

GRAIN FREIGHT NETWORK — FUNDING

**1037. Hon KEN TRAVERS to the Minister for Transport:**

I refer to the Minister for Transport's answer to question without notice 945.

- (1) Can the minister confirm that the business case used a single value for all externalities that is based on the cost of crashes being assessed using a "human capital approach with an element of WTP grafted on"?
- (2) If no to (1), what basis was used to assess the cost of the crashes?
- (3) Will the minister table copies of the two documents he identified in his answer to question (1)(c); and, if not, why not?
- (4) Is the minister or his agency aware of the Austroads report, "Component Costs in Transport Projects to Ensure the Appropriate Valuing of Safety Effects"; and, if yes, were any of its recommendations considered in determining the externalities to be used in the business case?
- (5) Does the government accept that rail transport is safer than road transport by a factor of between six and nine times; and, if not, why not?
- (6) Did the government make any assessment of the number of additional accidents or fatalities that will occur as a result of the grain task being transferred from tier 3 lines to road transport; and, if yes, what was it?

**Hon SIMON O'BRIEN replied:**

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question.

- (1) Yes. Externalities were considered, as identified in question without notice 945.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) Although these reports are publicly available, I do not have immediate access to them for tabling.
- (4) No. Refer to answer to question without notice 945.
- (5) Rail is generally considered to be safer than road. Transport decisions by those undertaking a freight task will also be based on economics and pricing.
- (6) Safety was incorporated in the analysis of all externalities.