt. (*Council*): Mr Dalla-Riva.

Heads of parliamentary departments

Assembly — Clerk of the Parliaments and Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Mr R. W. Purdey

Council — Clerk of the Legislative Council: Mr W. R. Tunnecliffe

Parliamentary Services — Secretary: Mr P. Lochert

**MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
FIFTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT — FIRST SESSION**

Speaker:

The Hon. CHRISTINE. FYFFE (from 4 February 2014)

The Hon. K. M. SMITH (to 4 February 2014)

Deputy Speaker:

Mr P. WELLER (from 4 February 2014)

Mrs C. A. FYFFE (to 4 February 2014)

Acting Speakers: Mr Angus, Ms Beattie, Mr Blackwood, Mr Burgess, Ms Campbell, Mr Languiller, Mr McCurdy, Mr McGuire, Mr McIntosh, Ms McLeish, Mr Morris, Mr Nardella, Mr Northe, Mr Pandazopoulos, Ms Ryall, Dr Sykes and Mr Thompson.

Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party and Premier:

The Hon. D. V. NAPHTHINE (from 6 March 2013)

The Hon. E. N. BAILLIEU (to 6 March 2013)

Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party:

The Hon. LOUISE ASHER

Leader of The Nationals and Deputy Premier:

The Hon. P. J. RYAN

Deputy Leader of The Nationals:

The Hon. P. L. WALSH

Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party and Leader of the Opposition:

The Hon. D. M. ANDREWS

Deputy Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party and Deputy Leader of the Opposition:

The Hon. J. A. MERLINO

Member	District	Party	Member	District	Party
Allan, Ms Jacinta Marie	Bendigo East	ALP	Languiller, Mr Telmo Ramon	Derrimut	ALP
Andrews, Mr Daniel Michael	Mulgrave	ALP	Lim, Mr Muy Hong	Clayton	ALP
Angus, Mr Neil Andrew Warwick	Forest Hill	LP	McCurdy, Mr Timothy Logan	Murray Valley	Nats
Asher, Ms Louise	Brighton	LP	McGuire, Mr Frank ⁶	Broadmeadows	ALP
Baillieu, Mr Edward Norman	Hawthorn	LP	McIntosh, Mr Andrew John	Kew	LP
Barker, Ms Ann Patricia	Oakleigh	ALP	McLeish, Ms Lucinda Gaye	Seymour	LP
Battin, Mr Bradley William	Gembrook	LP	Madden, Mr Justin Mark	Essendon	ALP
Bauer, Mrs Donna Jane	Carrum	LP	Merlino, Mr James Anthony	Monbulk	ALP
Beattie, Ms Elizabeth Jean	Yuroke	ALP	Miller, Ms Elizabeth Eileen	Bentleigh	LP
Blackwood, Mr Gary John	Narracan	LP	Morris, Mr David Charles	Mornington	LP
Brooks, Mr Colin William	Bundoora	ALP	Mulder, Mr Terence Wynn	Polwarth	LP
Brumby, Mr John Mansfield ¹	Broadmeadows	ALP	Naphtine, Dr Denis Vincent	South-West Coast	LP
Bull, Mr Timothy Owen	Gippsland East	Nats	Nardella, Mr Donato Antonio	Melton	ALP
Burgess, Mr Neale Ronald	Hastings	LP	Neville, Ms Lisa Mary	Bellarine	ALP
Campbell, Ms Christine Mary	Pascoe Vale	ALP	Newton-Brown, Mr Clement Arundel	Prahran	LP
Carbines, Mr Anthony Richard	Ivanhoe	ALP	Noonan, Mr Wade Mathew	Williamstown	ALP
Carroll, Mr Benjamin Alan ²	Niddrie	ALP	Northe, Mr Russell John	Morwell	Nats
Clark, Mr Robert William	Box Hill	LP	O'Brien, Mr Michael Anthony	Malvern	LP
Crisp, Mr Peter Laurence	Mildura	Nats	Pakula, Mr Martin Philip ⁷	Lyndhurst	ALP
D'Ambrosio, Ms Liliana	Mill Park	ALP	Pallas, Mr Timothy Hugh	Tarneit	ALP
Delahunty, Mr Hugh Francis	Lowan	Nats	Pandazopoulos, Mr John	Dandenong	ALP
Dixon, Mr Martin Francis	Nepean	LP	Perera, Mr Jude	Cranbourne	ALP
Donnellan, Mr Luke Anthony	Narre Warren North	ALP	Pike, Ms Bronwyn Jane ⁸	Melbourne	ALP
Duncan, Ms Joanne Therese	Macedon	ALP	Powell, Mrs Elizabeth Jeanette	Shepparton	Nats
Edwards, Ms Janice Maree	Bendigo West	ALP	Richardson, Ms Fiona Catherine Alison	Northcote	ALP
Eren, Mr John Hamdi	Lara	ALP	Ryall, Ms Deanne Sharon	Mitcham	LP
Foley, Mr Martin Peter	Albert Park	ALP	Ryan, Mr Peter Julian	Gippsland South	Nats
Fyffe, Mrs Christine Ann	Evelyn	LP	Scott, Mr Robin David	Preston	ALP
Garrett, Ms Jane Furneaux	Brunswick	ALP	Shaw, Mr Geoffrey Page ⁹	Frankston	Ind
Gidley, Mr Michael Xavier Charles	Mount Waverley	LP	Smith, Mr Kenneth Maurice	Bass	LP
Graley, Ms Judith Ann	Narre Warren South	ALP	Smith, Mr Ryan	Warrandyte	LP
Green, Ms Danielle Louise	Yan Yean	ALP	Southwick, Mr David James	Caulfield	LP
Halfpenny, Ms Bronwyn	Thomastown	ALP	Sykes, Dr William Everett	Benalla	Nats
Helper, Mr Jochen	Ripon	ALP	Thompson, Mr Murray Hamilton Ross	Sandringham	LP
Hennessy, Ms Jill	Altona	ALP	Thomson, Ms Marsha Rose	Footscray	ALP
Herbert, Mr Steven Ralph	Eltham	ALP	Tilley, Mr William John	Benambra	LP
Hodgett, Mr David John	Kilsyth	LP	Trezise, Mr Ian Douglas	Geelong	ALP
Holding, Mr Timothy James ³	Lyndhurst	ALP	Victoria, Ms Heidi	Bayswater	LP
Howard, Mr Geoffrey Kemp	Ballarat East	ALP	Wakeling, Mr Nicholas	Ferntree Gully	LP
Hulls, Mr Rob Justin ⁴	Niddrie	ALP	Walsh, Mr Peter Lindsay	Swan Hill	Nats
Hutchins, Ms Natalie Maree Sykes	Keilor	ALP	Watt, Mr Graham Travis	Burwood	LP
Kairouz, Ms Marlene	Kororoit	ALP	Weller, Mr Paul	Rodney	Nats
Kanis, Ms Jennifer ⁵	Melbourne	ALP	Wells, Mr Kimberley Arthur	Scoresby	LP
Katos, Mr Andrew	South Barwon	LP	Wooldridge, Ms Mary Louise Newling	Doncaster	LP
Knight, Ms Sharon Patricia	Ballarat West	ALP	Wreford, Ms Lorraine Joan	Mordialloc	LP
Kotsiras, Mr Nicholas	Bulleen	LP	Wynne, Mr Richard William	Richmond	ALP

¹ Resigned 21 December 2010

² Elected 24 March 2012

³ Resigned 18 February 2013

⁴ Resigned 27 January 2012

⁵ Elected 21 July 2012

⁶ Elected 19 February 2011

⁷ Elected 27 April 2013

⁸ Resigned 7 May 2012

⁹ LP until 6 March 2013

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TUESDAY, 18 FEBRUARY 2014

4861.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	535
4862.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	536
4864.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	536
4865.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	537
4866.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	538
4867.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	539
4868.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	540
4869.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	541
4870.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	541
4872.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	542
4873.	<i>Ports: Webb Dock development</i>	543
4874.	<i>Police and emergency services:</i>	
	<i>Emergency Services</i>	
	<i>Telecommunications Authority</i>	544

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

*Answers to the following questions on notice were circulated on the date shown.
Questions have been incorporated from the notice paper of the Legislative Assembly.
Answers have been incorporated in the form supplied by the departments on behalf of the appropriate ministers.
The portfolio of the minister answering the question on notice starts each heading.*

Tuesday, 18 February 2014

Ports: Webb Dock development

4861. Mr FOLEY to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation’s invitation to a consortium comprised of CMA CGM S.A., ANL Container Line Pty Ltd and Macquarie Specialised Asset Management Ltd, to submit a proposal for the third container port at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did the consortium lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did the consortium submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the consortium’s proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
- (4) Does the consortium’s proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the consortium’s bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the consortium’s proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the consortium’s proposal.
- (8) Has the consortium’s proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to the consortium or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to the consortium about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
- (11) Did the consortium’s proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the consortium’s proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as ‘commercial in confidence’ under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

4862. Mr FOLEY to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation’s invitation to Australian International Container Terminals Ltd (AICTL) to submit a proposal for the third container port in Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did AICTL lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did AICTL submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the AICTL proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
- (4) Does the AICTL proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the AICTL bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the AICTL proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the AICTL proposal.
- (8) Has the AICTL proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to AICTL or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to AICTL about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
- (11) Did the AICTL proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the AICTL proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as ‘commercial in confidence’ under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

4864. Mr FOLEY to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation’s invitation to Hutchison Port Holdings to submit a proposal for the third container port at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did Hutchison Port Holdings lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did Hutchison Port Holdings submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.

- (4) Does the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Hutchison Port Holdings bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal.
- (8) Has the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Hutchison Port Holdings or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Hutchison Port Holdings about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
- (11) Did the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as 'commercial in confidence' under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

4865. **Mr FOLEY** to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation's invitation to Qube Holdings Ltd to submit a proposal for the third container port at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did Qube Holdings Ltd lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did Qube Holdings Ltd submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the Qube Holdings Ltd proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
- (4) Does the Qube Holdings Ltd proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Qube Holdings Ltd bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Qube Holdings Ltd proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Qube Holdings Ltd proposal.
- (8) Has the Qube Holdings Ltd proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:

- (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Qube Holdings Ltd or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
 - (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Qube Holdings Ltd about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
 - (11) Did the Qube Holdings Ltd proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
 - (12) Did the Qube Holdings Ltd proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as 'commercial in confidence' under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

4866. **Mr FOLEY** to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation's invitation to Autonexus to submit a proposal for the pre-delivery inspection hub at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did Autonexus lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did Autonexus submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the Autonexus proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
- (4) Does the Autonexus proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Autonexus bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Autonexus proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Autonexus proposal.
- (8) Has the Autonexus proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Autonexus or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Autonexus about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.

- (11) Did the Autonexus proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the Autonexus proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as 'commercial in confidence' under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

4867. **Mr FOLEY** to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation's invitation to Hutchison Port Holdings to submit a proposal for the pre-delivery inspection hub at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did Hutchison Port Holdings lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did Hutchison Port Holdings submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
- (4) Does the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Hutchison Port Holdings bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal.
- (8) Has the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Hutchison Port Holdings or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Hutchison Port Holdings about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
- (11) Did the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as 'commercial in confidence' under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

4868. **Mr FOLEY** to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation's invitation to Patrick Autocare to submit a proposal for the pre-delivery inspection hub at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did Patrick Autocare lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did Patrick Autocare submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the Patrick Autocare proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
- (4) Does the Patrick Autocare proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Patrick Autocare bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Patrick Autocare proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Patrick Autocare proposal.
- (8) Has the Patrick Autocare proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Patrick Autocare or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Patrick Autocare about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
- (11) Did the Patrick Autocare proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the Patrick Autocare proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as 'commercial in confidence' under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

- 4869.** **Mr FOLEY** to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation’s invitation to Prixcar to submit a proposal for the pre-delivery inspection hub at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:
- (1) Did Prixcar lodge the proposal as requested.
 - (2) On what date did Prixcar submit the proposal.
 - (3) Was the Prixcar proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
 - (4) Does the Prixcar proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
 - (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Prixcar bid to deliver against their plans.
 - (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Prixcar proposal.
 - (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Prixcar proposal.
 - (8) Has the Prixcar proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
 - (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Prixcar or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
 - (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Prixcar about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
 - (11) Did the Prixcar proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
 - (12) Did the Prixcar proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as ‘commercial in confidence’ under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

- 4870.** **Mr FOLEY** to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation’s invitation to Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics to submit a proposal for the pre-delivery inspection hub at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:
- (1) Did Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics lodge the proposal as requested.
 - (2) On what date did Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics submit the proposal.
 - (3) Was the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.

- (4) Does the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics proposal.
- (8) Has the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
- (11) Did the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as 'commercial in confidence' under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

4872. **Mr FOLEY** to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation's invitation to Hutchison Port Holdings to submit a proposal for the automotive terminal at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did Hutchison Port Holdings lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did Hutchison Port Holdings submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
- (4) Does the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Hutchison Port Holdings bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal.

- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal.
- (8) Has the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.
- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Hutchison Port Holdings or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Hutchison Port Holdings about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
- (11) Did the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the Hutchison Port Holdings proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as 'commercial in confidence' under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Ports: Webb Dock development

4873. **Mr FOLEY** to ask the Minister for Ports — with reference to the Port of Melbourne Corporation's invitation to Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS to submit a proposal for the automotive terminal at Webb Dock Port Melbourne:

- (1) Did Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS lodge the proposal as requested.
- (2) On what date did Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS submit the proposal.
- (3) Was the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS proposal merged with the proposal of another consortium; if so, which consortium and on what date; if not, did the proposal proceed as an individual proposal.
- (4) Does the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS proposal comply with the specifications and requirements sought by the Port of Melbourne Corporation and the government in the initial expression of interest phase.
- (5) What is the total amount in capital of the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS bid to deliver against their plans.
- (6) What is the time frame for consideration of the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS proposal.
- (7) What is the time frame for the final decision to be made on the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS proposal.
- (8) Has the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS proposal addressed the need to ensure freight and logistic movements in and out of the Port of Melbourne avoid local council streets in both the City of Melbourne and the City of Port Phillip; if so:
 - (a) which roads will be avoided;
 - (b) which roads will be subject to continued freight movements.

- (9) Did VicRoads provide information to Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS or to the Port of Melbourne about the implications of freight movements in and out of the Webb Dock area; if so, what was it.
- (10) Did the Port of Melbourne Corporation provide information or specifications to Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS about the implications of freight movements upon local roads, state roads and CityLink roads; if so, what was it.
- (11) Did the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS proposal address issues resulting from the relationship between the port capacity project and the growth in road freight movements through the Fishermans Bend Inner Urban Renewal area zone; if so, how.
- (12) Did the Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics AS proposal address community benefit and community legacy aspects of the project; if so, what were they.

ANSWER:

I am informed that, as at the date the question was raised:

The bidding processes being conducted by the Port of Melbourne Corporation in relation to the port capacity project are subject to a strict probity and confidentiality regime in order to preserve commercial integrity and confidence.

Any details in relation to the bidding process or details contained within information lodged as part of the bids remain classified as 'commercial in confidence' under the management of the Port of Melbourne Corporation.

Police and emergency services: Emergency Services Telecommunications Authority

4874. Ms **KNIGHT** to ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services — with reference to hearings at the Fair Work Commission initiated by the Department of Health or Ambulance Victoria in 2013 seeking cessation of protected action at the ESTA call centre in Mount Helen:

- (1) For each instance, was outside counsel engaged; if so:
 - (a) which law firm was engaged;
 - (b) what was the cost of engaging the law firm.
- (2) How many departmental staff were present at each hearing.
- (3) Were any hearings sought at the specific direction of the minister.

ANSWER:

I am advised that:

- (1) Yes.
 - (a) Minter Ellison Lawyers.
 - (b) Approximately \$100 000.
- (2) There were two staff members from the Department of Justice and one staff member from the Department of Treasury and Finance present for part of each hearing.
- (3) The minister did not initiate the hearings at the Fair Work Commission. The hearings were initiated by the Emergency Services Telecommunications Authority (ESTA) to address concerns of public safety.