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*1. Mr Moppett asked:

(a) Why was the capital budget for Glenmore Park High School not spent last year?

(b) Why has the date for its completion been extended to the year 2000?

(c) Does this mean that the school will not open before that date?

Answer—

(a) Difficulties were experienced in gaining Development Approval from Penrith City Council. Although the Development Application was lodged with Council in April 1996, it was not approved until March 1997. Contracts for construction cannot be let without Development Approval.

(b) The construction of the school will be completed during 1998.

(c) Stage One of the school is programmed to open Term 1, 1998.

*2. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 298:

(a) What types of policy and planning projects cost $8.4 million last year and are anticipated to cost $7.1 million in 1997/8?

(b) Does it mean that adding employee related expenses that policy and planning will really cost $17 million?

Answer—


(b) No.

*3. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-88 - Overview by agency:

What is the level of funding for:

(a) capital,

(b) current,
(c) other purposes from the Commonwealth?

Answer—

DSE  (a) $72.0m
     (b) $326.8m
     (c) $95.6m

DTEC (a) $6.15m
      (b) $72.329m
      (c) nil

TAFE  (a) $50m
       (b) $181.756m
       (c) nil

BOS   (a) nil
       (b) $870,000
       (c) nil

*4. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 297:

What does the $78,000 loss on the sale of non-current assets represent?

Answer—

The figure represents the required accounting standard for the book value of outdated computers and other equipment transferred at no charge to the Department of School Education.

*5. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-91:

It is stated that in June 1996 the State Government announced the allocation of $10 million for training and reskilling in the building versus construction industry in the lead up to the Olympics.

(1) What was the source of these funds.

(2) What percentage of the funds are allocated to:
(a) data collection?
(b) tendering processes?
(c) monitoring?

Answer—


(2) (a), (b) and (c): To provide detailed statistical responses to these parts of the question would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the Department of Training and Education Co-ordination that cannot be justified.

6. Nil Question

*7. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-89:

(1) What was the total of ANTA funds to NSW for 1997?
(2) What is the breakdown of this allocation?

Answer—

(1) Approximately $295 million will be received by the State from ANTA for 1997.

(2) This allocation includes base recurrent funding, recurrent literacy funding, growth funds, funds for VET in schools, conditional funds for additional 1996 traineeships, funds for buildings, equipment and childcare, money for industry-based Skills Centres and Skills Centres for school students, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander facilities.

*8. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 302:

$3.2 million was budgeted for redundancies in 1996/7 yet less than 1/3 was actually expended.

(1) Why did this occur?
(2) What confidence do you have that the 1996 target will be achieved in 1997/8?

Answer—

(1) Redundancy expenditure relates to the restructuring process. The Department is continuing to redeploy most staff in an effort to minimise redundancies.

(2) Not applicable.

*9. Mrs Chadwick asked:
In reference to Budget Paper 3, Volume 1, p. 298.

(1) What floor space is currently leased but unoccupied across the portfolio?

(2) What is the cost of such space?

Answer—

To provide detailed statistical responses to these questions would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the agencies in the education and training portfolio that cannot be justified.

*10. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 309:

What is the explanation for just over $2 million in redundancies for 1996/7?

Answer—

Redundancy payments made in 1996/97 relate to the Department’s administrative restructure conducted during the 1995/96 financial year.

*11. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, pp 308, 310, 313 and 316:

Last year the Government gained interest across the portfolio of $8763 million this represents the interest on what funds?

Answer—

Cash management arrangements were implemented by Treasury during the 1993/94 financial year. Interest earnings are calculated on the agency cash balances, incorporating all funds (irrespective of the funding source).

*12. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 311: Sales of property plant and equipment Kindergarten and Primary Education:

(a) What sales generated $14.8 million in 1996/7?

(b) What anticipated sales are expected to generate $10.2 million 1997/8?
Answer—

(a) Various surplus school sites.

(b) It is expected that further sales of surplus school sites totalling $10M will be achieved in 1997/98.

*13. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 314:

What sales of property plant and equipment:

(a) generated $7.1 million in 1996/7?

(b) are expected to generate $4.2 million in 1997/8?

Answer—

Property sales cannot be split between 7-10 and 11-12 programs. Pro-rata estimates of revenue are provided for Budget purposes.

*14. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-88:

It is stated that an additional 5,000 places were provided in TAFE for 1997.

(1) What were the priority areas where those places were provided?

Answer—

Places were provided in the following areas: Western Sydney (1,250 places), North Coast (900), South Western Sydney (750), Hunter (700), Illawarra (550), Southern Sydney (300), Riverina (75), Western (75), New England (75), Sydney (100), Northern Sydney (125) and OTEN (100).

Priority was given to areas with increased industry demand including: information technology (1255), tourism and hospitality (800), general education and training (1105), community services, health and education (580) and business and clerical (810).

*15. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 317 - Years 11 & 12:

What sales of property plant and equipment generated $3.146 million in 1996/7 and are anticipated to generate $2.5 million in 1997/8?

Answer—

Property sales cannot be split between 7-10 and 11-12 programs. Pro-rata estimates of revenue are provided for Budget purposes.
16. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 320:

Why has the number of Country Area program schools decreased?

Answer—

The number of Country Areas Program (CAP) schools administered by the Department of School Education has decreased as a result of:

• the closure, at the end of 1995 following decisions by the previous government, of a number of schools including some small CAP schools; and

• the Diocese of Wilcannia/Forbes deciding to independently administer their Commonwealth CAP funding in 1996 and 1997.

17. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-88 - Overview:

In relation to current payment Department of School Education:

(1) What is the current level of Commonwealth notifiable funds?

(2) Will you provide an outline of the disposal of these funds?

Answer—

(1) Commonwealth Notifiable funds total $123.8 million in 1997/98.

(2) These funds have been allocated across the Department’s budget programs as follows:

- Core (90%)

- Balance (10%) including:
  - Special Education
  - Rural Education
  - Socio-Economic
  - Aboriginal Education
  - Non English Speaking Background
  - Strategic

18. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-94:

I note that Commonwealth funding for Aboriginal Education has increased.

(1) Of the $20 million allocated to Aboriginal education in 1997/8 what percentage was the state contribution?
Of the $20 million allocated to Aboriginal Education in 1997/98 the State’s contribution represents some 31%.

*19. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-92 - Expenditure Trends:

(1) Will estimated expenditure increase for 1997/8?

(2) Does this increase include the $50 per child allocation?

(3) What measures are in place to ensure that those funds actually go towards school education?

Answer—

(1) Yes

(2) Yes

(3) The initiative represents a payment to parents of school children attending Kindergarten to Year 12 in both government and non government schools in NSW to help them reduce the cost of clothing and equipping children for school.

*20. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-96:

(1) What level of additional funds are being provided to:

(a) Support Asian language programs?

(b) Support the training of primary teachers to extend language provision?

(2) What is the source of these funds?

Answer—

(1) (a &b) Additional funding of $1.7 million is being provided in 1997/98 to support Community Language Programs (including Asian Languages).

(2) The Consolidated Fund

*21. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-96:

It is stated that programs are being targeted at increasing the students undertaking language studies.

(1) How are you doing that and what indications of success are evident.
Answer—

The programs are the;

- Student Language Study in Overseas Countries Program
- Access to Language via Satellite (ALS)
- Consultancy Support
- Japan Album, a multimedia CD-ROM.
- China Album, based on the Japan Album concept.

The success of these programs will be judged through participation and the value placed on them by both teachers and students. This success will include students with higher proficiency levels in languages. Sixty-five percent of primary schools have language programs.

*22. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-96 - Anti violence program:

(1) Where are the 102 staff referred to located?

(2) What is their job description?

Answer—

(1) The 102 staff include:

- specialist teachers who are located in the general areas where the original appointments were made.
- community liaison officers who are allocated on a needs basis
- community information officers (NESB).
- school counsellor positions
- teachers’ aides who are allocated on a needs basis to districts across the state.

(2) All of these positions are involved in supporting schools in the management of various anti-violence initiatives.

*23. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-95:

I note that implementing a fresh approach to special education is listed as a priority for 1997:

(1) (a) Does this refer to the McRae Report?
(b) If so, can you advise where I may find the allocation for the implementation of the report?

(c) If not, can you explain why the report has been rejected and what is the alternate “fresh approach” referred to in priorities for 1997?

Answer—

(1) (a) Implementing a fresh approach to special education refers to new measures designed to provide direct support to teachers and schools. As part of the restructure the Department of School Education, Special Education Consultants positions have been established in each of the 40 districts. The role of these positions is to co-ordinate and manage the delivery of special education services. These positions are a significant resource, and are in addition to Learning Difficulties Coordinator positions which have also been established in each of the districts to provide support coordination for services for students with learning difficulties.

The Special Education Consultant positions in districts are supported by six Leaders Operational Support who work as part of the Special Education Directorate and are based in State Office locations at Bathurst, Newcastle, Wollongong, Blacktown and Ryde.

The primary focus of these measures is to provide effective coordination of services between state offices, districts and schools, so that teachers are better able to meet the needs of students with disabilities and learning difficulties and their families or carers.

The opportunity to introduce measures derived from the McRae Report will be considered following advice from the DSE to me.

(b) and (c) See above.

*24. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-99:

Will you outline the current criteria for the airconditioning of schools and demountables?

Answer—

The major criteria of the revamped air conditioning program is to target the hottest classrooms in high heat stress schools. All schools experiencing high heat stress will receive relief by having their hottest classrooms air conditioned more quickly. Funding for the new program has been increased from $2 million to $5 million per annum.

The nature of the building, the extent of its use and the views of the school community will be taken into consideration to maximise benefits to as many schools as possible.

Schools to be treated first are in the hottest areas of rural New South Wales experiencing mean maximum mid-summer temperatures of 30°C or more. Demountable classrooms will be treated down to the 29°C isotherm.

*25. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-104:
What is the level of State funding in TAFE’s capital program of $94.4 million.

Answer—

The level of State funding in TAFE’s capital program is $40.6 million. This represents an increase of 15 percent over 1996-97.

*26. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-99:

I note that an additional $1 million is provided for an enhanced drug and alcohol strategy in 1997/8.

(1) What is the source of these funds?

Answer—

This additional funding is a State Government initiative met from the Consolidated Fund.

*27. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 322 and p. 328:

In relation to the attendance rates for distance education pupils.

(1) What are the attendance rates for the general school population?

   (a) Primary
   (b) Years 7-10
   (c) Years 11-12

(2) (a) Why is the attendance rate for 1996/7 for students in staying on programs not available?

   (b) When will the rate be known?

Answer—

(1) and (2) It is compulsory for all school aged children as specified in the Education Act to attend school.

   For students in Years 10-12, the attendance rate for the general school population in 1996 was 90.4 percent

*28. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 330:

(1) (a) Has the system of scholarships been abolished?

   (b) If so why?
Answer—

(1) The system has been discontinued.

Those students who are currently on a scholarship to support their teacher education studies will continue to receive financial support for the duration of their scholarship. They will be appointed to permanent positions at the conclusion of their studies according to the terms of their deeds of agreement.

*29. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 333:

I note that for 1995/6, 1996/7 and 1997/8 that student numbers in non-government schools have increased by approximately 5,000 per annum.

(1) Do you anticipate this trend to continue?

Answer—

It is not possible accurately to predict possible increases in the future enrolment of non-government schools. Such an increase could be significantly affected by implementation of Federal Government policy on enrolment benchmarks.

*30. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-88:

(1) What activities has DSE undertaken and what activities are planned for the DSE contribution to the year 2000 Olympic Games.

(2) What is the estimate of the total financial contribution?

Answer—

(1) Since the announcement of the Sydney 2000 Olympics in September, 1993, the DSE has maintained a commitment to Olympic Education programs and the involvement of students in Olympic activities.

The Olympic 2000 Schools Strategy which has been developed in conjunction with the AOC and the SOCOG, now forms the basis of a tripartite agreement and encompasses programs and initiatives to be implemented on a statewide basis.

In addition, a broad-based management group including the non-government education systems has been established.

New South Wales will host the 2000 Pacific School Games in Sydney prior to the Year 2000 Olympic Games using the Olympic facilities.

(2) Detailed funding arrangements for the 2000 Pacific School Games are still being developed.
*31. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-100:

If young people (under 19) represented over 1/4 of enrolled students:

(1) What is the overall age profile for TAFE students?

Answer—

Below is table showing 1996 TAFE NSW enrolments by age group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Years &amp; Under</td>
<td>103,384</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29 Years</td>
<td>134,157</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39 Years</td>
<td>91,071</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49 Years</td>
<td>57,381</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Years &amp; Over</td>
<td>27,439</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>4,441</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>417,873</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*32. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-100:

I note TAFE enrolments increased by 1.5% between 1995 and 1996.

(1) What was the EFTU for both years?

(2) In what subject areas was there unmet demand?

(3) Were (1) and (2) influenced by geographic locations and if so please identify these by area?

(4) What is the anticipated enrolment level and EFTU for 1997?

(5) In what subject areas was there unmet demand in semester 1, 1997?

(6) In what subject areas were there vacancies in semester 1, 1997?

(7) Were (5) and (6) influenced by geographical location and if so please specify by area.

Answer—

(1) The number of equivalent full-time students (EFTS) as measured by curriculum hours were:

(a) 123,209 in 1995

(b) 120,541 in 1996

1996 data has been collected using a more stringent approach and therefore is not comparable with 1995 data.
(2) The major areas with standby lists included Business Services, Information Technology, Personal and Community Services, Foundation Studies and Arts and Media.

(3) Metropolitan colleges accounted for over half of EFTS in 1996. Areas showing growth in the number of EFTS from 1995 to 1996 were South Western Sydney, Riverina and Southern Sydney.

(4) In 1997, the anticipated enrolment count is 430,350 and EFTS is 123,825.

(5) In semester 1, 1997 areas with standby lists included Arts and Media, Business Services, Information Technology, Personal and Community Services, Tourism and Hospitality, and Foundation Studies.

(6) and (7) To provide a detailed statistical response to these parts of this question would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the NSW TAFE Commission that cannot be justified.

*33A. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 303:

What happened to the recoupment administration costs last year?

Answer—

The revised 1996 figure is less than the estimate because administration costs were not recouped from TAFE NSW during the restructure and fees from other agencies were either revised down, which reflected the service provided, or were recorded against another budget program.

*34A. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, Volume 1, p. 296 and 297:

Recognising that DTEC was created to achieve efficiencies and avoid duplication:

(1) Why will DTEC increase staff costs from $31.3 million to $36.9 million in 1997/8?

Answer—

DTEC staff costs have increased as a result of the consolidation of TAFE and DTEC central policy, planning and corporate services functions from TAFE into DTEC to service both organisations. The consolidation has involved a reduction of 265 positions from the formerly separate DTEC/TAFE establishment. In addition, the National Art School has been established as an independent institution.

*33B. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-92:

(1) What fitouts will be undertaken in relation to the $1.11 million allocation in 1997/8?
Answer—

Make good work will be carried out at locations vacated by the Department. This work had been costed into the rationalisation of the DTEC/TAFE accommodation. Refurbishment works are also required on heritage buildings at the National Arts School at East Sydney. The balance of the funds is required for maintenance work on heritage buildings at Kirkbride.

*34B. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 297:

What is the explanation for the fluctuations between last year’s budget revised estimates versus this year’s estimates, for user charges and other departmental revenue?

Answer—

The variation in User Charges Revenue between the 1996-97 Revised Estimate and the 1997-98 Estimate is due to anticipated recoupment of administration costs from TAFE NSW and the Commonwealth decision to no longer fund the New Work Opportunities and Landcare and Environment Action programs.

Variations in Other Departmental Revenue reflect the reallocation of funding within the Education and Training portfolio and further reductions in Commonwealth vocational education and training funding.

*35. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

(a) catering and entertainment of any form;

(b) travel and accommodation of any form; and

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

*36. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s)?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies?

Answer—
(1) and (2) As is the case in all Westminster systems, Minister’s are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.

*37. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97, and at what cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip?

Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.

*38. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.

*39. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:
(a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?

(b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?

(c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?

(d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?

(e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

(1) (a-e) and (2) Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.

*40. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and its funding are set out at pace 12 of the Budget Summary.

*41. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(b) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for these purposes?

(2) (a) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97?
(b) How many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

(3) (a) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98?

(b) How many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

Answer—

(1) to (3) The refurbishment, upgrade or relocation of offices are required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.

*42. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97?

(2) Which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98?

(3) Which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/Completion Date</th>
<th>Total cost of Project</th>
<th>Total allocation to the Project 1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 33.

*43. Mr Moppett asked:

In relation to the provision of Pre Schools.

Despite the ever increasing demand, the program for pre-school education remains static at 2,200 students:

(1) What is the reason for this service to be frozen at current levels?

(2) What consideration has been given to expanding the long standing but very small provision for rural and remote children over the School-of-the-Air radio?

Answer—

(1) Funding to support pre-schools in New South Wales is generally provided through the Department of Community Services. According to the Children Services program (Program 25.1.2.) of the Department of Community Services, it is estimated that there will be over 117,000 licenced places available during the 1997/98 financial year. In comparison, the Department of School Education operates 75 pre-schools which provide the equivalent of 2,200 full time places.
(2) The provision of School-of-the-Air education services are available to all school-aged students requiring this assistance. The need for this assistance is determined through the Rural Education program.

44. Mr Moppett asked:

In relation to Enrolments in Year 11 & 12 school classes:

Student numbers shown in the program description reflect a decline in enrolment of 5,500 pupils.

(1) What is being done to ensure maximum retention of students after Year 10?

Answer—

Each secondary school has a trained careers adviser who is responsible for the development and implementation of a career education program that meets the needs of the students.

Career advisers in schools play a critical role in assisting students to explore and consider the range of school and post-school options available to them.

Careers advisers provide information and advice to students in areas of tertiary and TAFE courses and opportunities for traineeships and apprenticeships post school.

JSSTAFE courses are also available for senior students wanting to study one or more TAFE subjects as part of their HSC JSSTAFE courses are delivered by TAFE teachers and cover a wide range of industry areas.

In 1997, 21,000 students in Government schools are enrolled in these courses.

The Government has provided an additional 8,000 places in JSSTAFE courses since 1995.

There has been a broadening of the Curriculum to cater for non-university bound students. Vocational courses have been introduced to meet student needs. In 1997, 14,000 students in Government schools are enrolled in these courses.

The vocational courses are dual accredited and meet both industry and HSC requirements. Some courses also contribute to the TER.

The vocational courses are in areas of industry training needs and labour market demand. They emphasise workplace learning and integration of on-the-job and off-the job training.

45. Mr Moppett asked:

In relation to Rural Education Programs

After recent decline, student numbers have stabilised and are up slightly this year. However staff numbers are down and expenditure has been reduced:

Does this indicate a lack of commitment to equality and equity for isolated children?

Answer—

No, the government is committed to maintaining services in rural schools and, apart from general school and teacher costs, will provide over $51 million in 1997/98 current payments.
46. Mr Moppett asked:

In relation to Disadvantaged Schools Programs:

The number of students assisted by this program has risen by 7% (144,500 to 154,200) but expenditure is up by only 5%.

(1) Is the quality of this vital assistance being attenuated by lack of funds?

Answer—

(1) The NSW Government continues its strong commitment to the students in schools serving communities with the highest concentrations of socio-economic disadvantage. The Disadvantaged Schools Program (DSP) has been refocused in a more strategic way to emphasise improvements in literacy outcomes. This should result in higher quality outcomes for the dollars spent.

47. Mr Moppett asked:

In relation to Other Equity Programs

(1) What funds have been allocated specifically for addressing gender issues in education outcomes?

(2) Is the Girls in Schools program still current?

(3) What initiatives are being taken to address the special needs pertaining to boys?

Answer—

The Gender Equity Strategy, Girls and Boys at School 1996-2001 was released in May 1996 to address educational inequities affecting both girls and boys in NSW government schools.

Girls and Boys at School 1996-2001 is underpinned by a set of gender equity principles. It focuses on teachers developing their understanding of gender as an educational issue, building constructive relations within and between the sexes, providing opportunities for parents and caregivers to join in discussion on the ways gender may affect their children.

The strategy reflects government and DSE priority on focussing upon the needs of students and provides for gender issues to be taught across the curriculum to all students.

48. Mr Moppett asked:

In relation to Strategic Plans

The program description shows that Home School Liaison Officers have been reduced by 96 and School Counsellor numbers remain static:

(1) Does the Minister agree that these services are vital to some students at particular times?

(2) Why are these services declining and failing to match the growth in demand for counselling?
Answer —

(1) and (2) The Home School Liaison Program provides valuable assistance to schools and parents in restoring and maintaining satisfactory student attendance at school.

The school counselling service complements and enhances the work of teachers by strengthening schools’ student welfare provisions and providing counselling and psychological assessment of students with specific needs.

The 85 home school liaison officers and 11 education officers (Aboriginal community support) remain unchanged. There has been no decline in the services offered by the program in supporting students, their families and schools. When the Department of School Education moved into a district structure, student welfare consultants were appointed to each of the 40 districts to manage the Home School Liaison Program in addition to a variety of other functions. The number of personnel directly involved in the program has increased by 30.

49. Revd Nile asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 349, Office of the Board of Studies:

(1) What organisations and/or individuals are represented on the Community Panel that reviews new texts?

(2) How often does the Panel Meet?

(3) Where did it last meet?

Answer —

(1) The following organisations are represented on the Literature Reference Group:
Aboriginal Education Consultative Group Inc
Anglican Education Commission
Anti Discrimination Board
Association of Heads of Independent Schools
Australian Festival of Light
Australian Society of Authors
Catholic Education Commission of New South Wales
Christian Community Schools Ltd
Christian Parent-Controlled Schools Ltd
Department of School Education Committee on Special Religious Instruction
Ethnic Affairs Commission
Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations
Islamic Council of New South Wales
Jewish Board of Deputies
New South Wales Council for Civil Liberties
New South Wales Council of Churches
New South Wales Parents' Council

(2) The Literature Reference Group does not meet formally as a panel. As part of the text selection process, the list of texts recommended by the Board’s English Years 7-12 Syllabus Advisory Committee is forwarded to the Group for consideration. Group members' written submissions on the texts are referred to the Board's Curriculum and Assessment Committee, for recommendation to the Board.
(3) Not applicable.

*50. Revd Nile asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 328, Other Equity Programs:

(1) What is the process for ensuring the accuracy of courses and kits such as the Homophobic anti-violence Module?

(2) Does the Module incorrectly states that 10% of the population is homosexual, the percentage is between 1% and 2% according to recent authoritative research and surveys?

(3) Will the Government review those courses for accuracy?

Answer—

(1) Resources such as the homophobia module are checked for accuracy by senior departmental officers in consultation with relevant community and academic groups as necessary.

(2) The percentage referred to by Reverend Nile (10% of the population being homosexual) was only found in the materials which were approved by the previous government. It was replaced in 1996 by the statement, “Homosexuality is found in all populations”.

(3) The Resources for Teaching Against Violence materials were revised in 1996 under the present Government. This Government considered the previous materials unsuitable in areas such as the one about which the Reverend Nile has expressed concern.

*51. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?

Answer—

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 42.

*52. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at page 17), how many employees are currently employed by the Department; by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?
(1) and (2) The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available for certain cases.

*53. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration in:

(1) the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;
(2) the period 1 July 1996 to date; and
(3) relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

(1) to (3) Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.

*54. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you?
(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96?
(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees?
(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee?

Answer—

(1) Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 government boards and committees. The database does not contain information on the large number of small trusts administered by the Department of Land and Water Conservation and the Nation Parks and Wildlife Services.

(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of boards and committees.
(3) There are approximately 6000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all member of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each Department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories of people statistical information is only available for 1918 members. Of these 3.3% who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people 11% are, people from a non-English speaking back ground and 5% have disabilities. Board and Committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July 1996.

*55. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In 1996/97 how many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office?

Answer—

(1) and (2) It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

*56. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”?

(2) From which particular programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.
Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you?

(b) What was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you.

(2) (a) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97?

(b) If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?

(3) (a) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97?

(b) If so, what was their floor space?

Answer—

(1) to (3) Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each Department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of Departments in their Annual Reports.

Mrs Chadwick asked:

(1) How many overseas students are undertaking their Higher School Certificate via study at public schools, private schools, TAFE and private colleges?

(2) What is the estimated value in fees and associated costs of these students?

(3) Over the last five years what has been the Board of Studies expended on travel, accommodation, materials and training to develop a market for overseas students for the NSW HSC?

(4) What are the estimated numbers of overseas students who proceed to Australian Universities as fee paying students?

(5) What assurances can be given that regardless of changes to the HSC, that the HSC will remain a highly regarded international credential?

Answer—

To provide detailed statistical responses to parts (1) to (4) would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the agencies in the education and training portfolio that cannot be justified.

The integrity and reputation of the Higher School Certificate as a world class credential will be maintained. The Government is committed to a Higher School Certificate which reflects rigour and standards in curriculum and assessment.
*59. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) Which schools received funding under the School Maintenance Program for 1996-97?

   (a) what was or is the name of each school

   (b) the electorate

   (c) the project description

   (d) the start date for each project

   (e) the estimated completion date

   (f) the total cost for each project

   (g) the expenditure prior to 1/7/96

   (h) the allocation for 1996-97?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Commence Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Exp to 30/6/96</th>
<th>Allocation 96/97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

To provide a detailed statistical response to this Question would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the department that cannot be justified.

*60. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) Which schools received funding under the Minor Capital Works Program for 1996-97:

   (a) what was or is the name of each school

   (b) the electorate

   (c) the project description

   (d) the start date for each project

   (e) the estimated completion date

   (f) the total cost for each project

   (g) the expenditure prior to 1/7/96

   (h) the allocation for 1996-97?
Minor capital works programs were undertaken in 1996/97 at 69 schools at a cost of $8.9M.

*61. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3.p.328, Program 35.2.6 Equity Programs, Grants to organisations:

(1) Which community groups received grants in 1996-97?

(2) Which will receive the grants in 1997-98?

(3) What is the reason for the cut in this program?

Answer—

(1) There are no community groups that received grants during 1996/97. Grants payments in 1996/97 represent grants to schools from program funds.

(2) There will be no community groups that will receive grants during 1997/98.

(3) The reduction in payments for this item predominantly reflects the cessation of the Commonwealth funded Students at Risk program.

*62. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-97, Technology in Schools:

(1) What is the breakdown of payments to be made under the technology in schools program over the four year life of the program?

Answer—

The Computers in Schools Strategy was introduced in 1995 to implement the Government’s Computers in Schools Policy. The strategy provides $186.4 million, over four years, to support and enhance the use of computer technology in schools. Key aspects of the strategy for the four year life of the program are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- connection of all schools to the Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- training and development for 15,000 teachers in the use of computers in all learning areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the appointment of 40 Technology Advisers to district offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- an increase in the level of computer coordinator support in schools to complement the computer resources being provided and ensure that these resources support teaching and learning in the classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- the provision of more than 50,000 additional personal computers to schools
- the development of curriculum support materials to enhance the use of technology in teaching and learning across all learning areas
- additional technology (computer co-ordinator) positions in schools

*63. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-97, Technology in Schools:

What program exists to ensure that every student can touch type by Year 7?

Answer—

There is no mandatory program for touch typing.

*64. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-97, Technology in Schools program:

(1) How many of the following have been provided under this program:
   (a) Laptop computers for senior students
   (b) Computers fitted with classroom projection equipment

(2) In allocating computers to schools under this program, what formula was used?

(3) In what way were disadvantaged schools targeted for computer allocation under this program?

(4) How many after hours classes have been established for students, teachers and parents who want to increase their access to technology?

(5) How many software rental libraries have been established for community use?

(6) In what way is community use of school computers being encouraged? Is there a program to rent out computer time not required by schools and how is this program being implemented?

Answer—

(1) Neither laptop computers nor classroom projection equipment has been supplied to schools under the program.

*65. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-97, Technology in Schools program:

I refer the Minister to his answer regarding computers in schools, and his statement that the Government has achieved a computer: student ratio of 1:14.
(1) How many of the computers counted in this figure were provided in whole or in part from parent or community funding?

(2) (a) How many schools have computers leased or rented by parent or community funding?
   (b) How many computers are involved?

(3) What plans exist for the Department to take over the lease or rental payments of these computers and what is the cost involved?

(4) (a) Does the Department maintain and service these machines?
   (b) If not, what plans exist for the Department to take over this function and what is the cost involved?

(5) When leases or rental agreements expire and parent-funded computers disappear from schools, is it the Department's policy to replace them? Over what period of time?

(6) Of the computers included in the 1:14 ratio calculation:
   (a) How many do not have a hard disk drive?
   (b) How many do not have a CD-ROM?
   (c) How many do not have network capabilities?
   (d) How many were, at the time the survey was taken, more than 3 years old?
   (e) How many were, at the time the survey was taken, more than 5 years old?
   (f) How many were, at the time the survey was taken, more than 7 years old?
   (g) How many are now considered obsolete?
   (h) How many were provided in whole or part by parent or community funding?

(7) What plans exist to replace those computers which do not meet the same multi-media standards of the computers being supplied in the current roll-out?

(8) How many computers will be provided in the next roll-out and what formula or method will be used to target these resources?

Answer—

(1) The Computers in Schools survey indicated that 13% of school computers had been acquired from parent and community funds.

(2) (a & b) Detailed information on the number of schools leasing computers through their own funds, prior to 1995, is not available. To provide a detailed statistical response to this question would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the department that cannot be justified.

(3) The Department of School Education is considering the issue of school leases negotiated prior to the Government’s Computers in Schools program as part of the second phase distribution of computer resources to schools.
(4) (a) All equipment acquired directly by the school, are subject to school determined maintenance arrangements.

(b) The maintenance of equipment acquired directly by schools will remain a school responsibility.

(5) Schools when entering into a leasing agreement are required to have made provision to meet the leasing costs over the full term of the lease. The issue of expiring leasing and rental agreements, that were negotiated privately by schools prior to the Computers in Schools program, is being considered within the context of the further distribution of computer resources to schools under phase 2 of the program.

(6) (a, b & c) The 1995 Survey did not provide this specific information. To provide a detailed statistical response to this question would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the department that cannot be justified.

(d) The ratio calculation included some 18,800 computers that were between 3 and 4 years of age. Computers older than this were not included in the calculation of a school’s entitlement.

(e, f & g) Computers acquired prior to 1992 were not included in the distribution. To provide a detailed statistical response to this question would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the department that cannot be justified.

(h) Less than 4,900 of the existing computers included in the 1:14 ratio calculation were provided from Parents and Citizens funds.

(7) The Department of School Education is finalising proposals for the further distribution of computer resources to schools. The issue of ageing computer stock will be addressed within the phase two distribution model.

(8) Over 30,000 personal computers will be supplied under the second phase of the Computers in Schools distribution. It is proposed that the distribution will be per capita based with targeted resources to students with specific needs.

*66. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-97; Technology in Schools Program:

I refer to the provision of Internet services.

What is the rate per hour being charged to schools and the Department for Internet access?

Answer—

The Department meets the cost of the access to the Internet and associated services for all schools. This service is outsourced to the Department’s provider OzEmail Ltd.

The terms and conditions of the OzEmail contract are “commercial in confidence”. The equivalent hourly rate is less than $2 per hour for the school day.
*67. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 306; Capital Program: Brooklyn Public Schools:

(1) What plans exist to provide a permanent administration block at Brooklyn Public School?

(2) What plans exist to replace temporary buildings on the site?

Answer—

(1) Brooklyn Public School is acknowledged as a nomination for future capital works to provide permanent administration facilities.

(2) The current 3-module demountable library is to be replaced with an 8-module administration/staff/library demountable before the end of August, 1997.

*68. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 4, p. 39; State Capital Program:

What allocation has been made to address the severe overcrowding problems at Megalong Public School?

Answer—

No allocation has been made from the State Capital Program to address accommodation issues at Megalong Public School.

The Department of School Education is currently considering providing demountable accommodation for Megalong Public School as part of a Statewide review of core facilities provision in 1 and 2 classgroup schools.

*69. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-99, Capital Payments:

When will Parkes High be fully air conditioned?

Answer—

I recently visited Parkes High School to discuss first hand the issue of air conditioning. Following my visit I have instructed the Department of School Education to air cool Parkes High School’s library, computer room, and the equivalent of two other classrooms to be nominated by the school. The Special Education facilities will maintain an absolute priority even if they are relocated. The installation will commence in 1997 but the final completion date is not determined.

The new air conditioning program is fairer, smarter and better targeted to cool the hot spots in hot schools. It will provide immediate relief to thousands of students.
Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 295, Program 34; Recurrent and Capital Works Services:

What capital and recurrent expenditure is being allocated to Olympic related programs:

(a) last year,

(b) this year,

(c) next year,

(d) 1999,

(e) 2000?

Answer—

To provide detailed statistical responses to these the questions would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the Department of Training and Education Coordination that cannot be justified.

Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 309, 312 and 315, Program 35.1.2.K-6; 35.1.3., 35.1.4.; Other Services-Funding towards school expenses:

(1) What provision is made for the replacement of musical instruments in this school year?

(2) What schools are in the replacement program?

Answer—

There is no central replacement program for the repair and replacement of musical instruments in schools. Funds have been provided within global funding arrangements for all equipment repairs and purchases.

Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-91, Training strategies for the Building and construction industry:

(1) What funds have been allocated to the Building and Construction Industry Training Division at Castle Hill?

(2) How does this allocation compare with 1995/96 and 1994/95?

Answer—

(1) Some $2.688 million has been allocated to the Building and Construction Industry Training Division for 1996-97.

(2) This compares with an allocation of $2.026 million in 1994-95 and $2.222 million in 1995-96.
Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-100:

(1) With enrolments growing by 1.5% but staff numbers declining, which TAFE courses will have to be cut?

(2) Have minimum student numbers been increased as a way of rationalising courses?

(3) Which courses are affected?

Answer—

The reduction of staff numbers reflects the restructure of TAFE and DTEC and mainly involves TAFE corporate services staff at Institutes and Head Office as well as a reduction of teaching staff who are underprogrammed.

Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 296; Staffing:

(1) Notwithstanding the transfer of some functions to DTEC, what is the impact on TAFE of a cut of 494 staff?

(2) How many student places had to be cut because of reductions on teaching staff?

Answer—

Staff reductions in the NSW TAFE Commission relate to administrative staff in corporate services and in Institutes and underprogrammed teachers.

Through efficiencies and the introduction of flexible arrangements the level of enrolments is expected to increase in 1997.

Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 328: Equity Programs-Employee related expenses:

(1) What is the reason for the under expenditure of the 1996/97 budget?

(2) What is the reason for the cut in the 1997/98 allocation?

(3) Which programs will be affected by this cut?

Answer—

(1) The projected under expenditure during 1996/97 is primarily a result of the cessation of the Commonwealth funded Students at Risk program. This program ceased at the end of the 1996 calendar year. The 1996/97 expenditure therefore reflects a half year effect rather than a full year.
(2) The reduction in 1997/98 represents the full year effect of the cessation of the Commonwealth funded Students at Risk program.

(3) The Students at Risk program will be effected by this cut.

*76. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 328: Equity Programs-Other Operating Expenses:

(1) What is the reason for the under expenditure of the 1996/97 budget?

(2) What is the reason for the cut in the 1997/98 allocation?

(3) Which programs will be affected by this cut?

Answer—

(1) The projected under expenditure during 1996/97 is primarily a result of the cessation of the Commonwealth funded Students at Risk program. This program ceased at the end of the 1996 calendar year. The 1996/97 expenditure therefore reflects a half year effect rather than a full year.

(2) The reduction in 1997/98 represents the full year effect of the cessation of the Commonwealth funded Students at Risk program.

(3) The Students at Risk program will be effected by this cut.

*77. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Summary, p. 15; Grants to Organisations:

(1) From your overall portfolio allocation, what is the total amount provided by way of grants to organisations?

(2) Please list by organisation and identify the level of each grant.

Answer—

To provide detailed statistical responses to these questions would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the agencies in the education and training portfolio that cannot be justified. Information can be found in each agency’s Annual Report.

*78. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 309, 312, 315 and 333 (non-government): Back to school allowance:

How does the Government intend to administer the scheme across the school sectors?

Answer—
An implementation committee comprising representatives of the Department of School Education, Treasury and the Cabinet Office is finalising administrative arrangements for the scheme. Parents and interest groups will be advised of details when the implementation plan is completed.

*79. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 307, 309, 313 and 316, Programs 35.1.1, 351.2 K - 6, 35.1.3., 35.1.4.; Retained Revenue-Fees for services:

(1) What proportion of students in NSW schools have full fees paid by parents in 1997?

(2) Does the Minister intend mandating the $50 once-yearly grant to students be used to pay ‘voluntary’ school fees where families have not paid the fees?

Answer—

(1) There are no fees payable. There is no central record of the numbers of parents and guardians who make voluntary contributions to the government schools attended by their children.

(2) An implementation committee comprising representatives of the Department of School Education, Treasury and the Cabinet Office is finalising administrative arrangements for the $50 Back to School Allowance. Parents and interest groups will be advised of details when the implementation plan is completed.

*80. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In Reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 312 and 315, Program 35.1.3 and 35.1.4: Maintenance:

(1) Was drainage work undertaken at Mulawarree High School after two recent floods in the Hall area?

(2) How much did the work cost?

(3) Has the problem been permanently fixed?

Answer—

(1) There has been recent faults in the water supply service. If the leaks had not been detected and immediate action taken to cut off the water supply, water damage may have been caused to the school’s hall area. At the time of the incidents work was undertaken to repair the faults.

(2) Cost of the repair work was $3,793. The school contributed $2,000 to this work with the Department of School Education covering the balance of costs.

(3) The Department of Public Works and Services has been engaged to investigate the cause of the recent faults in the school’s water service to determine the most cost effective solution of either further repair work or replacement.

The results of the investigations are expected by the end of term 2, 1997.
Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 337; Bricklaying - Hornsby TAFE:

(1) Why is bricklaying being abolished at Hornsby TAFE?

(2) Have apprentices from the Central Coast and elsewhere told you it will be impossible for them to get to courses at Meadowbank, causing them to face dropping out?

(3) Have employers also told you they will have to lay off apprentices because they cannot afford the additional time away which would be caused by their apprentices having to travel further afield to attend bricklaying?

Answer—

(1) TAFE has an extensive network of colleges and is continually responding to changes in demographic circumstances and industry training needs.

In addition the Commission is employing a range of strategies to maximise efficient access. These include: programming multiple classes in parallel; the use of alternate year or cyclic enrolments; and flexible delivery and distance education techniques.

There has been a progressive decline in enrolments and course completions in the Northern Sydney Institute in a number of trades, including bricklaying.

Faced with this decline the Institute has decided after consultation with stakeholders to relocate bricklaying to excellent facilities at Ryde campus.

(2) and (3) Employers, students and unions were advised both orally and in writing of the decision to relocate bricklaying and of the options available to attend at Newcastle, Ryde or Granville.

Students and employers have confirmed their intention to continue with the course at these locations.

Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-89; McGaw review of the HSC:

(1) What was the cost of the McGaw review?

(2) What is the estimated cost of implementing the McGaw recommendations?

(3) (a) What will be the cost of rewriting all syllabus documents and writing new courses as proposed by McGaw?

(b) Would the Board of Studies be expected to meet that cost or would additional money be made available from DTEC’s funds?

(4) (a) What would be the cost of training required for teachers into the new courses and marking systems proposed by McGaw?

(b) Would DTEC make separate funds available or would the DSE have to provide for the training from its own budget?
(5) What assistance will the government provide for non-government schools for training their staff and otherwise making the necessary changes to implement the McGaw report?

Answer—

I refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to this question during the Estimates Committee hearings. The answer can be found in the Hansard record of the General Purpose Standing Committee of 2 June, 1997 at pages 18 and 19.

*83. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 298; Capital Program:

What is the full list of major and minor capital works included in this program?

Answer—

I refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to this question during the Estimates Committee hearings. The answer can be found in the Hansard record of the General Purpose Standing Committee of 2 June, 1997 at pages 21 and 22.

*84. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, pp. 312 & 315, Programs 35.1.3 and 35.1.4; State schools - capital grants:

(1) What is the current status of Killarney Heights High School Multi-Purpose Centre?

(2) When will building on the MPC commence and be completed?

(3) What funds have been allocated for the building of the MPC?

Answer—

(1) This project has undergone preliminary planning

(2) Construction is subject to the projects inclusion on a future Capital Works Program or a redistribution of school capital assets.

(3) Nil

*85. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-88; Restructure of DTEC - Oxford Street:

(1) What expenditure has been required in relation to the move of DTEC offices into Oxford Street?

(2) Have occupational health and safety concerns regarding possible asbestos in the building been resolved?

(3) What is the future of the former TAFE head office at St Leonards?
Answer—

I refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to this question during the Estimates Committee hearings. The answer can be found in the Hansard record of the General Purpose Standing Committee of 2 June, 1997 at page 21.

*86. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-105; McGaw:

(1) How much has been set aside in the Board of Studies budget for implementation of the McGaw report?

(2) Is it the case, as estimated by the Association of heads of Independent Schools, that the cost of rewriting syllabuses is conservatively estimated at $10 million?

(3) Given the budget shows no increase over last year, where will this money come from?

Answer—

I refer the Honourable Member to the answer given to this question during the Estimates Committee hearings. The answer can be found in the Hansard record of the General Purpose Standing Committee of 2 June, 1997 at pages 18 and 19.

*87. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-105; ELTIS:

(1) How far behind schedule is the process of rewriting syllabus documents, in line with the recommendations of the ELTIS review?

(2) What has been the reason for the delays in this program.

(3) Will you guarantee similar delays will not occur when the Board has to rewrite HSC syllabuses as a result of the McGaw review?

Answer—

I refer the Honourable Member to the answer I gave at the Estimates Committee hearing on Monday June 2 (page 19).

*88. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-105; Registration - Corporal Punishment:

(1) How many non-government schools have failed to meet the requirements of the new discipline policy, by refusing to rule out corporal punishment?

(2) What course of action do you intend following?

(3) Will these schools be deregistered?
Answer—

The new statutory requirements are being implemented smoothly. The Board of Studies is providing advice to schools on the requirements as necessary.

*89. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-105; Registration - New Schools Policy:

What plans exist to re-impose, via Board of Studies registration procedures in New South Wales, the restrictions on new non-government school development of the federal New Schools Policy which was abolished by the Howard government?

Answer—

The Board of Studies will be advising me on requirements for non-government school registration.

*90. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-97; Computers and Technology:

In relation to the “Technology in Schools Program”:

(1) Were computers supplied under this program delivered basically as cardboard boxes containing a PC, limited software and no other assistance?

(2) Has this “cargo cult” approach left schools with computers they can’t use until they upgrade school electricity supplies and install additional power points at their own expense?

Answer—

(1) Under the leasing agreement negotiated by the Department computers selected by the schools are delivered direct to the schools, pre-configured with the preferred operating system and ready for installation. It is the responsibility of the school to arrange for the final installation of the computer.

(2) The Government through the Computers in Schools program has made a significant contribution to the use of technology in schools. Computers supplied under the program are fully maintained at no cost to the school. Schools through their global budgeting have funds available to meet minor expenditures such as the need for additional power points.

*91. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-99; Behaviour Disorder Schools:

Budget Paper No. 2 (p. 4-99) states that “facilities for behaviour disorder students will be provided at two schools’.

Budget Paper No. 4 lists this as “special behaviour schools — pilot facilities for behaviour disorder students”.

(1) (a) Are these schools to be new schools, as implied by Government announcements over the past 12 months?
(b) If so, where will they be, what plans have been out in place for their construction; when will they be finished; and are they permanent facilities?

(2) Alternately, are these behaviour disorder students to be accommodated in existing schools?

(3) What implications would this have for the safety of other students and which schools have been targeted for this program?

Answer—

1. (a) Yes.

(b) The two schools will be established in the west/south west of the Sydney metropolitan area. They will be permanent facilities and will be open in 1998.

2. Possible sites for the new schools are currently being investigated.

3. Consideration is being given to surplus accommodation which is not located in mainstream schools. However, should free standing accommodation in a mainstream school appear suitable then provision will be made to maintain the adjoining schools as clearly separate facilities.

*92. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 333, Program 35.4; non-government schools assistance:

1. What prompted the changes to the Interest Subsidy Scheme?

2. Why was there no discussion or consultation about this change?

3. Will this change affect the ability of many schools, including many Catholic systemic schools, to fund school improvements?

Answer—

1. These changes reflect government priorities and the overall budgetary situation facing the Government.

I might point out that funding under the non-government schools program has increased by some 9.1% from 1996/97. This is against a background of the State receiving reduced Commonwealth funding.

2. As indicated in the answer to question 1, changes to funding levels reflected overall government budgetary decisions.

3. This issue is a matter for the Catholic school system. The government provides a very generous Interest Subsidy scheme to assist all non-government schools.

*93. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 333, Program 35.4; non-government schools assistance:

1. What is the basis for the announced changes?

2. Are these changes designed to restrict the growth and quality of non-government schools?
(3) Are these changes linked to the Government reaction to the abolition of the former Commonwealth Government’s New School Policy?

Answer—

(1) Funding under the non-government schools program has increased by some 9.1% from 1996/97. This is against a background of the State receiving reduced Commonwealth funding. These changes reflect government priorities and the overall budgetary situation facing the Government.

This Government is providing an additional $16 million to parents of non-government school students through the introduction of an annual $50 Back-to-School Allowance for each student attending a school in New South Wales.

Notwithstanding, there have been some adjustments to the interest subsidy scheme, the basic interest subsidy policy remains unchanged with all applicants still being able to receive full subsidy under market interest rates provided they meet the long standing conditions of the scheme. Non-government per capita grants policy remains unchanged.

(2) No.

(3) No.

49. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 38; Capital Works - Major Works:

(1) What is the reason for the delay on the major capital works projects at the following schools:

(a) Blaxland Public School — redevelop school
(b) Blue Haven Public School — new school
(c) Buxton Public School — replacement school
(d) Camden Haven High School/Distance Education Centre — new school stage 1
(e) Kendall Public — conversions
(f) Castle Hill Public School — replacement school
(g) Claremont Meadows Public School — new school
(h) Dungong Public School — upgrade
(i) Evans Head K-12 School — new school
(j) Woodburn Public School — stage 1 redevelopment
(k) Glenmore Park High School — new school stage 1
(l) Government School Technology Program
(m) James Ruse Agricultural High School — stage 2 refurbishment
(n) Kurrambee School — stage 2 refurbishment
(o) Mudgee High School — stage 2 upgrade
(p) Orange High School — stage 2 upgrade
(q) Ourimbah Public School — stage 2 upgrade
(r) Salamander Bay Public School and High School — new school
(s) Sydney Girls High School — stage 2 upgrade
(t) Toronto High School — stage 2 upgrade
(u) Tumbi Umbi High School — new school stage 2.

(2) What impact will this delay have on the schools

Answer—

(1) (a) **Blaxland Public School - redevelop school**

There has been a delay in receiving development consent from the local council. Negotiations are currently in progress over appropriate access to the school.

(b) **Blue Haven Public School - new school**

There has been a delay in receiving development consent from the local council. The Department of School Education has also been required to provide a statement of environmental effects and to develop a strategy to preserve the endangered froglet species.

(c) **Buxton Public School - replacement school**

In construction with an expected completion date in early 1998.

(d) **Camden Haven High School/Distance Education Centre - new school stage 1**

Delays have been caused due to the abandonment of the original site as a result of environmental concerns.

A new site has been identified and a resumption order has been issued for acquisition. The new school will be delivered as close to the original 1999 date as possible.

(e) **Kendall Public School - conversions**

This project is a follow on from the Camden Haven High School project.

(f) **Castle Hill Public School - replacement school**

Lengthy delays at development consent and in resolving access.

Letter of acceptance for the contract to construct the new Castle Hill Public School was issued in June, 1997. The new school is expected to be completed towards the end of 1998.

(g) **Claremont Meadows Public School - new school**
In construction with an expected completion date in early 1998.

(h) **Dungong Public School - upgrade**


(i) **Evans Head K-12 School - new school**

There has been a delay in receiving development consent from the local council. Statement of environmental effects requested.

The project has been referred to the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning for mediation. It is expected that the outstanding concerns will be resolved shortly.

(j) **Woodburn Public School - stage 1 redevelopment**

This project is a follow on from the Evans Head K-12 school project.

(k) **Glenmore Park High School - new school stage 1**

Delayed Development Consent and eventually determined by the Minister for Planning. In construction with an expected completion date in mid 1998.

(l) **Government School Technology Program**

The phased implementation of the Government School Technology Program is proceeding.

(m) **James Ruse Agricultural High School - stage 2 refurbishment**

In construction with an expected completion date in August, 1997.

(n) **Kurrambee School - stage 2 refurbishment**

Project has been held over awaiting the outcome, following public consultation, on the recommendations from the McRae Report on Integration/Inclusion Feasibility Study.

(o) **Mudgee High School - stage 2 upgrade**

In construction with an expected completion date in early 1998.

(p) **Orange High School - stage 2 upgrade**

In construction with an expected completion date in early 1998.

(q) **Qurimbah Public School - stage 2 upgrade**

Stage 2 early works relating to construction of homebases underway. Remainder of upgrade to 21 core, subject to resolution of development consent conditions with the local council.

(r) **Salamander Bay Public School and High School - new school**
Now in construction. Delay was experienced with development consent and resolution of environmental concerns. Expected completion date towards the end of 1998.

(s) Sydney Girls High School - stage 2 upgrade

In construction with an expected completion date in September, 1997.

(t) Toronto High School - stage 2 upgrade

In construction with an expected completion date in mid 1998.

(u) Tumbi Umbi High School - new school stage 2

Delayed by delays in consent for Stage I and II. Expected completion date in August 1998.

(2) For the proposed new schools which have experienced some delay,

- Blue Haven Public School
- Camden Haven High School/Distance Education Centre
- Evans Head K-12 School

... students will be held in existing schools until the new facilities are completed.

In all other cases there are existing arrangements which are satisfactory but which will be upgraded by the new work.

*95. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 4-92; Cost of Restructure of DSE:

Budget Paper No. 2 refers to the restructure of the department and says it has eliminated duplication and waste. However, the Auditor-General has reported the cost of the restructure to be $38 million. This includes more than $20 million in dead rent.

This cost is far greater than the $17 million savings you projected for the restructure.

(1) As this year’s budget papers make no mention of this saving have you now accepted that there has been no gain to the budget from the restructure?

Answer—

The Department has been generally successful in divesting itself of leased accommodation in excess of requirements. In the interim, however, it will be necessary for the department to meet lease costs for those remaining premises where properties have not yet been sub-let.

Lease costs for accommodation for the new departmental structure will result in ongoing savings. These savings are being utilized to meet other needs associated with the department’s educational and administrative programs.

There have been some once off costs in establishing the new structure which have been met from within existing budget allocations.
The recurrent savings of $17M projected for the restructure result from the overall reduction of 432 positions under the new departmental staff structure. The Department’s operating statement (page 305 of Budget Paper 3, in 1997/98, incorporates the full $17 m planned savings resulting from the restructure first announced in 1995/96 and which have been returned to Treasury.

96. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 306; Investing Statement - Outflows:

(1) How much land does the Department own at the “Renwick” site in Mittagong?

(2) Has any land been sold in the last 24 months?

(3) If so, which portions and what was the price?

(4) Is any more intended to be sold?

(5) What plans exist for building a new High School at Mittagong?

(6) Will it be at the Renwick site?

(7) Will existing buildings be incorporated?

(8) When will the new high school commence construction?

(9) What will be the cost of the new high school?

Answer—

(1) Eight point four zero five (8.405) hectares

(2) No

(3) Not applicable

(4) Not applicable

(5) None, but it is recognised that there may be a possible future need

(6) Yes

(7) Yes, subject to suitability

(8) A new high school will be considered when demographic demand justifies the establishment of a further high school in the Southern Highlands.

(9) Not yet determined.
Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 296; staffing:

Budget Paper No. 3 shows changes in the staff of TAFE and DTEC. It shows a reduction on TAFE staff on 494 and an increase in DTEC staff by 142:

(1) Are all of these changes the result of the restructure of these agencies?

(2) If so, have all the redundancies and transfers been completed as part of this process?

(3) By what date were all the savings realised from this staff reduction?

(4) (a) Did advertisements for positions in the new structure only start appearing over Christmas/New Year?

(b) If so, how can the Government claim to have already made savings from the restructure in time to fund 5,000 new student places in TAFE?

Answer—

The restructure of DTEC and TAFE has resulted in changes to staffing levels. The reduction has provided the savings necessary to fund the 5,000 new student places in TAFE provided from 1 January, 1997.

Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, pp. 337-348; TAFE redundancies:

(1) Have expressions of interest for 200 redundancies recently been called among TAFE teaching staff?

(2) Which subjects will be hit by this cut in teachers?

(3) Is the reason for these redundancies the Government’s failure to fund the pay increase awarded to TAFE teachers?

Answer—

(1) The TAFE Commission has not called for a general expression of interest.

(2) Any areas effected by any voluntary redundancies will focus on teaching areas subject to declining demand.

(3) No.

Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 335; TAFE cuts:

(1) What will be the impact of the $9 million cut in TAFE’s recurrent expenditure?

(2) Further, how will TAFE colleges pay for the $26 million worth of pay increases to be paid in 1997/98 but not provided for in your budget?
(3) Will student places be cut to make up what amounts to a $35 million cut in the NSW Government’s TAFE budget in just one year?

Answer—

The NSW TAFE Commission will continue to implement a range of strategies to lower the cost of administrative arrangements in both corporate services and Institutes. Most Institutes already have such arrangements in place.

The NSW Treasury has funded a 3% pay increase from 1 July 1997. Any additional funding required will be met by efficiency gains in both corporate services and the administration areas of Institutes and in teaching delivery.

*100. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 309, Program 35.1.2; State schools - capital grants:

(1) In relation to covered learning areas and sun/wet weather shelters, will requests for funding for work at the following schools be granted from this budget:

(a) Moss Vale Public School?

(b) Tirrana Public School?

(c) Berrima Public School?

Answer—

(1) (a) The Department of School Education has not received an application for funding under the 1997/98 Joint Funding Program for provision of a covered outdoor learning area for Moss Vale Public School.

(b) Funds of $8,385 have been approved under the 1996/97 Joint Funding Program for the provision of a covered outdoor learning area for Tirrana Public School.

(c) The Department of School Education has not received an application for funding under the 1997/98 Joint Funding Program for provision of a covered outdoor learning area for Berrima Public School.

*101. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 309, Program 35.1.2; State schools - capital grants:

(1) In relation to permanent building plans for Colo Vale and Hill Top Public Schools:

(a) When will funding be allocated for the entire building programs planned for both schools?

(b) How much money will be allocated?

(c) Why was landscaping work at both schools delayed from summer (when grass would have grown) to winter (when it has not)?
(d) How much extra will it cost to integrate the existing landscaping works at both schools, into the eventual permanent building programs?

(e) Will duplication of work be involved to integrate both landscape and permanent buildings?

Answer—

(1) (a) The facilities upgrade projects for Colo Vale and Hill Top Public Schools will remain a high priority for reconsideration for funding when next reviewing statewide nominations for inclusion in future capital works programs. It is not possible to provide a firm indication as to the timeframe for these projects’ inclusion.

(b) When construction funding is approved in a future capital works program it will be sufficient to undertake the planned upgrade works.

(c) The groundworks project for Colo Vale and Hill Top Public Schools were approved for funding in the 1996/97 School Maintenance Program in September, 1996.

Following funding approval the normal planning work was undertaken in consultation with the local school communities and Wingecarribee Shire Council. At the completion of the planning process the Department of School Education engaged the Department of Lands and Water Conservation to undertake the works.

The Department of Land and Water Conservation indicated that the projects were viable to be carried out in the first half of 1997 and gave an undertaking to maintain grass cover related to the works, moving into Spring 1997.

(d) There will be no extra costs as the groundworks projects have taken into consideration the design concepts for the future building upgrade works.

This was a deliberate strategy to avoid any future duplication of work and to ensure adequate playground space during the construction period.

(e) There will be no duplication of work.

*102. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 309, Program 35.1.2; State schools - capital grants:

(1) In relation to the permanent Library building at Mittagong Public School:

(a) What priority did the Library have in 1996/97 capital program?

(b) Why was the building not funded in this current budget?

(c) When is the Library scheduled for construction and at what cost?

Answer—

(a) The project did not receive funding as part of the 1996/97 Minor Capital Works Programs.

(b) The project did not have a statewide priority within the Budget Allocation for 1996/97.
The Library at Mittagong Public School has been funded as part of the 1997/98 Minor Capital Works program and is scheduled to call tenders as soon as planning processes are complete.

*103. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 309, Program 35.1.2, State schools - capital grants:

(1) In relation to the plans for a secondary Primary School in the Bowral area:

(a) How much land does the Department own at the Retford site?

(b) What was the cost of clearing recently at this site?

(c) What was the purpose of this clearing?

(d) Is the Retford site determined to be the site of a new school?

(e) When will planning commence?

(f) When will the new school be constructed?

Answer—

(1) (a) 3.039 hectares.

(b) $1,500.

(c) Hazard reduction as instructed by Wingecarribee Shire Council.

(d) Yes.

(e) Planning for a new primary school for the East Bowral area has commenced.

(f) Planning will continue on this project during 1997/98.

Funding for construction of the proposed new school has not been approved at this stage. The project will be considered for inclusion in a future major capital works program.

*104. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 311, Program 35.1.2; Outflows - Acquisition of property, plant and equipment:

(1) In relation to Bowral Public School:

(a) Has the Department accepted the recommendation of Bowral P&C that the upper segment of Banyette Street be acquired by the Department to extend the schools land area and create safe access to playing areas across the road?

(b) What would be the cost of the street acquisition from Wingecarribee Council?
Answer—
(a) Yes.
(b) Has not been determined as Wingecarribee Council has not agreed with the road closure.

*105. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 95; Reading recovery program:

(1) How many students were enrolled in the reading recovery program during 1996/97?

(2) What percentage of these achieved a satisfactory standard of reading?

(3) What has happened to those who did not?

(4) How many dollars have been allocated to additional programs for those who did not progress satisfactorily in the standard reading recovery program?

(5) What programs are being used to assist these students?

Answer—

(1) Enrolment figures for the reading recovery program reached 3,551 in 1996. This year 2,235 students have been enrolled to date. Data on reading recovery enrolment is collected by calendar year not financial year.

(2) Eighty-nine percent of these reading recovery students achieved a satisfactory standard of reading.

(3) Those reading recovery students who did not achieve a satisfactory standard of reading were referred to other programs and services for additional literacy support.

(4) and (5) In addition to the Department’s $60 million Literacy Strategy in 1997/98, funding of almost $31 million has been allocated for the following additional programs and services which not only support students who have made unsatisfactory progress in the reading recovery program, but also to assist all students K-6 who are experiencing difficulties in literacy and learning:

- primary support teachers learning difficulties;
- special education support centres;
- support classes reading; and
- support classes language.

There are 742 support teachers learning difficulties positions spread across primary schools and ten special education support centres throughout the State. There is a learning difficulties co-ordinator in each district whose key role is to assist and advise teachers where there are students with literacy and learning problems. We have appointed 51 support teachers for reading classes and 43 support teachers for language classes.

As part of the State’s Literacy ‘97 agenda, all support teachers learning difficulties have undertaken three days of intensive additional training on strategies to support students with literacy problems.
*106. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-97; Computer and Technology:

(1) How many schools to which new computers were delivered during 1996/97 have had computers stolen from them?

(2) How many computers have been stolen?

(3) Were most of these computers stolen within the first week of delivery?

(4) How many of these stolen computers have been recovered?

(5) Of the stolen computers not recovered, how many have subsequently been replaced?

Answer—

(1) to (4) Only a minimal number of computers provided to schools under the government’s program have been subject to theft.

(5) Action is underway to assist schools in the replacement of the stolen computers. Procedures have been developed under the Treasury Managed Fund for replacement which will not detract from the Government’s Computers in Schools initiative. The Department has been and will continue to investigate strategies to reduce the theft and increase the probability of recovery ranging from physical computer restraint devices and specially prepared paints that may be detected under specialised lighting.

*107. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, pp. 312 & 315, Programs 35.1.3 and 35.1.4; State schools - capital grants:

(1) What is the current status of Killarney Heights High School Multi-Purpose Centre?

(2) When will building on the MPC commence and be completed?

(3) What funds have been allocated for the building of the MPC?

Answer—

This is a repeat of question 84. Refer to response question 84.

*108. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-97; School based funding and grants to schools:

(1) Can the Minister identify what schools will be involved in the $30,000 country program and where does that amount of money appear in the Budget?

(2) How were those schools selected?

(3) Will the program be extended to all country schools?
Answer—

This tailored incentive package is targeted at particular schools which are difficult to staff. The schools which will receive this targeted funding will be considered during 1997 and have yet to be finalised. Funding is reflected under the Department’s strategic plan program on page 330. The funding will not be extended to all country schools.

*109. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 39; State capital program:

(1) The completion date given for the new Castle Hill Public School is 2000. When does the Minister estimate the school will be completed?

(2) If the date is earlier than the year 2000, why do the Budget papers specify a later date?

(3) What guarantees do the school community have that the school will be completed prior to the year 2000?

Answer—

(1) It is expected that the construction of the new Castle Hill Public School will be completed towards the end of 1998.

(2) The date specified in the 1997/98 Budget Paper No. 4, p. 39 is the completion date for expenditure flows on the project.

(3) The letter of acceptance on the contract to construct the new Castle Hill Public School was issued recently. It is a 64 week contract, which indicates the new school will be completed towards the end of 1998.

*110. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 328; Equity programs - average staffing:

(1) Which positions have been cut in the reduction of average staffing levels from 71 to 50 which occurred between 1994/95 and 1997/98?

(2) What is the reason for this reduction in staffing?

(3) Which equity programs have been cut since 1994/95?

(4) What has been the effect of this cut?

Answer—

(1) The reduction in staffing levels between the 1994/95 and the 1997/98 financial years predominantly reflects the cessation of the Commonwealth funded Students at Risk program.

(2) The reduction in 1997/98 is predominantly attributable to the cessation of the Commonwealth funded Students at Risk program.

(3) The Commonwealth funded Students at Risk program ceased at the end of the 1996 calendar year.
(4) It is envisaged that there will not be any significant effect on other ongoing programs.

*111. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, pp. 312 & 315, Programs 35.1.2 and 35.1.4; Maintenance:

(1) Have all schools in the Ashfield, Strathfield and Drummoyne electorates been assessed to determine maintenance needs for 1997/98?

(2) If not, which schools have not been assessed and why?

(3) What maintenance activities are proposed to be undertaken in schools in the Ashfield, Strathfield and Drummoyne electorates in 1997/98?

(4) What new capital works are proposed for schools in these three electorates in 1997/98?

Answer—

(1) All schools in the Ashfield, Strathfield and Drummoyne electorates have been assessed to determine maintenance needs.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) Routine maintenance activities will be carried out in all schools during 1997/98 where conditions have been identified to be below the standards established by the Department.

(4) None are listed in the normal forward capital works programs.

*112. Mr Moppett asked:

(1) Given the large number of computers that are becoming obsolete due to technological change, would you admit that in order to reach the ambitious target of 1:8 you will continue to rely on parent fund raising to achieve that target?

(2) What is the upgrade? What is the scheme you are looking at?

On p.309 there was funding for school expenses. How many primary schools have purchased the federal kit, Friends for Life, produced by the Department of Health and issued in 1993, which I understand schools have to purchase?

Can you give us the figures for the number of primary schools using that kit in New South Wales, and how much has been expended on the purchase of those kits?

Answer—

(1) & (2) Phase two of the distribution program commences in 1998 and will provide for additional computers to government schools. The distribution model for this phase is proposed to be based on a per capita approach, that provides an expanded range of choice to schools, as well as providing targeted student needs in specific circumstances.

The distribution of computer equipment, when taken in conjunction with existing computer resources will provide a state wide computer to student ratio of 1:8 by June 1998.
(3) The materials *Friends For Life* were not produced by the Department of School Education. They were produced by the Commonwealth Government in 1993. They have never been distributed by the DSE to NSW Government schools. Schools wanting to obtain a copy had to write to Canberra for it. The Department does not keep records of individual schools purchasing this material.

*113. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3 295, Capital Works and Services:

In relation to the Department of School Education;

(1) What is the full list of projects included as:

(a) Major works;

(b) Minor works;

(c) Maintenance;

to be undertaken in the 1997/98 budget?

Answer—

(a) Information on major capital works is included in the budget papers.

(b/c) To provide a detailed response to these questions would involve considerable time and diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the Department that cannot be justified.

*114. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3 295, Capital Works and Services:

In relation to the TAFE;

(1) What is the full list of projects included as:

(a) Major works;

(b) Minor works;

(c) Maintenance;

to be undertaken in the 1997/98 budget?

Answer—

(a) The list of projects included as ‘Major Works’ is contained in Budget Paper No 4, pp41-43.

(b) In 1997-98, the NSW TAFE Commission expects to spend $5.452 million on minor works and $13.04 million on upgradings.
(c) In relation to maintenance, a detailed response would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from core responsibilities of the NSW TAFE Commission that cannot be justified.

*115. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3 295, Capital Works and Services:

In relation to the DTEC;

(1) What is the full list of projects included as:

(a) Major works;

(b) Minor works;

(c) Maintenance;

to be undertaken in the 1997/98 budget?

Answer—

(a) The list of projects included as Major Works is contained in Budget Paper No 4, page 37.

(b) and (c) To provide detailed statistical responses to these questions would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the Department of Training and Education Co-ordination/TAFE NSW that cannot be justified.

*116. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-99;

The Drug and Alcohol education program is mentioned as a $5 million program over 4 years.

(1) What is the full list of:

(a) expenditure items to date;

(b) expenditure items budgeted in 1997/98;

(c) projected expenditure items for the balance of the program?

Answer—

(1) (a) $682,000 has gone directly to schools to purchase resources to support drug education.

Four teachers have been employed to develop additional resources for use in schools. These include:

- a K-6 drug education resource
- support for the 1997 SRC conference which will focus on drug education
- a pamphlet for parents about drug education
- materials for teachers on drug education
- end of year celebrations package including the Help Card.
Special programs have been developed for students at risk of drug abuse. One of these is for Aboriginal students. It was developed with the AECG in the first year of the funding and will continue for five years.

A kit is being trialed on dealing with students who are caught smoking at school. It will be distributed to all schools once the trial and evaluation has concluded.

(b) and (c) Detailed expenditure items for 1997/98 have not yet been finalised, however they will contain both new and continuing projects.

*117. Mrs Chadwick asked:

Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-99:

Budget Paper No 2 states that an amount of $5 million is spent on program for air conditioning of schools and demountables:

(1) What is the schedule for installation in 1997/98 and subsequent years?

(2) What formula is the allocation based on?

(3) How much was spent on school airconditioning in 1996/97?

(4) What is the full list of installation carried out in 1996/97?

(5) What was the full cost of air conditioning schools in Badgerys Creek electorate?

(6) Under what formula were air conditioners provided for schools in Badgerys Creek electorate?

(7) Which other metropolitan schools will receive air conditioners under this program?

Answer—

In April 1997 I announced the revamping of the air cooling program to target the hottest classrooms in the hottest schools across regional and rural New South Wales.

The new program will be expanded from $2 million per year to $5 million per year. Identification of the hottest classrooms in the hottest areas has started.

To provide a detailed response to this Question at this stage would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the department that cannot be justified.

*118. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 4-95:

The Budget paper refers to Government strategies to tackle the issue of truancy:

(1) What amount of funding has been allocated to this program?

(2) Why has the number of Home School Liaison Officers (HSLO) declined by 10 since 1994/95?
(3) How are HSLO’s targeted?

(4) What are the rates of truancy, by school district, for each of the years since 1994 until the present? (Where district figures are not available please provide regional statistics)

Answer—

(1) Funding of $6.3 million will be provided in 1997/98 to combat truancy. This includes salary and related working expense costs for the 85 Home School Liaison Officers and 11 Education Officers (Aboriginal Community Support). Funding will also continue to be provided for the training of additional home school liaison officers.

(2) The 85 home school liaison officers and 11 education officers (Aboriginal community support) remain unchanged. There has been no decline in the services offered by the program in supporting students, their families and schools. When the Department of School Education moved into a district structure, student welfare consultants were appointed to each of the 40 districts to manage the Home School Liaison Program in addition to a variety of other functions. In fact, the number of personnel directly involved in the program has increased by 30.

(3) Home school liaison officers are targeted to districts on the basis of levels of unjustified absences.

(4) The Department of School Education has never collected information on the rates of truancy. Last year this Government undertook the first ever review of truancy in NSW. Results indicated that fewer than 1% of students are absent on any one day without legitimate reason. Of this 1%, fewer than a third were found to have been truanting.

119. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper 3, pp 305-332:

In relation to the interagency school community centres pilot project;

(1) What is the full cost of this project, and what is the Departments component of this cost?

(2) How much was allocated towards this project in each budget from 1994/95 until 1996/97?

(3) How much has been allocated towards this project in 1997/98?

(4) What changes, if any, are planned for the project?

Answer—

(1) The full cost of this project to the end of 1996/97 is roundly $660,000. The Department of School Education contribution to this total is $259,000.

(2) The Department of School Education has allocated the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>$34,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>$112,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) The Department of School Education has provisionally allocated $117,200 in 1997/98 to maintain the project subject to the concurrence of the existing participants including the Departments of Health and Community Services.

(4) A meeting will be held of Chief Executive Officers from interested Departments to discuss and consider future directions following receipt of the evaluation report on the pilot project.

*120. Mrs Chadwick asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Open Training and Education Network?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

To provide a detailed statistical response to this question would involve considerable time and a diversion of resources away from the core responsibilities of the NSW TAFE Commission that cannot be justified.

**OLYMPICS**

COMMITTEE No. 1

*1. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 547, Financial Summary, Capital Program:

(1) (a) What are the intended post-Games uses of each of the Olympic facilities?

(b) How were these determined?

(2) Was the post-Games use of each facility the subject of general community input, or was it that the recognised sporting associations were the only ones approached?

(3) What is the estimated on-going subsidy for each of these facilities?

(4) (a) Is the management of these facilities being put out to tender?

(b) If so, when?

(c) If not, why not?
Answer—

(1) (a) The planned post-Games use of each of the Olympic facilities is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Post-Games Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>archery &amp; park-land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>baseball, showring, equestrian events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Volleyball</td>
<td>temporary facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>equestrian sport, other equestrian activities, walking trails, community recreation &amp; parkland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>State Hockey Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Bike</td>
<td>mountain bike track, walking track, park land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Arena</td>
<td>indoor sport and popular entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regatta Centre</td>
<td>rowing, canoeing, triathlon, parkland, community recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>shooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showground exhibition Halls</td>
<td>exhibition halls, Royal Easter Show halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>football and entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>State Softball Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>major tennis events, through to recreational tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velodrome</td>
<td>Cycling, community sport and recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) (b) and (2)

The post-Games use of each facility was determined by the following:-

- the legacy commitments to the sport as agreed during the Bid period and committed to the then Premier in the Sydney Bid documents; and

- a strategic analysis of market research for additional uses undertaken either by OCA, or its predecessors, or by the eventual owner in the case of BOOT projects.

Market research for each facility canvassed, where appropriate not only the recognised sporting associations but other relevant community organisations, relevant commercial operations and other potential users. It should be understood that wide market research was not undertaken for certain facilities which have limited potential for multi-purpose use eg. hockey, softball.
(3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Post-Games Use Estimated Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>not known at this stage - part of Millennium Parklands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>nil the RAS accepts exposure to operational costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Volleyball</td>
<td>not applicable - temporary facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>not known at this stage, business plan and plan of management being prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Bike</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Arena</td>
<td>nil - BOOT scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regatta Centre</td>
<td>anticipated that post Olympic costs will be off-set by user fees and investment from the Government’s share of the urban development component of the Penrith Lakes Development Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>not known at this stage, business and operational planning are underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showground Exhibition Halls</td>
<td>nil - the RAS accepts exposure to operational costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>nil - BOOT scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>not known at this stage the business planning for this facility has just commenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>nil- anticipated that the eventual operator will accept exposure to operational costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velodrome</td>
<td>nil - anticipated that the Bankstown District Sports and Social Club will accept exposure to operational costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) (a-c) Determination of the post-Games manager or operator for each facility will be undertaken on its merits having regard to the nature and location of the facility and commercial opportunities available to Government.

The following schedule details the current position regarding tendering for the management of each venue:-
## Facility Management Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Management Arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>Part of Millennium Parklands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>RAS is to be the operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Volleyball</td>
<td>temporary facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>State Sports Centre is owner/operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Bike</td>
<td>NPWS is the owner/operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Arena</td>
<td>subject of a current BOOT process - successful consortia will manage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regatta Centre</td>
<td>to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showground Exhibition Halls</td>
<td>RAS is the manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>was the subject of a BOOT process - SA2000 Consortium to manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velodrome</td>
<td>anticipated that the Bankstown District Sports and Social Club will manage as a result of the Velodrome EOI process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2. Mr Bull asked:

   In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 545, Annual Appropriation from Consolidated Revenue, Olympic Co-
   ordination Authority:

(1) What is the estimated recurrent costs for the OCA in each of the coming four years?

(2) (a) Do these figures differ from that estimated by the Auditor-General in his 1994 report?
   
   (b) If so, why?

Answer—

(1) 1997-98 $25.6 M  
    1998-99 $25.5 M
1999-00 $26.6 M
2000-01 $26.6 M

(2) (a) Yes.

(b) The figures included by the Auditor-General in his 1994 performance audit report “Sydney Olympics 2000 - Review of Estimates” were incomplete and only represented those costs of the former Office of Olympic Co-ordination, a division within the Premier’s Department, ignoring the recurrent costs of three other entities that had a major role in the Olympic Capital Program.

The current estimates represent the costs of the Olympic Co-ordination Authority, which is made up of four former entities the Office of Olympic Co-ordination, Premier’s Department; the Homebush Bay Corporation, Property Services Group; the Olympic Construction Authority, Public Works and Services; and the Olympic Facilities Unit, Department of Sport and Recreation.

*3. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 546, Olympic Co-ordination Authority, Operating Statement, other operating expenses:

(1) How much did Olympic Co-ordinating Authority spend on consultants in 1996/97?

(2) How much is budgeted to be spent in 1997/98?

Answer—

(1) This information will be provided in the Annual Report which is tabled in Parliament.

(2) The 1997-98 recurrent budget estimates expenditure of $2.157 M.

*4. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 547, Financial Summary, Capital Program:

State of Play 1, issued last year indicates that the Government will contribute $151.6m to the cost of the Olympic Stadium, surrounds and development costs. The latest State of Play indicates that the contribution is now expected to be $121m.

What is the reason for this discrepancy?

Answer—

The Government contribution to the stadium project is $30 m less than the amount reported in the 1996-97 State Budget and State of Play.

At the time of compiling the 1996-97 State Budget, contractual arrangements between the Government and Stadium Australia were the subject of continuing negotiations.

The stadium contracts were completed in late 1996, and the 1997-98 State Budget and State of Play Update 97 reflect the final contractual position.
*5. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 547, Financial Summary, Capital Program:

(1) (a) Can the Minister indicate how the Building Price Index, used to inflate the capital works program is derived?

(b) How does this figure compare with similar indices used by others in the building industry?

(2) How do you account for the fact that when adjusted by a BPI of 5.5%, last year’s capital budget of $1,914m is in fact $2,019m and not $1,988m as indicated in the Minister’s Budget-time press release?

(3) Does this mean that the increase on last year’s budget is in fact $229m and not $124m as indicated at the time?

Answer—

(1) (a) The Building Price Index used by OCA to inflate the capital works program is taken directly from QS Services Industry Review, NSW September Quarter 1996 (published November 1996), by State Projects, Department of Public Works and Services.

(b) The Department of Public Works and Services building price index is commonly used throughout the building industry.

(2) The interpretation of the numbers gives no consideration to the fact that work is done throughout the year, and that work has been completed in previous years. The arithmetic of the equation is not as simple as applying a per annum rate of increase. The $1988M is the correct figure.

(3) No.

*6. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 547, Financial Summary, Capital Program:

Other Olympic cities have gone to great effort to provide multi-lingual signs, information booths and translation services to provide the friendliest atmosphere for non-English speaking visitors.

What arrangements does the Government have in place to provide such facilities in and around Sydney and the Olympic site?

Answer—

Language services will be required for the Olympic Family, athletes, officials, media, sponsors and spectators. SOCOG will be providing signage around all Olympic venues, as well as pictograms in the two official languages of the Olympic Games - English and French. SOCOG will work with relevant Local, State and Federal Government agencies in order to achieve consistency in signage, wayfinding and the provision of visitor information.

Within Olympic precincts and venues there will be information booths, and these will be staffed by multilingual staff. SOCOG will be staffing a multilingual switchboard in more than 40 languages for athletes in the Athletes’ Village.
SOCOG will be recruiting 1500 language aides who will be sourced from Australia’s many language professionals and from within our multicultural communities. The language aides will be providing language assistance to visiting athletes and officials. Language assistance will be provided in areas such as airport welcomes, customs, immigration for the Olympic Family, VIP hosts and security.

Sydney already has in place excellent multilingual information services in relation to health care interpreter services, telephone interpreter services or visitors information services.

*7. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 547, Financial Summary, Capital Program:

Will the Minister table the probity auditor’s report for the selection of the Bankstown and Blacktown sites for Olympic venues?

Answer—

The Probity Auditor’s report for the Velodrome and Softball will be made available to any Member of Parliament to read at the OCA offices, Level 36, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, Sydney.

*8. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 547, Financial Summary, Capital Program:

Why was the Sydney Gun Club at Menai not suitable for the site of the Olympic Shooting Facility.

Answer—

(1) The Marconi Clay target club was considered both at the time of the Bid and as a replacement for Holsworthy when it was effectively ruled out by the Federal Government’s second airport decision.

The Menai site did not make the short-listed sites in either exercise for the following reasons:-

The Menai site is in excess of the critical 30 minute travel time from the Olympic Village;

(2) Insufficient space for the promised facility. The club is a shotgun club and the existing configuration of the site and the topography of the surrounding lands do not allow the development of the comprehensive shooting facility required for UIT events- a legacy promised to the ASA the UIT and the IOC within the Sydney Bid; and

(3) As a result of constraints in land size and topography the existing shot-gun range on the site has a shooting orientation too far east to be a serious contender for an international standard facility.

*9. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 547, Financial Summary, Capital Program:

Can the Minister provide venue by venue breakdown of expenditure to 30/6/97?
Answer—

Estimated costs to 30-6-97 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stadium</td>
<td>$29.500 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>$3.422 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velodrome</td>
<td>$1.350 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>$2.769 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>$0.827 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>$33.712 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures relating to other venues are considered confidential as they are subject to continuing commercial negotiations with private sector parties.

*10. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 547, Financial Summary, Capital Program:

Recent media reports have indicated that the Australian Baseball Federation is unhappy with the RAS Showring being used as a permanent home for baseball in Sydney, and that a search is underway for a second pitch.

(1) (a) What is the estimated cost of this second pitch?

(b) Who will fund it?

(c) Is the second pitch budgeted for in the Government’s current capital plan?

(2) Has the Government attempted to resolve any difficulties that the ABF is having with the proposed site at Homebush?

Answer—

(1) (a) The cost estimate for the second pitch is $4 million

(b) This cost is included in the SOCOG budget

(c) It is noted as a SOCOG item in the Government’s current capital plan

(2) The need for a second Baseball venue does not arise from any concerns regarding the design or operation of the Sydney Baseball Stadium. The need for a second competition field was identified in the Sydney Bid documents. Further, the experience of Atlanta and Barcelona has prompted the IOC and the International Baseball Association (IBA) to request planning for a second venue as a backup facility for the Olympic program. A request supported by the SOCOG Sports Commission.

On 4 April 1997, SOCOG and the Government announced that Oriole Park at Auburn would undergo a $4 million, SOCOG funded, redevelopment to become Sydney’s second baseball venue. Oriole Park has a long tradition with baseball and these improvements will provide an important legacy for the sport.

In terms of the Baseball Stadium at Homebush Bay:

OCA has been consulting with and seeking comment from the ABF and the Sydney Blues club regarding design and development of the Baseball Stadium at Homebush Bay;
The design was developed in consultation with HKS a specialist sport architecture firm from the USA, and fully complies with the requirements for international competition (including Olympic requirements); and

Negotiations are advanced on the terms of a long-term lease between the RAS and the Sydney Blues to have this venue as the home ground for the Sydney Blues in the National Baseball League - this lease to commence on completion.

*11. Mr Bull asked:

Given that the Cecil Park site for shooting has to be built from scratch and is not convenient to public transport:

Will the Minister explain why the Sydney Gun Club at Menai was not chosen instead as it already has half the facilities needed for the Games.

Answer—

Refer to Question No 8.

*12. Mr Bull asked:

Could the Minister provide probity auditor reports undertaken with the selection of the:

(a) Velodrome venue at Bankstown;

(b) Shooting venue at Cecil Park;

(c) Softball venue at Bankstown?

Answer—

A probity auditor was engaged to oversight the competitive Expressions of Interest (EOI) process used for the selection of sites submitted by nominated Local Councils for the Velodrome and Softball venues.

The selection of the Shooting site was not the result of a competitive EOI process. This selection was a result of a planning exercise and a probity auditor was not required.

Any Member of Parliament is welcome to view the Probity Auditor’s reports for the Velodrome and Softball at the OCA offices, Level 36, Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, Sydney.

*13. Mr Bull asked:

How many Australians and non-English speaking background and Aboriginal Australians are working at:

(a) SOCOG?

(b) The OCA?

(c) At what levels are these people working?
Answer—

Staff information is provided in Annual Reports which are tabled in Parliament.

*14. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

(a) catering and entertainment of any form;
(b) travel and accommodation of any form; and
(c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products?

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

*15. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s) ?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies ?

Answer—

(1) and (2) As is the case in all Westminster systems, Ministers are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the administration of these bodies.

*16. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97, and at what cost ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip?

Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.

*17. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.

*18. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:

(a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?

(b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?

(c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?

(d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?

(e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?
Answer—

(1) (a-e) & (2) Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.

*19. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general, wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

(3) The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and its funding are set out at page 12 of the Budget Summary.

*20. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

   (b) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for these purposes?

(2) (a) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97?

   (b) How many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

(3) (a) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98?

   (b) How many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

Answer—

The refurbishment, upgrading and relocation of offices are required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.
21. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97?

(b) Which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98?

(c) Which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/Completion Date</th>
<th>Total cost of Project</th>
<th>Total allocation to the Project 1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

Details of recurrent and capital programs are provided in the State Budget papers.

22. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office in 1996-97?

Answer—

It is a requirement that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

23. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you?

(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96?

(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees?

(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee?

(5) How many public servants are serving in an ex officio capacity?
(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) Four Boards and twelve Committees.

(2) Apart from the Darling Harbour Board and associated Committee, other Boards and Committees have been established in relation to Sydney’s hosting the Year 2000 Olympic Games.

(3) There are approximately 150 people serving on these Boards and Committees.

(4) Approximately forty-five Board and Committee Members receive fees. Premier’s Memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part-time members. Remuneration for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI. In some instances, other factors may be taken into consideration when establishing remuneration levels.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are included in Annual Reports.

(6) Committee members are not asked to provide the information sought by this question.

(7) Not applicable.

*24. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”?

(2) From which particular programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services announced in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.

*25. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?
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Answer—

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No 2, Chapter 1, page 42.

26. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at page 17), how many employees are currently employed by the Department, by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?

Answer—

The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available in certain cases.

27. Mr Bull asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration:

(1) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(2) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(3) specifically in relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups, and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.
*28. Mr Bull asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you, and what was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you.

(2) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?

(3) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was their floor space?

Answer—

Office accommodation expenses are generally included in financial statements in Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements in Annual Reports.
*1. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 67, Program 4.3.5, there is the statement:

“capital payments are lower due to completion of the purchase of housing associated with the 300 additional supported accommodation for people with disabilities”, also
“successful completion of the program has reduced the Department’s capital payments.”

As the Council for Intellectual Disability estimates there are still 2,200 intellectually disabled still being cared for by aged parents at home, how does the Government intend to respond to this unmet need?

Answer—

The government established the Accommodation Task Force in July 1996 to develop a strategic planning framework for accommodation support for people with disabilities and older people. The Task Force has investigated ways services can be improved for people with a disability including joint planning between agencies. There are a number of innovative projects being trialed in NSW around joint planning which includes disability services.

The Task Force is committed to examining how government accommodation and support service sectors can work more efficiently and effectively to house and care for people with disabilities. The Task Force is due to report to me later this year.

The Ageing and Disability Department has also developed a new population group planning model that looks at the needs of the whole disability population. This will improve the present planning and resource allocation process for disability services by enabling resources to be better targeted to the most disadvantaged groups.

The Ageing and Disability Department has also developed a Disability Policy Framework which will complement the work of population group planning model by working with mainstream government agencies to improve their service access to people with disabilities. This will be released for public comment in the near future.

I do recognise that there is significant unmet need in the area of supported accommodation, just as there was between 1988 and 1994. However this Government has provided more supported accommodation places than any Government in this state’s history.

*2. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 72, Program 4.3.5:

(1) How many intellectually disabled people will be accommodated with the $189.7 million as shown?

(2) Is the $30.7 million in addition to the $189.7 million or only a proportion of it?
Answer—

(1) Funding of $189.727 million will be provided to the Department of Community Services in 1997/98 to provide a range of accommodation services to people with disabilities. This level of funding will provide 2,733 accommodation placements for people with intellectual disabilities; 1,678 in large residential facilities and 1,055 in group homes. These numbers do not include any respite care placements.

(2) Funding of $30.7 million will be provided to both the Department of Community Services and non-government organisations in 1997/98 to provide services under the Supported Accommodation (300 Places) program. Funding for this item is included under the line items “Assistance to Disabled - payments to Department of Community Services” and “Assistance to Disabled - other payments” in Budget Paper Number 3 and is in addition to funding of $189.727 million being provided to the Department of Community Services for supported accommodation services.

*3. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 254, Program 29.1.1, Outputs for Home Care:

(1) In view of the demands on this service, and the unmet demand, particularly for respite care, why is there no increase in respite care hours?

(2) Why has the number of households serviced each month dropped from 39,000 to 37,000?

(3) Why has the staffing level decreased?

Answer—

(1) The number of respite care service hours for 1997/98 is expected to increase, although only slightly with Home Care looking to maintain the same 11.3% of all hours delivered.

The general decline in this category of service reflects the trend which has emerged over the last five years. The increase in personal care has been at the expense of hours of service for other categories of care. At present some 4% of customers utilise approximately 35% of all hours. These high use customers who are divided equally between frail aged and people with disabilities are not declining. In addition to this, the HACC guidelines require priority to be given to customers with ‘greater relative need’. The review of Home Care was established to address these issues.

(2) The decline reflects the trend which has emerged over the last five years and is identified above. The increase in personal care has been at the expense of housekeeping services which are less costly. This results in fewer customers/households being able to receive services. At present some 4% of customers utilise approximately 35% of all hours. These high use customers who are divided equally between frail aged and people with disabilities are not declining. In addition to this, the HACC guidelines require priority to be given to customers with ‘greater relative need’ and the outcome is that these high use customers will continue to consume an increasing amount of hours which may result in a decline in the number of households serviced per month. It is worth noting that although the number of people on the books at any one time are going down, the Home Care Service is seeing more than 47,000 clients pass through its books per annum.

(3) The decline relates to the expected review of establishment numbers in both Area and Central Office positions. Some positions where staff have left will not be filled in the coming year, eg, Area Managers and Accounting Staff.
Mrs Forsythe asked:

(1) As the Watagau Lodge hostel has been closed (or is in the final stages of closure), how many of the residents are now in independent supported accommodation?

(2) Is it a fact that some residents are to be sent to Allendale near Cessnock, a nursing home for frail, aged and people with dementia?

(3) If so, how will these people who were previously able to walk into Cooranbong from Watagau Lodge maintain their independence?

(4) Is the Minister aware that it will be too far from Allendale for these people to go independently into Cessnock?

(5) Does he regard this as satisfactory?

(6) Will the Minister guarantee that none of these ex Watagau Lodge residents be sent to Stockton Hospital, which is a facility for the most severely physically disabled?

Answer—

(1) The Watagan Centre closed on 16 October 1995 and 83 residents were placed in supported accommodation options. All of these residents continue to receive support.

(2) No resident was relocated to Allendale Hospital.

(3) The fundamental aspects of the Watagan Integration Project are community access and the development of living skills to increase the independence of the residents since the closure of the Watagan Centre.

Funding for day placement options has been provided under the Watagan Integration Project, specifically to enhance community access and skill development which will lead to greater independence. This funding is in addition to that provided for supported accommodation.

Since the closure of the centre, 12 of the residents initially relocated to supported accommodation options have progressed to semi-independent living in the general community. These ex-residents are now supported on a drop-in basis, with hours of support determined to suit individual needs of the person concerned.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) Yes.

Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 255:

As Home Care is known to be in such short supply, why is it suggested that user charges revenue from Home Care Service fees will drop in 1997/98 from 14,526 to 13,555?
Answer—

The answer lies in two areas:

First, the anticipated revenue from fees for the current financial year will not be realised. In large part, this has been due to the fact that 94% of Home Care’s customers are pensioners and have very limited capacity to pay higher fees.

Secondly, while the hours of service next year are expected to increase, a significant proportion of these hours are expected to be used by high need clients. This reflects the increasing complexity of care required by many Home Care customers, both older people and people with disabilities. People receiving relatively more hours of service pay relatively less for their services on an hourly basis because of their limited financial resources.

*6. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 256:

(1) (a) It states that the budget allocation for HACC for 1997/98 has not yet been determined.

(b) Why is this so?

(2) When will a determination be made?

Answer—

(1) As the Home and Community Care (HACC) Program is a joint State/Commonwealth Program, the final Budget requires joint agreement with the Commonwealth Minister. The State Budget allocated an additional $4.95 million in Program contributions. These additional funds provided by the State Government will enable matching of the anticipated offer for growth in the Program by the Commonwealth Government. The estimated HACC Budget for 1997/98 is $253.7 million, which represents an increase of $12.3 million from 1996/97.

(2) The process for finalising the HACC Budget is for the Commonwealth Minister to write to me with a formal offer. I am awaiting this offer. Once the formal offer from the Commonwealth is received, the 1997/98 HACC Budget will be resolved without further delay. The substantial increase in funding for the Program will enable the expansion of services and will be distributed later this year in accordance with priorities established through the local area planning processes.

*7. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 249, Program 28.8.1:

Can the Minister explain why the rate of juvenile recidivism still remains at 14%?

Answer—

It is widely acknowledged that juveniles in detention represent the most serious and recalcitrant of juvenile offenders.

The figure of 14% refers to the number of juveniles who have returned to custody having served a prior term in custody. The figure indicates that 86% of juvenile detainees are not returning to custody following serving a custodial sentence. There are three main reasons for this:
(i) they have stopped offending;

(ii) their latest offence was not serious enough to warrant a custodial sentence; or,

(iii) they are now too old for the juvenile justice system.

Generally speaking, the courts have afforded juveniles in custody numerous opportunities, through the use of community based alternatives to custody such as Community Service Orders and supervised probation orders, to stop offending. That 14% of juveniles in custody had served a prior term suggests that the Department's programs are reasonably successful in stopping re-offending or, at least, minimising the seriousness of subsequent offending.

It would be unrealistic to expect that programs will be 100% successful in preventing juveniles from returning to custody. Nonetheless, the Department is attempting to further reduce the likelihood of juvenile detainees returning to custody through, for example, the introduction of culturally appropriate post release services which assist young people in living crime free lives following their release from custody. Examples include:

- Careforce Post Release Support Program, at Cabramatta, for Indo-Chinese young people;

- Barnardos Post Release Support Services, at Bankstown and Marrickville, for Pacific Islander and Arabic speaking young people; and,

- Rural post release programs, operating at Wollongong, Newcastle, Armidale and Wagga Wagga, for all young people including Aboriginal young people.

The establishment of the Aboriginal Mentor Program and the generalist Mentor Program also aim to break the juvenile crime cycle.

*8. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 245, Program 27.1.1:

(1) Why is it anticipated that there will be an increase in the number of complaints handled?

(2) After two years under your administration, why has the number of complaints doubled?

Answer—

(1) The demand for the Community Services Commission’s services has increased for four main reasons:

(a) the education and publicity programmes of the commission have been effective in raising consumer and advocate awareness of their rights to demand good quality services, the benefits of good complaints handling, and the rights of consumers to speak out if they are dissatisfied;

(b) successfully resolved complaints have raised consumer and advocate awareness of the commission’s existence as a place to go for help;

(c) successful cases and high quality investigation reports have progressively raised consumer and advocate confidence in the commission’s ability and willingness to advocate for consumer rights to quality services;
(d) service provider confidence in the commission from fair and even-handed resolution of complaints has meant that services are increasingly willing to encourage dissatisfied consumers to take their cases to the commission.

(2) Please refer to the above answer. As I have mentioned before, and the literature confirms, an increase in complaints can be a positive sign that consumers are less afraid to speak out, more aware of their rights to complain if something is wrong and more confident that something will be done if they do.

My departments are encouraged to view complaints positively as valuable consumer feedback. The important thing is that complaints are handled skillfully, that lessons are learned from them, and that patterns are identified from complaints that drive reforms in service delivery.

*9. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 241, Program 26.1.1, Operating Statement:

(1) Why is there no money available for grants to organisations in 1997/98?

(2) Why have grants for capital services dropped from $11 million to $1.6 million?

Answer—

(1) In 1996/97 an amount of $7.566 million has been estimated as expenses relating to the payment of capital grants to the Department of Community Services for provision of services under the Supported Accommodation (300 Places) program.

Capital funding of $26 million was initially provided under the program in 1995/96 and the estimated expenditure in 1996/97 represents the final allocation of funds under the program to the Department of Community Services.

Additionally, an amount of $130,000 was paid to non-government organisations in 1996/97 by way of a one-off grant in support of Seniors Week activities.

(2) In 1996/97 an amount of $11.055 million has been estimated as expenses under the line item “Grants for Capital Purposes”. This level of expenditure represents $9.055 million in capital grants paid to non-government organisations under the Supported Accommodation (300 Places) program and $2 million in capital grants to be paid under the Disability Children’s Services program.

Funding of $26 million was initially provided under the Supported Accommodation (300 Places) program in 1995/96 and the estimated expenditure in 1996/97 represents the final allocation of funds under the program to non-government organisations.

Capital funding under the Disability Children’s services program was provided over a two year period with $2 million being provided in 1996/97 and a further $1.6 million being provided for allocation to services in 1997/98.

*10. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 235, Program 25.2.1, Disability Services:
Given that additional funds are being made available to provide additional places (see 4-72 Supported Accommodation), why has the number of group homes only increased from 228 in 1996/97 to 232 for 1997/98?

Answer—

This government has created an additional 300 supported accommodation places for people with disabilities.

These ‘places’ took the form of flexible service packages that were mainly allocated to people with moderate to high support needs who were in urgent need of supported accommodation. Most recipients had ageing carers; others were people whose parents had died and they had no other carers in the community, or people with exceptionally high support needs who required urgent support.

To ensure the most efficient use of resources the funding for service provision for the 300 supported accommodation places was put out to competitive tender.

All service providers with appropriate experience and capacity to provide services to the target group could apply. Selection was made on merit by selection committees convened by each of the Department of Community Services’ operational areas and included community and consumer representatives.

The Department of Community Services currently administers 28 of these 300 ‘places’. As is also the case for those ‘places’ won by the non government sector, most did not become configured into new group homes. Most of these new services are specifically designed to suit the individual needs of consumers and this involves providing a ‘package’ of services to each consumer designed to meet their individual needs.

Service packages usually consist of staff support provided in the consumer’s home, day program or some other form of daily activity, living skills training and recreational support services. To the extent that it is possible, these services are integrated into the person’s existing environment and social network. This is in keeping with the Disability Services Act which aims to promote the independence and community integration of people with disabilities.

*11. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 226, Program 25.1.1, Operating Statement:

Why is there no subvention for the St Vincent de Paul Homeless Persons project?

Answer—

During 1996/97, the Department of Community Services undertook a review of its line item structure with a view to presenting activities with a focus on program objectives and program description.

The process included the retitling of program line items or the amalgamation or transfer of line items to best reflect presentation of activities.

The St Vincent de Paul line item was incorporated into the Refuges for Men, Women, Youth and Children line item.

The transfer has not affected the level of funding previously provided to St Vincent de Paul, nor the level of commitment to the service.

*12. Mrs Forsythe asked:
In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 226:

Why has the funding for the child sexual assault program dropped from $1.2 million in 1996/97 to $642,000 in 1997/98?

Answer—

Included within the 1996/97 revised amount for the Child Sexual Assault Program were the following one-off funding adjustments:

- Supplementation of funding of $450,000 towards the Inter-Agency Guidelines for Child Protection; and,
- Commitment rollovers from 1995/96 being paid in 1996/97 of $210,000.

Additionally, funding of $108,000 was transferred, on a recurrent basis, from this line item to the Operating Expenses - Employee Related line item within the Child and Family Support sub-program.

The 1997/98 Budget reflects the adjustment for the one-off funding allocations made in 1996/97, plus an adjustment for indexation.

*13. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 226, Program 25.1.1:

Why has the funding for family group homes been halved from $798,000 in 1996/97 to $366,000 in 1997/98?

Answer—

The House Parent Group Home was designated a “non preferred model” following a review of service provision in substitute care. It was felt that children placed in this type of care could be accommodated in well supported foster care programs. In response to this decision, a financial plan established in 1994 to assist in the management of the transition of substitute care services, identified funding to Departmental group homes declining over time. The funds for group homes would be directed to payments for foster carers in the future.

The financial support provided to children and their carers in group homes will not change.

*14. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 72, Program 4.3.5:

If $1.5 million is being allocated to the Brain Injury program, will the Minister ensure that young people with brain injuries are no longer sent to Allendale and accommodated with people suffering from dementia?

Answer—

No. However, I can advise the Honourable Member that the $1.5 million for services to people with an acquired brain injury is fully committed to those services identified under the brain injury action plan which was announced in May 1992.

The issue of younger people being placed within nursing homes for the aged is a matter of great regret. It is an issue that is problematic across Australia. It is problematic because these young people require the level of care available in nursing homes that is not available elsewhere.
I indicated immediately after the Federal Treasurer’s Budget Speech of 13 May 1997, that the $54 million enhancements he announced were fictional. The Commonwealth Government raised hopes and expectations that at least some of the unmet need for accommodation and support for people with disabilities would be addressed. However, the Federal Treasurer neglected to announce that the 6% efficiency dividend (announced in last year’s Budget) would apply to disability services over the same four years as these “ghost” enhancements.

All States and Territories await confirmation from the Commonwealth Minister for Family Services, the Hon Judi Moylan, that when and if a new Commonwealth / State Disability Agreement is signed, the Commonwealth will agree to negotiate on a timeframe for addressing unmet need.

*15. Mrs Forsythe asked:

Does the Minister agree that people suffering brain damage, perhaps as a result of a motor accident, need much more intensive physiotherapy, occupational therapy and other treatment to ensure that their recovery can be maximised and expedited?

Answer—

It is true that people who acquire a brain injury as a result of a traumatic incident are likely to require intensive therapy/rehabilitation services immediately post acute care.

However, as the Honourable Member is no doubt aware, rehabilitation services are not a part of my portfolio responsibilities.

Such services are provided through the Health portfolio and I am sure that, should he be asked, my colleague, the Minister for Health, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Deputy Premier, the Honourable Dr Andrew Refshauge, will tell you, NSW leads the country in the provision of specialist rehabilitation services for people with an acquired brain injury. These are provided through Brain Injury Rehabilitation Units attached to more than a dozen major hospitals statewide.

*16. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 240, Program 26.1.1, Ageing and Disability and Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-76:

(1) What was the cost of the Home Care Review?

(2) Did the Review include a process of advertisements and public forums?

(3) How many people attended those forums?

(4) When and where were these forums held?

(5) (a) Will you release the Review Report?

(b) If so, when?

Answer—

(1) The total cost of the Home Care Review was $46,843.
The communication strategy used to inform stakeholders of the participation process was twofold. The Review directly mailed key organisations and also ran an advertisement in the print media and on radio.

The Review advertisement informed stakeholders that the review of HCS was under way. The advertisement also set out the Task Force Membership and invited those who wished to participate in the Review process to contact the Review.

The advertisement was placed in the Sydney Morning Herald, the Daily Telegraph, fifteen major regional newspapers, the Koori Mail, the Australian Chinese Daily, Chieu Duong, El Telegraph, La Fiamma, the Macedonian Herald, Nova Hrvatska, O Kosmos and the Spanish Herald. The choice of ethnic newspapers was determined by the demographics of ethnic consumers of the Home Care Service. The Review also contacted Radio 2RPH, who read the advertisement to listeners. The Review team placed the same advertisement in English and in the relevant language of the newspapers and included the Telephone Interpreter Service number.

Respondents to the advertisement and key organisations were sent an information pack containing the Review's Terms of Reference, a Newsletter explaining the Review's structure, process, participation and contact details.

Interested parties had a choice of three methods by which they could comment to the Review:

- over the telephone;
- written submissions;
- participation forums.

The preferred method for input by the Review was by attendance at participation forums. Selected key stakeholders were also invited to special interest focus groups.

The total number of people attending participation forums and focus groups was 597.

There were twelve Participation Forums held, five in city locations and seven in regional areas. The locations and dates were:

- Maroubra 5 August 1996
- Parramatta 6 August 1996
- Orange 7 August 1996
- Chatswood 8 August 1996
- Burwood 12 August 1996
- Wagga Wagga 13 August 1996
- Nowra 14 August 1996
- Lismore 19 August 1996
- Tamworth 20 August 1996
- Liverpool 21 August 1996
- Moree 26 August 1996.

It is envisaged that following Cabinet consideration the Review Report will be made public along with appropriate action strategies.

Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 235, Program 25.2.1, Disability Services - Operating Statement and Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 2-3, Figure 2.1:
(1) Have employees covered by the Health and Research Employees Association award lodged a 3% pay claim for 1997/98?

(2) Taking into account this fact and the fact that Figure 2.1 indicates inflation is estimated at 1.8% for 1997/98, will total expenses need to rise by $8.89 million in order to maintain the current level of services?

(3) Given these substantial costs, how do you expect to maintain services in 1997/98?

Answer—

(1) No.

(2) No. Included within the 1997/98 Total Expenses Budget figure within the Disability Services - Operating Statement (Budget Paper No 3, page 235) is a component of indexation for each expenses category (excluding Depreciation) as determined by Treasury.

(3) Not applicable.

*18. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

(a) catering and entertainment of any form;
(b) travel and accommodation of any form; and
(c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products?

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

*19. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s) ?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies ?

Answer—

As is the case in all Westminster systems of Government, Ministers are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption, and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.
20. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97, and at what cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip?

Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons in employed in the departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to overseas travel, the details of visits and their purposes is required to be published in each department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.

21. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

Each department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.

22. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:

(a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?

(b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?

(c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?
(d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?

(e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

Advertising by Government departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.

*23. Mr Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal. 

(3) The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and it’s funding are set out at page 12 of the Budget Summary.

*24. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(b) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for these purposes?

(2) (a) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97?

(b) How many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

(3) (a) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98?

(b) How many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?
Answer—

The refurbishment, upgrading or relocation of offices is required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.

*25. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97, and which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98, which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/Completion Date</th>
<th>Total cost of Project</th>
<th>Total allocation to the Project 1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No 2, Chapter 1, page 33.

*26. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

How many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office in 1996-97?

Answer—

It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in the Ministerial Office are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s office.

*27. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you?

(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96?

(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees?

(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee?
(5) How many public servants are serving in an *ex officio* capacity?

(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) The Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 Government boards and committees across all departments.

(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of Boards and committees.

(3) There are approximately 6,000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all members of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s Memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories of people statistical information is only available for 1,918 members. Of these, 3% are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, 11% are from non-English speaking backgrounds, and 5% have a disability. Board and committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July 1996.

*28. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996/97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”?

(2) From which particular programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services announced in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.
*29. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No 2, Chapter 1, page 42.

*30. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at page 17), how many employees are currently employed by the Department, by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?

Answer—

The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional budget funding is available in certain cases.

*31. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration:

(1) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(2) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(3) specifically in relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups, and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.
*32. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you, and what was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you?

(2) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?

(3) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was their floor space?

Answer—

Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of departments in their Annual Reports.

*33. Mr Corbett asked:

In reference to Program 25.1.1; Child and Family:

(1) What level of funding for 1996-97 has been made available by the Department to the Inter-Agency School Community Centres Project?

(2) What proportion of the total funding for this project, jointly funded by the Department of School Education, New South Wales Health and the Department of Community Services, is funded by the Department of Community Services?

(3) In an answer to a question regarding the Project provided by the Minister for Education and Training on November 28, 1996, he advised that pilot community centres had commenced at Redfern, Chartsey, Coonamble and Curran Public Schools:

(a) Has this pilot stage concluded?

(b) If not, when is it due to conclude?

(c) Has any commitment been made in the 1997-98 Budget Estimates for the continuing operation of the pilot centres?

(d) Has any commitment been made in the 1997-98 Budget Estimates for the expansion of the project?

(4) (a) Has any monitoring or evaluation been undertaken into the pilot program?

(b) If so, what are the findings of the monitoring or evaluation?

(c) If not, when is an evaluation due to commence?

(d) Has any funding been made available in the 1997-98 Budget Estimates for monitoring or evaluation?

(e) Is so, how much has been made available in the Budget Estimates?
Answer—

(1) $58,572 with additional resources allocated by local Areas.

(2) The Department of Community Services contributes one third of the total funding to this pilot project.

(3) (a) No.

   (b) 30 June 1997.

   (c) Funding for this pilot project was provided from within existing departmental funds.

   (d) No.

(4) (a) Yes. An Interim Evaluation Report was completed in December 1996.

   (b) An Interim Evaluation Report was completed in December 1996 with a final Evaluation Report to be completed after June 1997. The interim findings indicate that each local project has met program objectives. The findings include key elements under the headings:

   - encouragement and support for families in their parenting role;
   - preparation for school and promotion of the school as a community centre;
   - community involvement in the provision and coordination of services for children and families;
   - interagency cooperation and collaboration; and,
   - implementation issues.

   (c) Not applicable.

   (d) The original funding included $20,000 for evaluation of the pilot project. This was sufficient to cover the evaluation according to the project plan.

   (e) Not applicable.

Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Adoption Services?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) 40.

(2) 6 permanent part-time positions and 34 full-time positions.
(3) Approximately $1,327,564.

(4) Level 13, 130 George Street, Parramatta.

(5) 932 square metres.

(6) Approximately $435,707.

*35. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Child Protection Council?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) 13.

(2) 4 part time and 9 full time.

(3) Approximately $380,593.

(4) Level 14, 447 Kent Street, Sydney.

(5) 404 square metres.

(6) Approximately $109,000.

*36. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Guardianship Board?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?
(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) The Guardianship Board has an estimated equivalent full time staffing level in 1996/97 of 53.

(2) The number and ratio of full time and part time staff varies considerably throughout the year and for the purposes of reporting is converted to an equivalent full time number.

(3) The estimated cost of employee related expenses for the Guardianship Board in 1996/97 is $2.63 million.

(4) Staff are situated at the Guardianship Board, 3a Rowntree St, Balmain.

(5) 1,250 square metres.

(6) Annual rent of $402,036.

*37. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Reunion Information Register?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) The Reunion Information Register is a component of the Department of Community Services’ Adoption Services Branch servicing the Reunion Information Register, Contact Veto Register and Advance Notice Register. There are 5 clerical positions in this Section.

(2) 5 full-time positions.

(3) Approximately $170,076.

(4) Within Adoption Services Branch at Level 13, 130 George Street, Parramatta.

(5) The total area of floor space occupied by Adoption Services Branch is 932 square metres.

*38. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Home and Community Services Department?
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(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

(7) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) There is no such department as the Home and Community Services Department.

(2) Not applicable.

(3) Not applicable.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) Not applicable.

(7) Not applicable.

*39. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in Ageing and Disability Services?

(2) How many people are employed in Child Protection Services?

(3) How many people are employed in the Guardianship Board?

(4) How many people are employed in Adoption Services?

(5) What proportion are full time and part time?

(6) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(7) Where are the staff located?

(8) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(9) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—
The time that would be required to answer such questions is not justified, particularly given that the first question does not make sense and some other questions have already been answered.

*40. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 226: Child and Family Services, sub-program 25.1.1, Child and Family Support, Child Sexual Assault Program:

(1) What are the key features of the program?

(2) Given that the department spent in the year 1995/96 double what has been allocated for the coming year, could the Minister give any assurance that the department will have sufficient funds for this program?

(3) Has the number of children identified as being likely to benefit from the program increased, not decreased?

(4) Will this budget allocation not let some people down?

Answer—

(1) The program provides community education programs for child sexual assault, child protection and child abuse prevention strategies through the NSW Child Protection Council. The community education program includes various publications, seminar series, and conferences.

The Child Protection Council provides a training calendar which includes training in child sexual assault and other child protection strategies. Interagency training and cooperation and coordination are also a key feature of this program. This includes support for Area Child Protection Committees.

(2) The revised budget enhancements for 1996/97 included a one-off supplement for revised Interagency Guidelines in Child Protection Intervention and training for workers. The project to manage the training schedule has been developed and is well underway. This will not require funding in 1997/98. Hence, sufficient funds have been provided for this program.

(3) Has the number of children identified as being likely to benefit from the program increased, note there has been a great increase in the number of children likely to benefit from this program through the increased attendance by workers at Child Protection Council seminars. In addition, the Council has presented a State Conference on Child Protection for the past two years. The training around interagency guidelines has further increased the number of workers trained.

(4) The Child Sexual Assault Program does not provide direct services to children. The supplementation of the 1996/97 budget was directly for the revision of the Interagency Guidelines which is now completed. The charter for the Child Protection Council relates to monitoring and coordination of child protection services in NSW. Funding for 1997/98 will continue to support the ongoing training, seminar series, publications and other child protection prevention strategies identified by the NSW Child Protection Council.

*41. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Program 26, Ageing and Disability Department:

In relation to respite care;

(1) (a) Is some of the money being allocated to country areas of New South Wales?
(b) If so, can the Minister identify broadly the regions that will have access to that funding?

Answer—

(1) (a) In relation to respite care, the bulk of the 1996/97 funding allocation to Children’s Services was for respite care, i.e. $3.25 of the $5.5 million. A third of this amount i.e. $1 million went to country areas.

For HACC services, Area planning which occurred for Round 12, identified “respite” as a number one priority, and growth funding will be allocated according to Area planning priorities. HACC growth funds are allocated to Areas according to a formula which factors in demand and supply issues.

Of the existing HACC funding, $17.1 million was allocated to respite care, of which $10.857 million went to country areas.

In addition, funding of $18.406 million has been allocated for respite care from funds provided under the disability services program of which $9.323 million went to country areas. It should be noted that this latter information has been obtained from service outlets who participated in the 1996 Minimum Data Set collection.

(b) The country regions which will have access to the funding from the 1996/97 Children’s Services package are:

- Central West $250,000
- Macarthur $250,000
- Mid North Coast $100,000
- New England $100,000
- Illawarra $100,000
- Southern Highlands $50,000
- Nepean $50,000
- Riverina Murray $50,000
- Hunter $50,000

Funding to country regions under the Home and Community Care program is as follows:

- Central West $579,000
- Orana/Far West $547,000
- Mid North Coast $817,000
- New England $802,000
- Illawarra $1,124,000
- Southern Highlands $747,000
- Nepean $1,652,000
- Riverina Murray $563,000
- Hunter $2,390,000
- Far North Coast $844,000
- Central Coast $792,000

Funding to country regions under the Disability Services program is as follows (Note: information provided from 1996 Minimum Data Set collection):

- Central West $474,000
- Orana/Far West $1,560,000
- Mid North Coast $799,000
New England $ 516,000
Illawarra $ 671,000
Southern Highlands $ 130,000
Nepean $1,439,000
Riverina Murray $ 457,000
Hunter $2,615,000
Far North Coast $ 156,000
Central Coast $ 506,000

*42. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13: Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What is expected to be the total area of floor space and rent paid on offices in Departments administered by the Minister which will be continuously occupied and not continuously occupied in 1997/98?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program or Description of Office</th>
<th>Address of Office</th>
<th>Area of space continuously occupied in 1997/98</th>
<th>Rent on Floor space continuously occupied in 1997/98</th>
<th>Area of space not continuously occupied in 1997/98</th>
<th>Rent on Floor space not continuously occupied in 1997/98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—
Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of departments in their Annual Reports.

*43. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p 241; Program 26.1.1; Grants and Subsidies-Supported Accommodation Assistance;

What organisations have applied for funding under this item?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Registered Address</th>
<th>Size of Grant ($)</th>
<th>Purpose of Grant</th>
<th>Status of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—
Funding of $183.514 million is being provided to the Department of Community Services in 1996/97 to provide a range of residential and other direct care services for the treatment and care of persons with disabilities. This funding is provided specifically to the Department of Community Services and is not provided for the purpose of funding non-government organisations.

The level of funding being provided to the Department of Community Services for provision of these direct care services will rise to $189.727 million in 1997/98.
*1. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 565, Program 59, New South Wales Police Service:

What proportion of the Police Service budget will go to Police Internal Affairs in 1997/98?

Answer—

I am advised by the Police Service that, in the light of the broader restructure of the Police Service, the structure of Internal Affairs has yet to be determined. The budget for Police Internal Affairs for 1997/98 will not be decided until these structural issues are resolved.

*2. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 565, Program 59, New South Wales Police Service:

At last year’s Estimates Committee we discussed the Millennium system. What has happened to the Millennium system over the last 12 months?

Answer—

I am advised by the Police Service that a variety of new functions have been introduced into the Millennium system. Major developments include:

* extension of the Leave Management module to include annual and extended leave;
* the addition of an Education & Training module;
* functional interfaces with Computer Assessment and Safe Driver systems;
* installation of a partial interface with the Services’ payroll supplier;
* development and implementation of Performance Management, EEO, Armoury and Exit Interview databases;
* partial development of Term Employment and Secondary Employment databases, due for release in July, 1997; and
* a number of enhancements to the Millennium Security module.

*3. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 67, New South Wales Police Service Works in Progress:

(1) In relation to Kogarah Police station, why has this program not appeared in the works in progress in the 1997/98 Budget when the 1996/97 budget allocated $400,000 to the program which was to begin in 1996 and be completed in 1999?

(2) Does this mean that the Kogarah Police Station program has been scrapped definitely?
(3) Given that the 1996/97 Budget had allocated $400,000 to the program and that the program now does not appear in the 1997/98 Budget, does this mean that the program was never given any funding?

(4) Why was the $400,000 allocated in 1996/97 not spent?

(5) Given the program never received any funding in 1996/97, where was the $400,000 reallocated?

(6) Given that the 1996/97 Budget papers allocated $1,625,000 to the Narellan Police Station, why do the 1997/98 Budget papers show only $14,000 allocated to the program?

(7) Why has the Government underspent the program by $2,111,000 over the past years?

Answer—

(1) to (4) I am advised that the Police Service was originally awaiting advice from Kogarah Council about its plans for redevelopment concerning the provision of a new or redeveloped police station. The Council indicated it was not interested in a joint development with the NSW Police Service. The Police Service is currently investigating other options which will accommodate the restructure. The Member for Kogarah and I have been in constant liaison concerning this matter. The Carr Government is committed to the provision of a new or redeveloped police station at Kogarah.

(5) I am advised by the Police Service that the project was allocated $400,000. When it became evident that any action prior to the findings of the accommodation needs review would be inappropriate, the funding was redistributed to permit works across the whole program to be accelerated.

(6) I am advised by the Police Service that funding was allocated on the basis that a site could be acquired, planning completed, and construction commenced on a new police station at Narellan. Problems with site acquisition, coupled with the need to review accommodation needs arising from the restructure of the Police Service, have meant delays in construction as originally planned.

(7) This question is too ill-defined for a response to be given.

*4. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 566, Program 59, New South Wales Police Service:

It is stated that $34,668,000 will be spent on the acquisition of property, plant and equipment in the 1997/98 financial year.

Is there provision in this budget for the $3.6 million expansion and upgrade of Ashfield Police Station, promised to the Ashfield electorate by the Member for Ashfield and current Police Minister, Paul Whelan?

When will the Minister provide the funding required for the expansion and upgrade of Ashfield Police Station?

Answer—

As part of the general restructure of the Police Service, accommodation needs at many new Local Area Commands, including Ashfield will be re-evaluated.
*5. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 581, Safety in Custody:

(1) Why was the Safety in Custody Budget underspent by over $12 million in 1996/97?

(2) Why is the Safety in Custody budget for 1997/98 $10 million less than 1996/97?

Answer—

(1) and (2) As I have advised members of the Opposition on numerous occasions, the Program Groups in the Budget papers are an accounting mechanism required by Treasury which are not commensurate with the actual allocation of policing resources. Police resources are allocated geographically, not to particular program groups. I have been unhappy with the current accounting mechanism for some time and have asked the Police Service and Treasury to establish a new budgetary mechanism which better reflects the actual allocation of resources.

*6. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 576, Program 59.1.4, Road Safety:

(1) Is it the case that the Roads and Traffic Authority provides funding for Police to conduct selective traffic enforcement campaigns?

(2) How much money did the Police Service receive from the RTA for this purpose in the 1996/97 budget?

(3) How much has the Police Service budgeted this year to receive from the RTA for this purpose?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) $4,021,000.

(3) $4,235,000.

*7. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 581, Program 59.1.6, Safety in Custody:

(1) Why was the New South Wales Police Service “Safety in Custody” budget underspent by over $12 million in 1996/97?

(2) Why is the “Safety in Custody” budget for 1997/98 $10 million less in 1997/98?

Answer—

(1) and (2) See answer to question 5.
Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

   (a) catering and entertainment of any form;

   (b) travel and accommodation of any form; and

   (c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products?

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s) ?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies ?

Answer—

(1) and (2) As is the case in all Westminster systems, Minister’s are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.

Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97, and at what cost ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip ?
Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.

*11. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.

*12. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:

(a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?

(b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?

(c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?

(d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?

(e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

(1) (a-e) and (2) Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.
*13. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

(3) The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and it’s funding are set out at pace 12 of the Budget Summary.

*14. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(b) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for these purposes?

(2) (a) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97?

(b) How many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

(3) (a) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98?

(b) How many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

Answer—

(1) to (3) The refurbishment, upgrade or relocation of offices are required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.

*15. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97, and which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98, which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?
Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 33.

*16. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office in 1996-97?

Answer—

(1) and (2) It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

*17. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you ?

(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96 ?

(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees ?

(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee ?

(5) How many public servants are serving in an ex officio capacity ?

(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled ?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 government boards and committees. The database does not contain information on the large number of small trusts administered by the Department of Land and Water Conservation and the Nation Parks and Wildlife Services.
(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of boards and committees.

(3) There are approximately 6000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all member of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each Department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories of people statistical information is only available for 1918 members. Of these 3.3% who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people 11% are, people from a non-English speaking background and 5% have disabilities. Board and Committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July 1996.

*18. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”?

(2) From which particular programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.

*19. Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?

Answer—

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1; page 42.
Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at page 17), how many employees are currently employed by the Department, by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available for certain cases.

Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration:

(1) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(2) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(3) specifically in relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

(1) to (3) Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.

Mr Gallacher asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you, and what was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you.

(2) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?
(3) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was their floor space?

Answer—

(1) to (3) Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each Department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of Departments in their Annual Reports.

*23. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Infringement Processing Bureau?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of the salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

(7) What is the replacement cost of the computers used within the Bureau?

Answer—

1) 262.

2) 86.3% full time and 13.7% part time.

3) $6,720,000.

4) The Ferguson Centre, 130 George Street Parramatta.

5) 2839.94 sq metres.

6) $1,265,500.

7) $2,050,000.

*24. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Firearms Registry?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of the salaries paid?
(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

(7) What is the replacement cost of the lab?

(8) Where are the country offices located?

Answer—

(1) There are 49 permanent staff, which have been supplemented by an additional 53 temporary positions established for a period of twelve months or more to facilitate the implementation of the new firearms legislation.

(2) All positions are full-time.

(3) As at 31 May 1997, $1,885,417.

(4) Levels 3 and 4, State Emergency Building, 2A Greenbank Street, Hurstville.

(5) 1506.2 sq metres.

(6) As at 31 May, 1997 $2,380,670, of which $1,504,000 were costs directly associated with the implementation of the new firearms legislation.

(7) There is no lab at the Firearms Registry.

(8) The Firearms Registry does not have country offices.

*25. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Warrant Index Unit?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of the salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) 48.

(2) 46 full-time, 2 part-time.
(3) $1,662,251.

(4) Ferguson Centre, level 6, 130 George Street Parramatta.

(5) 530 sq metres.

(6) $183,155.

*26. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Office of the Valuer General?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of the salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer——

The Office of the Valuer General is not within the Police Portfolio.

The Minister also provided this information:

I refer to Question Without Notice asked in General Purpose Standing Committee No. 3 by the Hon C Lynn MLC on 2 June 1997, concerning assessment centres for Local Area Commanders, which requires a response in the Legislative Council by 12 June 1997. An appropriate response is provided below.

Question:


Why don’t the assessment centres for local area commanders take into account past performance of police?

Answer:

I am advised by the Police Service that the methodology used when examining applicants for positions of Local Area Commander is the most reliable, equitable and valid predictor of future performance of candidates.

Over a three day period, candidates undergo simulation exercises specifically designed to reflect a variety of situations experienced by Local Area Commanders. The assessment process involves three conference room exercises, four role play exercises, seven written exercises, two ninety minute target-selection interviews, and a knowledge based test. The simulation exercises provide candidates with an opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to fulfill the requirements of the position of Local Area Commander against predetermined role-related competencies. This process enables all candidates to be assessed against the same criteria.
*1. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) Regarding distribution of Methadone to inmates in NSW jails;
   (a) How much methadone treatment cost per inmate?

(2) Regarding health services at NSW Jails;
   (a) How much does provision of health and hospital services cost per inmate?
   (b) What is the average number of visits per inmate per year to prison health facilities/providers?

(3) Regarding health services at Goulburn Jail;
   (a) What is the cost of health services per annum at Goulburn Jail?
   (b) How many inmates required treatment in 1995, 1996, and 1997 outside the Goulburn Jail health services?
   (c) What was the cost of these services in each of those years?

(4) Regarding health services at Berrima Jail;
   (a) What is the cost of health services per annum at Berrima Jail?
   (b) How many inmates required treatment in 1995, 1996, and 1997 outside the Berrima health services?
   (c) What was the cost of these services in each of those years?

Answer—

The Corrections Health Service is responsible for the prison methadone program and health services to inmates. Your question should be directed to the Minister for Health.

*2. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) Regarding dental services at NSW jails;
   (a) How much does provision of dental services cost per inmate?
   (b) What is the average number of visits per inmate per year to prison dental facilities/providers?

(2) Regarding dental services at Goulburn Jail;
(a) What is the cost of dental services per annum at Goulburn Jail?

(b) How many inmates required dental treatment in 1995, 1996 and 1997 outside the Goulburn Jail health services?

(c) What was the cost of these services in each of those years?

(3) Regarding dental services at Berrima Jail;

(a) What is the cost of dental services per annum at Berrima Jail?

(b) How many inmates required dental treatment in 1995, 1996, and 1997 outside the Berrima Jail health services?

(c) What was the cost of these services in each of those years?

(4) Regarding education services at NSW jails;

(a) How much does provision of education services cost per inmate per year?

Answer—

(1) The Corrections Health Service is responsible for the provision of dental services to inmates. Your question should be directed to the Minister for Health.

(2) See (1) above.

(3) See (1) above.

(4) (a) $863 per inmate based on 1996/97 projected annual expenditures.

*3. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget paper No 3, p. 261, Program 30.1.1; Containment and Care of Inmates:

The program outputs indicate an increase in the number of receptions from 8,503 in 1994-95 to 12,000 in 1996-97.

(1) To what do you attribute this increase?

(2) Does the increase indicate that we are in the middle of a crime wave?

Answer—

(1) The Department of Corrective Services Research and Statistics Unit has advised that the method of retrieving reception data from the Offender Records System was improved in 1995/96. This resulted in increased numbers being counted. Had the 1994/95 reception data been retrieved on the same basis, the actual figure would have been 9,761.

As explained during the Estimates Committee hearing, the figure of 12,000 receptions for 1996/97 is a projection only, for planning purposes.
The increase from 9,761 in 1994/95 to 11,130 in 1995/96 may be attributed to the unusually low number of fine defaulters received in 1994/95 as a result of a moratorium on the execution of fine default warrants. Fine default receptions had returned to the usual level of approximately 3,400 per annum by 1995/96.

The remainder of the increase is attributable to an increase in the number of offenders sentenced to short periods of incarceration. If information is required on the explanation for this trend, your question is more appropriately directed to the Attorney General (regarding changes to Court operations and/or sentencing practices) and to the Minister for Police (regarding changes in reporting of crime, arrests and/or charges).

(2) No. See (1) above.

*4. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget paper No 3, p. 261, Program 30.1.1; Containment and Care of Inmates:

The program outcomes estimates 13 deaths in custody during 1996-97 from other than natural causes.

What were the causes at each of these 13 deaths?

Answer—

Any death in custody is made the subject of an inquest. No formal cause of death is ascribed until the inquest has been held and the Coroner has brought down a finding. Two of the thirteen custodial deaths during 1996/97 from other than natural causes have been determined by the Coroner as suicide (by hanging). The circumstances of the other eleven deaths remain the subject of inquests.

*5. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4, p. 34; Works in Progress:

(1) Given that the 1996/97 Budget Paper No 4 allocating $1 million to the Bathurst Periodic Detention Centre, and that in the 1997/98 Budget Paper only $457,000 appeared to be allocated to that program, why was the $1 million allocated in 1996/97 not spent on the program?

(2) Why has the Government underfunded this program?

(3) Why has the Government also pushed the completion date for the program out by one year?

(4) Can the Government give an assurance that the program will be completed by 1998?

Answer—

(1) The 1996/97 allocation of $1 million was not fully expended for the following reasons:

* An easement was discovered on the site which was not apparent when planning commenced. This easement was found to be no longer necessary and was extinguished.

* Council imposed conditions relating to the upgrade of services in the Mid western Highway street frontage.

* Security and communication requirements were increased and integrated with the main correctional centre.
These unforeseen events resulted in a revised construction program and hence a reduced cashflow requirement to that originally forecast.

(2) The Government has not underfunded the program. The reduced allocation reflected achievable expenditure in the 1996/97 financial year.

(3) The completion date for the project remains January 1998, as advised in response to your Question on Notice at the 1996 Estimates hearings.

(4) See (3) above.

Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4, p. 34; Works in Progress:

(1) Why has the Government underspent funding for the Bathurst Therapeutic Centre by $973,000?

(2) Given the program has been underfunded over the last two years, will the program be completed in 1998?

(3) Given the Government promised to allocate $900,000 to the Broken Hill period detention centre in the 1996/97 budget, why does the 1997/98 budget papers show only $558,000 has been spent on the program?

(4) Why has the completion date for the program been pushed out by one year?

(5) Given that the 1996/97 Budget allocated $1 million to the Emu Plains Corrective Centre Stage two redevelopment (70 beds), why does the 1997/98 budget show only $680,000 spent on the program?

(6) Why has the Government underspent on the program by $320,000?

Answer---

(1) The Therapeutic Centre at Bathurst has experienced similar planning and construction delays to those described in response to Question on Notice No.5. In addition, the contract was varied to include the provision of a new visiting centre for the correctional centre as a separable portion of the contract. This was done to minimise the disruption to the correctional centre routine and security by having several contractors working on site over an extended period.

(2) The project has not been underfunded; the allocation has not been fully expended for the reasons outlined in (1) above. The centre will be completed in 1998.

(3) The 1996/97 allocation was not fully expended for the following reasons:

* There was a need to address female accommodation at Broken Hill. The existing correctional centre was unable to provide appropriate accommodation for female inmates and they were precluded from programs available to male inmates due to the physical limitations of the centre.

* Originally it was planned for the existing kitchen within the correctional centre to cater for the periodic detention centre. It is now planned, for security reasons, to develop a separate kitchen in the periodic detention centre.

These changes resulted in a revised construction program and hence a reduced cashflow requirement to that originally forecast.
(4) The completion date for the project has been put back one month from that advised in response to your Question on Notice at the 1996 Estimates hearings, to December 1997.

(5) The expenditure of $680,000 of the $1 million allocation for Emu Plains Stage 2 in 1996/97 reflects the required cashflow for the project based on the revised construction program. The construction program was revised in order to incorporate development consent conditions imposed by the local council.

(6) See (5) above.

*7. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

   (a) catering and entertainment of any form;

   (b) travel and accommodation of any form; and

   (c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products?

Answer—

(1) Any expenditure on these items is required to be in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

*8. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s) ?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies ?

Answer—

(1) As is the case in all Westminster systems, Ministers are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, the Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.

*9. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97, and at what cost ?
Name of Officer | Date of Travel | Destination | Total Cost | Benefit to taxpayer of trip
---|---|---|---|---

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip?

Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.

*10. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.

*11. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:

(a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?

(b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?

(c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?

(d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?

(e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?
(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

(1) Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.

*12. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) In general, wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

(2) See (1) above.

*13. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(b) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for these purposes?

(2) (a) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97?

(b) How many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

(3) (a) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98?

(b) How many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

Answer—

(1) The refurbishment, upgrading or relocation of offices is required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.
(2) See (1) above.

(3) See (1) above.

(3) The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and its funding are set out at page 12 of the Budget Summary.

*14. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97, and which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98, which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/Completion Date</th>
<th>Total cost of Project</th>
<th>Total allocation to the Project 1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No.2, Chapter 1, page 33.

*15. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office in 1996/97?

Answer—

(1) It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

(2) See (1) above.

*16. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you?

(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96?
(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees?

(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee?

(5) How many public servants are serving in an ex officio capacity?

(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) The Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 government boards and committees.

(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of boards and committees.

(3) There are approximately 6000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all members of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s Memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each Department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories or people statistical information is only available for 1918 members. Of these 3.3% are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people, 11% are people from a non-English speaking background and 5% have disabilities. Board and committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July 1996.

17. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”?

(2) From which particular programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

(1) The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services announced in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.
(2) See (1) above.

*18. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?

Answer—

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No.2, Chapter 1, page 42.

*19. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2. p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at page 17), how many employees are currently employed by the Department, by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?

Answer—

(1) The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available in certain cases.

(2) See (1) above.

*20. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration:

(1) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(2) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(3) specifically in relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

(1) Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally
launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups, and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.

*21. Mr Lynn asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you, and what was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you.

(2) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?

(3) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was their floor space?

Answer—

(1) Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each Department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of Departments in their Annual Reports.

*22. Mr Lynn asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Bush Fire Services?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of the salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

(7) How much of the 1996 Budget was allocated to:

(a) Provision of fire fighting equipment?

(b) Training of Volunteers?

(c) Community Education?

(d) Emergency Planning?
Answer—

(1) 115, including 13 established positions in the Office for Emergency Services, which is administratively supported by the Department.

(2) 94% full time and 6% part time.

(3) Total salaries allocated by the Department in 1997/98: $6.779 million.

(4) Head Office and Central East Region are located at Units 3, 8 and 9, TEAC Complex, 175-179 James Ruse Drive Rosehill. Regional Offices are located at Grafton, Cessnock, Albury, Batemans Bay, Young, Narrabri and Cobar. The Training Office is located at the NSW Police Academy at Goulburn.

(5) Rosehill Unit 3 - 990 square metres of office area and 590 square metres of warehouse area.
    Rosehill Unit 8 - 160 square metres of office area and 805 square metres for State Operations Centre.
    Rosehill Unit 9 - 370 square metres of office area and 452 square metres of warehouse area.
    Grafton - 127 square metres.
    Cessnock - 104 square metres.
    Albury - 120 square metres.
    Batemans Bay - 118 square metres.
    Young - 140 square metres.
    Narrabri - 132 square metres.
    Cobar - 73 square metres.
    Goulburn - 40 square metres.

(6) 1996/97 overheads are:
    Rosehill - $526,358.
    Grafton - $24,601.
    Cessnock - $32,120.
    Albury - $21,409.
    Batemans Bay - $18,426.
    Young - $37,929 (office relocation in 1996).
    Narrabri - $20,593.
    Cobar - $14,418.
    Goulburn - $7,200.
(7) 1996/97 allocations were:
   (a) $39.638 million
   (b) $744,000
   (c) $661,000
   (d) $1.381 million

*23. Mr Lynn asked:
In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:
(1) How many people are employed in the Corrective Services Academy?
(2) What proportion are full time and part time?
(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?
(4) Where are the staff located?
(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?
(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?
(7) How many graduated were there from the Academy in 1996?
(8) How much of the 1996 Budget was spent on:
   (a) Library Facilities?
   (b) Accommodation?
   (c) the Conference Centre?
   (d) Classrooms?
(9) How many Officers received tertiary education through the Southern Cross University?
(10) What was the exact nature of this education?
Answer—
(1) 68
(2) 62 full time and 6 part time
(3) Actual salaries paid to staff of the Corrective Services Academy from 1 July 1996 to 31 May 1997 total $3,389,000.
(4) The Corrective Services Academy is located at the corner of Terry and Marsden Roads, Eastwood. All employees are situated at that location.
(5) 6,324 square metres

(6) Total overheads for the period from 1 July 1996 to 31 May 1997 was $1,356,000.

(7) 177 primary trainees graduated from the Corrective Services Academy in 1996.

(8) (a) $66,373

(b) Accommodation for staff of the Department of Corrective Services at the Corrective Services Academy is free in circumstances where the priority of the course and the individual circumstances of an officer (ie. work location is country NSW) necessitate that an officer resides at the Academy for the duration of a course. In all other circumstances (including the use of the Academy by staff from outside agencies such as the Police Service and Fire Brigades) the Academy charges $30 per night for individual accommodation. In 1996 income earned from accommodation was $77,674.

(c) The Conference Centre operates on a full cost recovery basis. The Academy charges outside agencies $300 per day for use of the Centre. Details of minor costs associated with Department of Corrective Services use of the Centre - namely, utilities and stationery and training aids - are not kept separately.

(d) $30,095

(9) The Associate Degree in Correctional Administration is an undergraduate program offered by Southern Cross University which has been designed specifically for custodial personnel. At present there are 336 non-commissioned custodial correctional officers enrolled in this program.

It is now mandatory for probationary correctional officers to successfully complete three modules of the Associate degree in Correctional Administration at Southern Cross University before being granted permanency as a custodial correctional officer. At present there are 92 probationary correctional officers enrolled in the required three modules of study.

The Graduate Certificate in Management is a post-graduate program offered by Southern Cross University for commissioned correctional officers. At present there are 83 commissioned correctional officers enrolled in the Graduate Certificate in Management.

From the beginning of 1997, 12 administrative and clerical officers were enrolled in the Associate Degree in Management and Professional Studies at Southern Cross University.

(10) See (9) above.
**TRANSPORT AND TOURISM**  
**COMMITTEE No 4**

*1. Dr Goldsmith asked:*

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on

(a) catering and entertainment of any form;

(b) travel and accommodation of any form; and

(c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products.

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

*2. Dr Goldsmith asked:*

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(a) how many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s) ?

(b) what is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies ?

Answer—

(a)-(b) As is the case in all Westminster systems, Minister’s are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.

*3. Dr Goldsmith asked:*

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97, and at what cost ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip ?
(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.

*4. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.

*5. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:
   
   (a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?
   
   (b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?
   
   (c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?
   
   (d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?
   
   (e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

(1) (a-e) & (2) Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.
**6.** Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) ?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid ?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases ?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

(3) The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and its funding are set out at page 12 of the Budget Summary.

**7.** Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure was made in 1996-97, and what expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98, for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you ?

(2) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97, and how many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you ?

(3) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98, and how many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you ?

Answer—

(1) to (3) The refurbishment, upgrading or relocation of offices are required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.

**8.** Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you, and what was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you.

(2) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97 ? If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space ?

(3) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97 ? If so, what was their floor space ?
Answer—

(1) to (3) Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each Department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of Departments in their Annual Reports.

*9. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by you were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97.

(2) Which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98?

(3) Which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/ Completion Date</th>
<th>Total Cost of Project</th>
<th>Total current and capital allocation in 1996-97</th>
<th>Total current and capital allocation in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 33.

*10. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No 3, p. 635

Given that in 1996-97 $27.3 million was spent on 177 job redundancies in rail, how many jobs will be cut in 1997-98 where $61 million has been allocated for redundancies in the SRA and the RSA?

Answer—

I refer the Honourable Member to the Monday 2 June 1997 Hansard, p.60 for the answer to this question.

*11. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premiers memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced $100 million increase in the health budget?

(2) From what particular programs have such savings been achieved?
Answer—

(1) and (2) The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services announced in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.

*12. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments-Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?

Answer—

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1; page 42.

*13. Dr Goldsmith asked:

The Minister indicated that approximately $90 million would be raised in the State Rail Authority through asset sales, and that properties for sale have been identified.

(1) Would the Minister please detail which properties have been identified for sale by the Government?

Answer—

The main properties identified for sale are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>PROPERTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central/Eveleigh</td>
<td>Central 2000 Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatswood</td>
<td>Chatswood Connection Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chullora</td>
<td>Brunker Road and Anzac Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks River Terminal</td>
<td>Various Lease Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville</td>
<td>“Y” Link Lands Left Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavender Bay</td>
<td>2 Walker Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>State Property Preparing Disposals Strategy Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandown - Clyde</td>
<td>Old Goods Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Leonards</td>
<td>Herbert Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynyard Centre</td>
<td>Holiday Inn/ANA House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*14. Dr Goldsmith asked:

Does the Minister have to report to a budget committee on a bi-monthly basis on the financial performance of rail agencies, job cuts and other savings?

Answer—

I refer the Honourable Member to the Monday 2 June 1997 Hansard, p.75 for the answer to this question.

*15. Dr Goldsmith asked:

Given that there is no funding in the 1997-98 budget for the Parramatta to Hornsby rail link, does the Government intend to honour its election promise to build the Parramatta to Hornsby rail link before the next state election?

Answer—

There is funding allocated in 1997-98 for the continuation of the Parramatta-Chatswood study.

*16. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper Number 2, p. 4-160:

The estimated current payments for 1997-98 identifies an amount of $1,347,100:

(1) Does this provide for the $5.47 million that the Member for Ashfield, The Hon Paul Whelan MP, promised his electorate before the 1995 election, for the renovations to Ashfield Railway Station?

(2) As the development application for this project has been lodged with Ashfield Council, when does the Minister expect it to be completed?

Answer—

(1) Funding for the upgrading of Ashfield Station to full ‘Easy Access’ standard is included in Budget Paper No. 2, page 4-160.

(2) 1999.

*17. Dr Goldsmith asked:

The 1997-98 Budget provides $225,000 for the Ashfield Bus Rail Interchange:

(1) Given that the project is estimated to cost $1.37 million, and work on the project has not yet commenced, how long will it be before the interchange is completed?

Answer—

(1) Budget Paper No. 4 incorrectly lists the Estimated Total Cost as $225,000. The correct Estimated Total Cost is $1,475,000. Construction is expected to commence in July 1997 and be completed by December 1997.
*18. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 1-13; Department Payments - Other:

In 1996-97 how many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office?

Answer—

(1) and (2) It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

*19. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997, Volume one, at page 17):

(1) How many employees are currently employed by the Department, by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?

Answer—

The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available in certain cases.

*20. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration in:

(a) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(b) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(c) in relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?
Answer—

(1) (a-c) Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups, and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.

21. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No. 2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administration by you?

(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96?

(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees?

(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee?

(5) How many public servants are serving in an ex officio capacity?

(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 government boards and committees. This information is available on request.

(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of boards and committees.

(3) There are approximately 6000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all members of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s Memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each Department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories of people statistical information is only available for 1918 members. Of these 3.3% who are
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people, 11% are people from a non-English speaking background and 5% have disabilities. Board and committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July 1996.

*22. Dr Goldsmith asked:

On September 11, 1995 the Minister issued a media statement saying that “the State Government will not introduce a bed tax” and that “on numerous occasions - in public and private meetings with tourism industry representatives - I have expressed my long held opposition to introduce a bed tax.

(1) In the light of these statements do you support the State Government’s decision to introduce a 10 per cent bed tax?

(2) If so, on what basis have you seen fit to change your long held view on this matter?

Answer—

I refer the Honourable Member to the Monday 2 June 1997 Hansard, pp. 76-77 for the answer to this question.

*23. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to Budget Paper 1:

(1) As Minister for Tourism were you consulted about the proposed 10 per cent bed tax prior to its announcement in the State Budget?

(2) If so what advice did you provide on the Government’s intention to introduce the tax?

Answer—

The accommodation levy is one which has been introduced as part of the budget process by the Treasurer. The Hon. Member would be well aware that Budget Committee decisions are bound by the same confidentiality provisions as any Cabinet deliberations.

*24. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In refer to Budget Paper 1:

(1) What consideration was given to those accommodation providers with pre-existing contracts that cannot be altered who are now forced to absorb completely the 10 per cent bed tax?

Answer—

This question was asked in Committee by The Hon. Helen Sham-Ho, MLC, and was answered.

*25. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to Budget Paper 1:
In other cities and States where a bed tax - as opposed to a broad ranging Goods and Services tax - is applied, (eg the Northern Territory, Hong Kong, Singapore), the funds raised by this tax are directed back to the industry for promotional purposes.

(1) Was this option considered by the State Government

(2) If not, why not?

Answer—

The accommodation levy is one which has been introduced as part of the budget process by the Treasurer. The Hon. Member would be well aware that Budget Committee decisions are bound by the same confidentiality provisions as any Cabinet deliberations.

*26. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to Budget Paper 1:

Before Estimates Committee No 3 on October 30 1995 in response to a suggestion relating to the introduction of a 2 per cent bed tax the Minister replied “evidence indicates that a bed tax would be a disincentive for investment in accommodation in Sydney and NSW”.

(1) What impact does the Minister now believe the State Government’s 10 per cent bed tax will have on investment projects in Sydney?

Answer—

This question is more appropriately answered within the administration of The Hon. M.R. Egan, MLC, Treasurer, Minister for Energy, Minister for State and Regional Development, Minister Assisting the Premier and Vice-President of the Executive Council.

*27. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to Budget Paper 1:

A recent report by Access Economics revealed that one in nine jobs in Australia depends on tourism.

(1) What advice has the Minister sought and received on the potential impact of the 10 per cent bed tax on employment in the tourism industry?

(2) Were these issues taken into account in the Government decision to introduce this tax?

Answer—

These questions are more appropriately answered within the administration of The Hon. M.R. Egan, MLC, Treasurer, Minister for Energy, Minister for State and Regional Development, Minister Assisting the Premier and Vice-President of the Executive Council.
28. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to Budget Paper 1:

A recent survey by JLW Transact revealed that the proposed 10 per cent bed tax has put in jeopardy some $800 million worth of development projects in the CBD and surrounding areas.

(1) In the light of this information does the Minister believe the bed tax represents good policy for promoting tourism investment in NSW?

Answer—

This question is more appropriately answered within the administration of The Hon. M.R. Egan, MLC, Treasurer, Minister for Energy, Minister for State and Regional Development, Minister Assisting the Premier and Vice-President of the Executive Council.

29. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to Budget Paper 1:

A key problem suffered by the tourism industry in recent years has been gaining access to capital for investment and development. The wariness of investors towards tourism was highlighted in a major study conducted by Macquarie Bank in 1985 that was sponsored by the Department of Tourism.

(1) What impact does the Minister believe the Government’s decision to impose a 10 per cent bed tax will have on investor confidence in the tourism sector?

(2) How will this impact on the industry’s ability to access capital for investment and development in the future?

Answer—

These questions are more appropriately answered within the administration of The Hon. M.R. Egan, MLC, Treasurer, Minister for Energy, Minister for State and Regional Development, Minister Assisting the Premier and Vice-President of the Executive Council.

30. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to Budget Paper 1:

The meetings, conventions and exhibitions industry in Sydney generates approximately $1 billion worth of business every year. Given the importance of this business to the NSW and Sydney economy:

(1) What advice has the Minister sought and received in relation to the impact of the 10 per cent bed tax on the meetings, conventions and exhibitions industry?

(2) Was this information taken into consideration in the decision to impose a 10 per cent bed tax in the Sydney CBD and surrounding areas?
Answer—

These questions are more appropriately answered within the administration of The Hon. M.R. Egan, MLC, Treasurer, Minister for Energy, Minister for State and Regional Development, Minister Assisting the Premier and Vice-President of the Executive Council.

*31. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to Budget Paper 1:

What proportion of room nights in the area affected by the bed tax are taken up by NSW residents?

Answer—

It is not the role of Tourism New South Wales to record data on the origin of hotel guests.

*32. Dr Goldsmith asked?

In relation to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13 under Departmental Payments-Other:

What Committees and Inquiries exist in your portfolio? Please provide details in the format of the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Agency</th>
<th>Name of Committee or Inquiry</th>
<th>Type (e.g., Departmental, Community, Commonwealth/State, Parliamentary)</th>
<th>Date Constituted</th>
<th>Expiry Date/Reporting Date</th>
<th>Chairperson and Members</th>
<th>Remuneration details (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

The cost to the public of the diversion of resources necessary to answer this question is not justifiable.

*33. Mr Cohen asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, Sub-program 66.1.1; Development, Co-ordination and Planning of Transport Service:

What amount of money has been spent in the strategy process for Sydney Integrated transport?

Answer—

(1) Excluding the cost of government agencies’ time, to date $23,429 has been spent, largely on market research, and also on five regional community workshops and graphic design.
*34. Mr Cohen asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 647, Program 67.1.2; Marketing:

(1) (a) Is there funding available for the development of an ecotourism accreditation process?

(b) If not, how much funding will be spent on such a process?

Answer—

(1) One of the New South Wales Tourism Master Plan’s outcomes relates to developing tourism products and a marketing system that attract high yield markets. Quality products and services can be achieved through a number of means including accreditation. Tourism New South Wales plays a facilitator role in encouraging the industry to achieve quality outcomes.

In relation to funding for an accreditation process for ecotourism, Tourism New South Wales has not allocated funds in 1997/98 because the Outdoor Tour Operators Association of New South Wales has already developed an accreditation system.

However, in the broader context of industry accreditation, Tourism New South Wales is working with Tourism Council Australia to investigate the feasibility of implementing a quality assurance accreditation program across all tourism sectors in this State. It is intended for this program to be workshopped with industry representatives at the Annual Tourism Conference in Wollongong later this year.

(2) Tourism New South Wales has a number of programs aimed at facilitating sector development including the eco-tourism sector. For example, Tourism New South Wales is jointly funding the development of strategic plans for both the Outdoor Tour Operators Association of New South Wales and the Tourist Attractions Association. Tourism New South Wales’ total contribution to these planning processes amounts to $40,000. These plans will address issues such as accreditation.

*35. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) Regarding Rail Services in the Southern Highlands:

(a) what services will be changed and/or deleted following the appointment of Mr David Hill?

(b) what savings will be made by these cuts?

(c) where will these savings be spent?

(2) Regarding security services on Southern Highlands Trains (Campbelltown to Goulburn):

(a) what was spent on rail security in the Southern Highlands in 1996/97?

(b) what will be spent in this year’s Budget?

(3) Regarding Tallong Railway Platform:

(a) when will the platform at Tallong Station be raised to a manageable height?

(b) what will be the cost?
Answer—

I am advised of the following:

(1) (a) The Southern Highlands timetable will be that applying prior to 3 November 1996.

(b) Nil. The changes were not made as a cost saving measure, but to improve train performance.

(c) Not applicable.

(2) (a) Approximately $43,000 for on-train security.

(b) Approximately $43,000 for on-train security.

(3) (a) There are a large number of stations on CityRail’s Platform Raising Programme. Owing to the high costs involved, it is necessary to carry out work on a priority basis. CityRail is not in a position at this stage to proceed with the raising of the platform at Tallong. Nevertheless, the matter will continue to be kept under review as future works priorities are being determined.

(b) A cost estimate has not yet been determined.

*36. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 1-13, table 1.6, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) Regarding Roads in Mulwaree Shire:

(a) what road works are planned by the RTA in the Shire?

(b) when will these works commence and finish?

(c) what is the cost estimate for these works?

(d) how much has been allocated in the 1997/98 budget for these works?

(2) Regarding RTA staff in Goulburn:

(a) how many staff were based in Goulburn in 1995, 1996 and 1997?

(b) what was the value of their salaries in each of those years?

(c) what staffing levels will be maintained in Goulburn for the next two years?

Answer—

These questions are more appropriately answered within the administration of The Hon. P.C. Scully, MP, Minister for Public Works and Services, Minister for Roads, Minister for Ports, Assistant Minister for Energy, and Assistant Minister for State and Regional Development.
37. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 1-13, table 1.6, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) Sutton Forest Public School Loading/Unloading Bay:
   (a) how much has been allocated by the RTA for the necessary agreed work?
   (b) when will the work be completed?
   (c) what is the estimated total cost of the agreed necessary work?

(2) Regarding Sheepwash Road, Avoca near the Avoca Public School:
   (a) what priority has the upgrade of this road been allocated by the RTA?

(3) Regarding the Wombeyan Caves Road:
   (a) is any work scheduled and funded in 1997/98?
   (b) what would be the total cost to completely seal the Wombeyan Caves Road?

(4) Regarding Roads in Wingecarribee Shire:
   (a) what road works are planned by the RTA in the Shire?
   (b) when will these works commence and finish?
   (c) what is the cost estimate for these works?
   (d) how much has been allocated in the 1997/98 budget for these works?

Answer—

These questions are more appropriately answered within the administration of The Hon. P.C. Scully, MP, Minister for Public Works and Services, Minister for Roads, Minister for Ports, Assistant Minister for Energy, and Assistant Minister for State and Regional Development.

38. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 630, Program 66.1.1, Employee related expenses for 19997/98 total $14.6 million:

(1) How much is SRA Chief Executive David Hill being paid for his six month contract?

(2) What benefits, such as superannuation, car, etc, does he receive under the contract?

Answer—

(1) Mr Hill has been appointed at SES Level 4 for a period of six months and is being paid the equivalent SES rate for that period.
(2) No, additional benefits in excess of the total remuneration package are provided. Any payment to superannuation is deducted from the total remuneration.

*39. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 4-162, Program 4.3.19:

(1) Budget Paper No. 2 states all funding arrangements between the four rail entities are now to be undertaken on a commercial basis to ensure cross subsidies are removed. What mechanisms are in place to ensure cash flows between the four rail entities are fully transparent and accounted for so budget blowouts do not occur?

(2) Why was the cross subsidisation between SRA and Freight Rail not detected prior to 1996/97?

Answer—

(1) The entities are separate organisations and will have separately audited and published financial accounts.

(2) Because the restructure of the SRA was implemented in 1996/97.

*40. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 2, pp. 1-13, Program 1.2, 1997/98 Budget Projections:

(1) Can you confirm the savings targets for the rail entities was $50 million for 1996/97 and $100 million for 1997/98? Why were these savings not achieved?

(2) Can you table working papers which detail why these savings were not achieved?

Answer—

(1) Savings have been achieved however, the rail reform process identified cross subsidisation in the funding method put in place by the previous Government. This resulted in 1996/97 Budget supplementation.

(2) No.

*41. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 635, Program 66.2.2:

(1) In 1996/97 how many staff of the State Rail Authority and the State Transit Authority were employed and paid, but did not attend work?

(2) Can you provide future staff numbers for the next three years for all rail entities?

(3) Can you provide detailed breakdowns of the redundancies that occurred within the four rail entities for 1996/97 year?

(4) What are the forecast staff numbers for Freight Rail for the next three years?
(5) Has your department calculated optimal staff numbers for the four rail entities and how does this compare with actual numbers?

Answer—
The cost to the public of the diversion of resources necessary to answer this question is not justifiable.

*42. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 628, Program 66, Operating Expenses:

(1) In relation to the Operating Expenses of the Department of Transport, how much money was spent on the analysis of competitive outsourcing of service packages for the Rail Service Authority?

Answer—

(1) There is no such item as a “service package”.

*43. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 78, Capital Works in Progress for the Department of Transport, Hurstville Bus/Rail Interchange:

The 1996/97 Budget papers show $1,498,000 allocated to Hurstville Bus/Rail interchange, and the project was to cost $1,530,000.

(1) Why do the 1997/98 Budget papers show only $32,000 allocated to the project?

(2) In the 1997/98 Budget, why was the project shown to only cost $130,000 when the 1996/97 budget shows the project to cost $1,530,000?

(3) Why was $1,530,000 allocated to the project in 1996/97 not spent?

(4) Has this project now been underfunded?

(5) Why has the total cost of the project decreased over the two years?

(6) Given $158,000 was allocated to the upgrade of the Wyong Bus/Rail interchange and commuter car park in the 1996/97 Budget, why did this funding not appear in the 1997/98 Budget papers?

(7) Why was the funding allocated to the project not spent?

Answer—

(1) $32,000 is the Estimated Expenditure to 30 June 1997. However, the figure is incorrect as it is a reprint of Estimated Expenditure to 30 June 1996 from the 1996/97 Budget papers.

(2) Budget Paper No. 4 incorrectly lists the Estimated Total Cost as $130,000. The correct Estimated Total Cost is $1,530,000.

(3) $1,530,000 was not spent as construction is not completed. Construction commenced in May 1997 and is expected to be completed in December 1997-January 1998.
(4) No.

(5) The total cost of the project has not changed.

(6) 1997/98 Budget Paper No. 4 reports Estimated Expenditure to 30 June 1997 of $158,000. This is only part of the Estimated Total Cost of $587,000.

(7) Work on the project was suspended during 1996/97 due to a review by the Standing Committee on Public Works.

*44. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 78, Capital Works in Progress for the Department of Transport:

In the 1996/97 Budget papers, Department of Transport Major Works allocated $250,000 to Rockdale Bus/Rail interchange which was to cost $2 million and was to be completed by 1999.

(1) Why did this project not appear in the 1997/98 Budget?

(2) Given this project did not appear in the 1997/98 Budget papers, has the project been scrapped?

(3) Given $250,000 was allocated to the project in 1996/97, but did not appear in the 1997/98 Budget, did the project not receive any funding. If so, why not?

Answer—

(1) There is no budget allocated to the project in 1997/98 as construction is scheduled for 1998/99.

(2) No.

(3) The project received funding in 1996/97.

*45. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 78, Capital Works in Progress for the Department of Transport:

(1) In the 1996/97 Budget papers, Department of Transport Major Works allocated $50,000 for Looking Glass Bay Wharf project at Gladesville which was to cost $2 million and be finished by 1999. Why did this project not appear in the 1997/98 Budget?

(2) Given this project did not appear in the 1997/98 Budget papers, has the project been scrapped?

(3) (a) Given $50,000 was allocated to the project in 1996/97, but did not appear in the 1997/98 Budget, did the project not receive any funding.

(b) If so, why not?

Answer—

(1) There is no budget allocated to the project in 1997/98 as construction is scheduled for 1998/99.

(2) No.
(3) (a) The project received funding in 1996/97.
   (b) Not applicable.

*46. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 78, Capital Works in Progress for the Department of Transport:

In the 1996/97 Budget papers, Department of Transport Major Works allocated $50,000 to Cabarita Wharf project at Cabarita which was to cost $1.5 million and was to be finished by 1999.

(1) Why did this project not appear in the 1997/98 Budget?
(2) Given this project did not appear in the 1997/98 Budget papers, has the project been scrapped?
(3) (a) Given $50,000 was allocated to the project in 1996/97, but did not appear in the 1997/98 Budget, did the project not receive any funding.
   (b) If so, why not?

Answer—
(1) There is no budget allocated to the project in 1997/98 as construction is scheduled for 1998/99.
(2) No.
(3) (a) The project received funding in 1996/97.
   (b) Not applicable.

*47. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Taxi Transport Subsidy Scheme?
(2) What proportion are full time and part time?
(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?
(4) Where are the staff located?
(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?
(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—
(1) There are 4 staff employed on Taxi Transport Subsidy Scheme work.
(2) Three staff are engaged full time on Scheme work and an additional officer spends 40% of her time on this work.
(3) $134,278 p.a.

(4) All staff members are located in the Surry Hills - Central Metropolitan Office of the Department of Transport.

(5) Forty square metres.

(6) $138,200 p.a.

ROADS, PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES, PORTS COMMITTEE No. 4

*1. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to RTA Drivers and Vehicle Policy Regulation

How many repeat proof-of-age cards is a young person entitled to get from the RTA?

Answer—

The issue of a replacement Proof-of-Age card is limited to one replacement card only.

*2. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper 3, p. 602: Driver and Vehicle Policy and Regulation:

Does a recent publication by Austroads, entitled National Performance Indicators, show that the average cost of servicing vehicle registrations and driver licences in New South Wales is a third higher than per other States in Australia? Are New South Wales motorists bearing the costs of these inefficiencies?

Answer—

Since 1994 Austroads has produced National Performance Indicators. These have included two measures related to the administration of driver licensing and vehicle registration:-

User Transaction Efficiency (UTE)
User Transaction Additional Cost (UTAC)

UTE is defined as the annual cost of servicing vehicle registrations and drivers licences divided by the average number of records on a State Registering Authorities database. UTAC is the cost of adding a record of a new car or newly licensed car driver to that database.

The most recent report (1996) shows the costs for NSW were:-

UTE drivers licences = $18.56
vehicle registration = $12.29
UTAC drivers licences = $28.59
vehicle registration = $103.39
While these figures for UTE are approximately one third higher than the costs provided by most other jurisdictions, Austroads and the participating jurisdictions recognise that these indicators must be interpreted with care. This is for essentially two reasons:

the methodology used to calculate and report costs is not applied consistently by each jurisdiction; and the end products and their delivery in each jurisdiction are different. Thus the cost of producing these outcomes are different.

Accordingly, last year the RTA, on behalf of Austroads, managed a consultancy to provide a better basis for comparison of registration and licensing cost between jurisdictions.

The study found that there were major differences between jurisdictions including:

different accounting systems;
a non-uniform approach to defining which items of expenditure are included;
the capacity of the computer system in various jurisdictions to record and report costs;
difficulty in proportioning the operating/maintenance costs of computer based systems; and
correctly defining and allocating agency costs (overheads).

The report recommended that all jurisdictions adjust their methodology for reporting transaction costs to comply with uniform guidelines. While agreed by Austroads, only NSW adjusted its methodology prior to submitting data to the recent Austroads report. The other states intend to adjust their methodology over time. In addition, work is being managed by Vicroads to further refine the indicators.

Nevertheless, in some areas the NSW cost structure is higher than other jurisdictions. This is because of differences in the legislative requirements in NSW and in the high level of customer service provided. For instance, in NSW annual roadworthy inspections are required on vehicles more than three years old. This system increases the processing and auditing costs associated with annual vehicle registrations. Also the NSW RTA has the largest network of motor registries and agencies, 179 in total, to ensure that customers have easy access to this service. Bi-annual surveys show that more than 90% of customers have a high level of satisfaction with the service provided in NSW motor registries and the average waiting has decreased from 8.4 minutes in 1991 to 4.8 minutes today.

*3. Dr Goldsmith asked:

I refer to RTA, M4-M5 Associated Works

In relation to the tender for the widening of the M4:

(1) What was the amount of each of the 6 tenders for this widening?

(2) What factors were taken into account in awarding the tender to a bidder substantially higher than the lowest tender?

(3) Will the Minister provide the Committee with the records of the Tender Assessment Committee?

Answer—

(1) A public interest immunity is claimed in relation to the disclosure of unsuccessful tender prices, as all Questions and Answers for this Committee become publicly available. Section 4.5 of the Government’s Code of Tendering for the Construction Industry (July 1996) states that:

“No information is to be released in relation to unsuccessful tenders”.

Tender prices are commercially sensitive information and their disclosure would undermine the high ethical standards of tendering practice which the Government expects from all participants in the construction industry.

It can be confirmed that:

there was a wide range in both the quality and the price of the six proposals received;
Statewide Roads did not propose the lowest or the highest price;
the lowest price proposal was around 45% lower than the mean of the other five proposals and involved a quantity and quality of work that was assessed as unacceptable; and
the variation in the prices of the other five proposals was far less significant, being approximately 6% above or below the mean of those prices.

(2) After the lowest unacceptable proposal was rejected, the variation in the other five prices was not significant, as indicated in (1) above. Hence, it is not appropriate to suggest that the tender was awarded to a bidder ‘substantially higher’ than the lowest tenderer.

The assessment criteria as listed in the RTA’s Request for Proposals brochure which was distributed to all proponents included the following:

Technical Merit

the level of innovation included in the proposal;
the extent to which the proposal exceeds the minimum required design and construction standards; and
evidence, including its corporate quality manual, of the proponents’ approach and commitment to quality systems.

Project Experience

the relevant experience of the proponents’ project management, design and construction personnel on urban road projects including:
the proponents’ record of carrying out works of similar magnitude, complexity and public sensitivity; and
the management approach to and expertise in dealing with those projects.

Programming

the ability to commence the provision of extra lanes on the section between Church Street and Coleman Street at an early date;
commitment to early completion of the provision of extra lanes throughout the whole project; and
the programme for rehabilitation of existing pavements and other improvement works.

Financial

evidence of the proponents’ financial capacity and resources over the period of performance (including design, construction and defects correction periods);
competitive and innovative schedule for remuneration (both in terms of total cost and timing of payments) allowing latitude in financing having regard to the RTA’s maximum projected payments of $15 million in 1995/96 and $25 million in 1996/97;
preparedness to negotiate a six monthly payment schedule which progresses the project at the most cost effective rate; and

willingness to give a performance bond or other form of security of an amount which reflects the proponents’ assumption of risk for design and construction, but not less than $5 million, which will remain in effect for the full ten years (minimum) defects correction period of the project.

Project Risks

identification and allocation of risk including, but not limited to, financing, design and construction risks; and

the proposed contractual commercial terms, particularly those relating to timing of payments for completed work.

(3) See (1) above. As such records contain commercially sensitive information, public interest immunity is claimed to justify the non-disclosure of records.

Disclosure would be a clear breach of the Government’s July 1996 Code of Tendering for the Construction Industry which details the ethical standards which the Government expects to be upheld by all participants in the construction industry.

Following contract award, all of the unsuccessful proponents are entitled to a debrief by members of the assessment panel to establish how their proposal rated against the advertised assessment criteria. Only two unsuccessful proponents are understood to have availed themselves of this opportunity.

*4. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.3, p. 595; Roads - Summary of Average staffing:

(1) How many staff in the RTA are currently underemployed?

(2) For how long will they remain underemployed?

(3) What functions are these underemployed staff currently engaged in?

Answer—

(1) There are 19 formally declared excess staff.

(2) At this stage, it is not possible to indicate how long staff will remain undeployed. A number of excess staff will be affected by the outcome of applications for alternative advertised positions and the level of interest shown in accepting offers of voluntary redundancy.

(3) Excess staff are carrying out a range of clerical support and administrative duties.

*5. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

(a) catering and entertainment of any form;
(b) travel and accommodation of any form; and

(c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products?

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

*6. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s)?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies?

Answer—

As is the case in all Westminster systems, Ministers are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.

*7. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p.1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-1997, and at what cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip?

Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.
*8. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p.1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.

*9. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:
   (a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?
   (b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?
   (c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?
   (d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?
   (e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.

*10. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid?
(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

(3) The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and its funding are set out at page 12 of the Budget Summary.

*11. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p.1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(b) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for these purposes?

(2) (a) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97?

(b) How many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

(3) (a) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98?

(b) How many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

Answer—

The refurbishment, upgrading or relocation of offices are required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.

*12. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p.,1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97, and which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98, which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/Completion Date</th>
<th>Total cost of Project</th>
<th>Total allocation to the Project 1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 33.
*13. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office in 1996-97?

Answer—

It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

*14. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you?

(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96?

(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees?

(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee?

(5) How many public servants are serving in an ex officio capacity?

(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 government boards and committees. The database does not contain information on the large number of small trusts administered by the Department of Land and Water Conservation and the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of boards and committees.

(3) There are approximately 6000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all members of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s Memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993.
Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each Department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories of people statistical information is only available for 1918 members. Of these 3.3% who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people, 11% are, people from a non-English speaking background and 5% have disabilities. Board and committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July 1996.

*15. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”?

(2) From which particular programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services announced in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.

*16. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?

Answer—

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 42.

*17. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at page 17), how many employees are currently employed by the Department, by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?
Answer—

The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available in certain cases.

*18. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration:

(1) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(2) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(3) specifically in relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups, and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.

*19. Miss Gardiner asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you, and what was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you.

(2) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?

(3) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97? If so, what was their floor space?

Answer—

Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each Department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of Departments in their Annual Reports.
*20. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Statefleet Services?
(2) What proportion are full time and part time?
(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?
(4) Where are the staff located?
(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?
(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) 33 staff.
(2) 100% of staff are full time.
(3) Aggregated year to date gross for salaries is $1.348M.
(4) Level 13, 1 Francis Street, Darlinghurst.
(5) 502 square metres.
(6) Maintenance and working expenses totalling $700,000.

*21. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Department of Public Works?
(2) What proportion are full time and part time?
(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?
(4) Where are the staff located?
(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?
(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) 2441 staff.
(2) 97.3% are full time, 2.7% are part time.
(3) Aggregated year to date gross for salaries is $102,881,191.
(4) and (5) Staff locations and floor space at each location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FLOOR SPACE M²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head office</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKell Building, 2-24 Rawson Place, Sydney</td>
<td>21,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main regional offices and sub-offices</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Macquarie Tower, 1 Farrer Place, Sydney</td>
<td>2,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 Richmond Road, Doonside</td>
<td>1,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Edgeworth David Road, Hornsby</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-72 Rickard Road, Bankstown</td>
<td>2,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalley Street, East Lismore</td>
<td>1,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359 High Street, Coffs Harbour</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office Block, 117 Bull Street, Newcastle</td>
<td>1,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454-456 Peel Street, Tamworth</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office Block, 140 William Street, Bathurst</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Street, Dubbo</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office Block, 84 Crown Street, Wollongong</td>
<td>1,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourke Street, Goulburn</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6 Coleman Street, Wagga Wagga</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414 Moppett Street, Hay</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office Block, 87 Cooper Street, Cootamundra</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maher Street, Port Macquarie</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-57 Holt Street, Surry Hills</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office Block, 3 Galena Street, Broken Hill</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Hospital, Fleet Street, North Parramatta</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 William Street, Bathurst</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly Hydraulics Laboratory, 110B King Street, Manly Vale</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe Testing Laboratory, 2 Cowper Street, Glebe</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Stores, Stationery Warehouse, Alexandria</td>
<td>3,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Business, 1-15 Francis Street, Darlinghurst</td>
<td>4,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***8-12 Chifley Square, Sydney</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***Panorama Street, Bathurst</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***130 George Street, Parramatta</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***391 Park Road, Regents Park</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**15 Everley Road, Chester Hill</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Government Office Block, cnr Kite and Anson Streets, Orange</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**2/100 Kirrawee Road, North Gosford</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Government Office Block, 37-39 Carrington Street, Dubbo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Cnr Molesworth and Woodlark Streets, Lismore</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TAFE Building, Goulburn</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*155 Marius Street, Tamworth</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Government Office Block, 37-39 Carrington Street, Dubbo</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction project and site offices

Central Railway Project 147
MSB Building, Snug Cove, Eden 54
Derby Street, Kingswood 278
Oberon Dam site office 10
8 Beach Road, Batemans Bay 60
561 Kiewa Street, Albury 56
Menangle Street, Picton 123
125 Bull Street, Newcastle 517
63 Portland Street, Wallerawang 70
Stoneyard, Burroughs Road, St Peters 5,659
Cnr Holker and Newington Streets, Silverwater 50
190-196 Cressy Street, Deniliquin 16
22 Harris Street, Pyrmont 80
Opera House, Bennelong Point, Sydney 180
Sewerage project, Pacific Palms 35
Sewerage project, Duckmaloi 10
Sewerage project, Berridale 10
Sewerage project, Dareton 16
South West Tablelands Water Supply depot, Cootamundra 10
WTP Filter Road, Nowra 90
251 Wharf Road, Newcastle 50

*Government Printing Service
** State Mail Service
***Government Information Service

The overheads for the Department of Public Works and Services for 1996/97 will total approximately $89.5M. The overheads include items such as occupancy, travel, depreciation, human resources, financial and IT support, Internal Audit and Legal Services as well as postal and telephone charges.

As corporate overheads are not distributed across all units, individual overheads by separate location are not available.
*22. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 589, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority, Operating Statement, Employee related:

(1) How many officers fall into each of the following categories:

(a) SES 1 (band 1 lower)
(b) SES 2 (band 1 lower)
(c) SES 3 (band 2 lower)
(d) SES 4 (band 2 upper)
(e) SES 5 (band 3 lower)
(f) SES 6 (band 3 upper)
(g) Grade 12
(h) Grade 11/12
(i) Above Grade 12 (professional)
(j) Above Grade 12 (other)

TOTAL

Answer—

As at 30 May 1997:
SES 1 (band 1 lower) 2
SES 2 (band 1 lower) 14
SES 3 (band 2 lower) 12
SES 4 (band 2 upper) 7
SES 5 (band 3 lower) 4
SES 6 (band 3 upper) 1
Grade 12 212
Grade 11/12 199
Above Grade 12 (professional) 47
Above Grade 12 (other) 0
TOTAL 498

*23. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 595, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority, Total Roads Program:

Budget Paper No. 4 contains details of many roads projects in which the estimated total cost of the project has increased or decreased. What are the reasons for the increases or decreases in the total cost, or changes in completion date, in each of these projects?
Apart from those projects for which there were only minor variations and those projects that were not detailed in the 1996/97 budget papers, details of variations between the estimated total cost or completion date of projects listed in the 1997/98 Budget Paper No. 4 and the equivalent figures given in the 1996/97 Budget Paper No. 4 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Estimated total cost 1997/98 Budget $000</th>
<th>Estimated total cost 1996/97 Budget $000</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Complete 1997/98 Budget Years</th>
<th>Complete 1996/97 Budget Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>METROAD 2 - SYDNEY TO WINDSOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH WEST TRANSPORT LINK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPING RD NORTH RYDE TO OLD WINDSOR RD BAULKHAM HILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation Estimate increased because the scope of the work has been increased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224,300</td>
<td>223,548</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROAD 3 - BLAKEHURST TO MONA VALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING GEORGES RD, STONEY CREEK RD INTERSECTION WIDENING AND IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation Estimate increased because the work has been delayed by property adjustments and public utilities delays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,191</td>
<td>6,753</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUME HIGHWAY, ROBERTS ROAD RECONSTRUCTION OF INTERSECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation Estimate has increased because of slightly higher than estimated contract prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,679</td>
<td>48,969</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMEBUSH BAY DRIVE, AUSTRALIA AVENUE - GRADE SEPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation Estimate has increased because of unanticipated geotechnical problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,536</td>
<td>10,544</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP RYDE INTERCHANGE AT VICTORIA RD AND DEVLIN ST, RYDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation Estimate has decreased because of savings on contract prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Estimated Cost 1997</td>
<td>1997 Variation</td>
<td>Initial Year</td>
<td>Final Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEBE ISLAND ARTERIAL CONSTRUCTION FROM DARLING HARBOUR TO VICTORIA RD, WHITE BAY INCLUDING NEW GLEBE ISLAND BRIDGE AND APPROACHES</td>
<td>217,855</td>
<td>-1,084</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate has decreased because of savings on contract prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY WEST LINK RD - SECTION 3 CONSTRUCTION BETWEEN BALMAIN RD, LILYFIELD AND BOOMERANG ST, HABERFIELD</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>16,936</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate has increased because the previous estimate was strategic only and a detailed estimate is now available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY WEST LINK ROAD WARATAH STREET TO PARRAMATTA ROAD, FIVE DOCK - SECTION 5</td>
<td>19,434</td>
<td>-732</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate has decreased slightly because of a revised strategic estimate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROAD 5 - MASCOT TO MENANGLE</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-3,400</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5 SOUTH WESTERN MOTORWAY DUPLICATION OF GEORGES RIVER BRIDGE AT CASULA INCLUDING, APPROACHES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate has decreased because of savings on the contract price.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENAI - SILVERWATER - CARLINGFORD ROUTE</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>3,959</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STACEY ST EXTENSION FROM WATTLE ST TO ROOKWOOD RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased because the previous estimate was strategic only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Previous Estimate</td>
<td>Variation</td>
<td>Planned Completion Year</td>
<td>Actual Completion Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROAD 7 - HEATHCOTE TO WAHROONGA VIA CUMBERLAND HIGHWAY</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote Rd, Widening to 4 lanes from MacArthur Dr to M5 Motorway, Hammondville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased because the previous estimate was strategic only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPECT ARTERIAL</td>
<td>10,181</td>
<td>10,606</td>
<td>-425</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott Rd, widen from Station Rd to Old Windsor Rd, Seven Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate decreased because of variations in the scope of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN SYDNEY ORBITAL</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>558,603</td>
<td>241,397</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Sydney Orbital from Camden Valley Way at Prestons to M2 at West Baulkham Hills (Federal Funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All estimates on this work are strategic at this stage. Current estimate aggregates and updates previous estimates. Completion date deferred following reduced funding from the Federal Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPIN-PENRITH-COLO ROUTE</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Northern Rd (Richmond Rd) Widening to 4 lanes from Coreen Ave to Andrews Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased because the previous estimate was strategic only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREAT WESTERN HIGHWAY (BLUE MOUNTAINS)</th>
<th>29,000</th>
<th>24,657</th>
<th>4,343</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WARRIMOO SECTION 2, GREAT WESTERN HIGHWAY, THE BOULEVARD TO VALLEY HEIGHTS - RECONSTRUCT AND WIDEN TO 4 LANE DIVIDED CARRIAGEWAY Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased and completion extended because the previous estimate was strategic only and the scope of the work has been increased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OTHER SYDNEY ROAD IMPROVEMENT - PARRAMATTA TO ROUSE HILL ROUTE |        |        |       |      |      |
| WINDSOR ROAD - M2 TO SEVEN HILLS ROAD WIDEN FROM 4 LANE TO 6 LANE DIVIDED CARRIAGEWAY INCLUDING BUS PRIORITY Variations | 5,269  | 6,000  | -731  | 1997 | 1997 |
| Estimate has decreased because of savings in construction of the work. |

| ELIZABETH DRIVE |        |        |       |      |      |
| ELIZABETH DR, WIDENING FROM CABRAMATTA RD TO WEST OF COWPASTURE RD, CECIL HILLS Variation | 21,000 | 20,357 | 643   | 1999 | 2000 |
| Estimate increased and completion date revised because previous estimate was strategic and the work has been accelerated to finish earlier. |

<p>| NEWCASTLE ROAD IMPROVEMENT - SYDNEY-NEWCASTLE FREEWAY |        |        |       |      |      |
| DUPLICATION OF LENEHANS DRIVE FROM F3 AT MINMI TO JOHN RENSHAW DRIVE (FEDERAL FUNDING) Variation | 62,500 | 60,679 | 1,821 | 1998 | 1996 |
| Estimate increased and completion delayed because of key archaeological finds on the project. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Estimate 1996</th>
<th>Estimate 1997</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Year Completed 1997</th>
<th>Year Completed 1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW ENGLAND HIGHWAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF GRADE 11,077 SEPARATED INTERCHANGE AT JOHN RENSHAW DRIVE, BERESFIELD (FEDERAL FUNDING)</td>
<td>11,077</td>
<td>9,018</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased and completion extended because of contractor delays and anticipated claims for extra work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEWCASTLE INNER CITY BYPASS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH23 CONSTRUCTION OF WEST CHARLESTOWN BY-PASS FROM PACIFIC HIGHWAY, WINDALE TO KOTARA HEIGHTS</td>
<td>68,600</td>
<td>68,101</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased slightly because of environmental delays to commencement of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOLLONGONG ROAD IMPROVEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN FREEWAY WIDENING FROM 79KM TO 83KM SOUTH OF SYDNEY GWINNEVILLE TO GHOST CREEK</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>27,349</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased because previous estimate was strategic only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCES HIGHWAY INTERCHANGE AT NEW LAKE ENTRANCE ROAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCES HIGHWAY INTERCHANGE AT NEW LAKE ENTRANCE ROAD</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>20,824</td>
<td>3,676</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased and completion extended because previous estimate was strategic only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYDNEY-NEWCASTLE FREEWAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION OF DUAL CARRIAGEWAYS FROM OURIMBAH CREEK TO KANGY ANGY CREEK INCLUDING OURIMBAH INTERCHANGE(FEDERAL FUNDING)</td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td>56,190</td>
<td>-4,890</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate decreased because of decreased scope of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TUGGERAH-NORAHVILLE ROAD
WIDENING TO FOUR LANES FROM F3 FREEWAY AT TUGGERAH TO THE ENTRANCE RD, LONG JETTY
Variation
Estimate increased and completion extended because of increased scope of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td>61,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RURAL - HUME HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT
CONSTRUCTION OF DUAL CARRIAGEWAYS FROM 19KM TO 39KM SOUTH OF YASS - BOOKHAM BYPASS (FEDERAL FUNDING)
Variation
Estimate increased because previous estimate was strategic only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>64,338</td>
<td>60,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>3,898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RURAL - NEW ENGLAND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT
DIVIDED CARRIAGeway FROM BLACK CREEK TO BELFORD - BELFORD FOREST DEVIATION (FEDERAL FUNDING)
Variation
Estimate decreased because previous estimate was strategic only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>37,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>-7,959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RURAL - PACIFIC HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT
CONSTRUCTION OF RAYMOND TERRACE BY-PASS (JOINT STATE/FEDERAL FUNDING)
Variation
Estimate increased due to increased scope of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>55,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONSTRUCTION OF DUAL CARRIAGEWAY RAYMOND TO KARUAH 29.5 TO 50.9KM NTH OF TERRACE NEWCASTLE
Variation
Minor increase to strategic estimate for this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>67,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Original Estimate</td>
<td>Variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening from Bray Street to Arthur Street, Coffs Harbour</td>
<td>14,067</td>
<td>5,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increase as original estimate was strategic and scope of work significantly increased to include a new rail overbridge and grade separated interchange. Completion date extended because of delays in finalising public utility relocations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate existing carriageway at Eungai (Joint State/Federal Funding)</td>
<td>12,373</td>
<td>11,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased because previous estimate was strategic only. Completion date extended because of wet weather delays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of second carriageway to stage 1 and stage 2 of the Herons CK Deviation (Joint State/Federal Funding)</td>
<td>20,241</td>
<td>23,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate decreased because previous estimate was strategic only. Completion date extended because of wet weather delays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realignment including southbound overtaking lane 88.0km to 92.0km north of Grafton at Gap Rd</td>
<td>9,247</td>
<td>10,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate decreased because previous estimate was strategic only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Rural Roads Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway - Construction of dual carriageways at Lake George 27.5km to 51.2km from Canberra (Federal Funding)</td>
<td>130,930</td>
<td>125,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased because previous estimate was strategic only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Old Estimate</td>
<td>New Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONARO HIGHWAY - RECONSTRUCTION FROM 31.7KM TO 37.2KM SOUTH OF BOMBALA (BONDI)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>8,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased because of higher contract prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBB HIGHWAY - INITIAL SEALING BETWEEN 128KM AND 156KM NORTH OF HAY TOWARDS IVANHOE</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>5,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased and completion extended because of wet weather delays and slightly higher contract prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN ROAD No 84 - BURLEY GRIFFIN WAY ILLALONG CREEK DEVIATION 26KM TO 34KM WEST OF YASS</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>6,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate increased and completion extended because of significantly increased scope of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN ROAD No 78 - OLYMPIC HIGHWAY GOBBA BRIDGE AND DEVIATION AT WAGGA WAGGA</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>49,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate decreased because of savings in contract costs and variations to scope of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT - RAILWAY OVERBRIDGES LEVEL CROSSING REPLACEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAKERS HILL RAIL OVERBRIDGE LEVEL CROSSING REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate decreased because previous estimate was strategic only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEUMEAH ROAD RAIL OVERBRIDGE LEVEL CROSSING REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>8,396</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate decreased because previous estimate was strategic only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*24. Miss Gardiner asked:

Budget Paper No. 2, page 4-153, refers to the Public Transport Infrastructure Improvement Program:

(1) What works were carried out in 1996/97?

(2) What is the value of each of these works?

(3) What is the proposed schedule of works in this program for 1996/97?

Answer—

(1) Works being carried out in the 1996-97 Public Transport Infrastructure Improvement Program and

(2) the expected value of each of these works (forecast 1996-97 expenditure) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>$'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNNYHOLT RD, GEORGE ST TO FIFTH AVE, BLACKTOWN - BUS PRIORITY WORKS</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN SYDNEY - BUS PRIORITY (B SIGNALS)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS PRIORITY COMMITTEES' ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN VALLEY WAY &amp; STRATHALLEN AVE - BUS STUDY</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALCON ST, WARRINGAH FWY, MILITARY RD - BUS PRIORITY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLINDERS ST, DARLINGHURST - BUS PRIORITY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY RD, NEUTRAL BAY - TIDAL FLOW</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXFORD ST, BONDI JUNCTION TO CITY - BUS PRIORITY</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY &amp; ALBERT AV, CHATSWOOD - LEFT TURN BAY</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY &amp; BOUNDARY ST - LEFT TURN BAY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY &amp; FULLERS RD, CHATSWOOD - RIGHT TURN BAY</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRAMATTA RD, LIVERPOOL RD TO CITY RD - BUS PRIORITY</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIT RD &amp; STANTON RD, SPIT JUNCTION - BUS BAY</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYDNEY CBD BUS PRIORITY WORKS</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA RD, ROZELLE TO GLADESVILLE - ELECTRONIC TIDAL FLOW</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIT RD &amp; BICKELL ST, THE SPIT - NEW SIGNALS</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIT RD &amp; MEDUSA ST, THE SPIT - BUS BAY</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPROVEMENTS TO BUS LANE MERGE AREA ON WARRINGAH FWY</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATION ST, PARRAMATTA - PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLE HILL RD &amp; HIGHS RD, CASTLE HILL - TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND TURN BAY</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH ST, PARRAMATTA - BUS PRIORITY LANE</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETH DR, EAST OF CABRAMATTA RD, BONNYRIGG - BUS PRIORITY</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPING RD, NEAR EPPING STATION - BUS PRIORITY WORKS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BUS PRIORITY WORKS BY LIVERPOOL COUNCIL
- Kingsgrove & Omnibus RDS, Kingsgrove - Bus Signals: 7
- Lane Cove & Waterloo RDS, Macquarie Park - Intersection Reconstruction: 178
- Sydney Western Region - Bus Priority: 180
- Newbridge Rd, Milperra Rd, Milperra - Bus Priority: 15
- Old Northern Rd & Excelsior Ave, Castle Hill - Right Turn Bay: 750
- Pacific Hwy & Beechworth Rd, Pyrmble - Tidal Flow: 50
- Blenheim & Pittwater RDS, North Ryde - Slip Lane: 220
- Strathfield Town Centre - Bus Priority Study: 10
- Castle Hill Ring Road, Castle Hill - Bus Priority: 650
- Narellan Road, Currans Hill - Bus Bays: 550
- Westmead Traffic & Transport Plan - Development & Implementation: 700
- Darcy Road, Westmead - Route Improvements: 100
- Epping Rd, Lane Cove River to Mowbray Rd - Transit Lane: 1992
- Epping Rd, Mowbray Rd to Sam Johnson Way - Transit Lane: 480
- Webbs Creek & River RDS, Webbs Creek - Upgrade Ferry Facilities: 80
- Clarence St Ramp to Sydney Harbour Bridge - Bus Bay: 80
- Development of Bus Priority Algorithms: 50
- Bus Passenger Information System Evaluation: 67
- Bus Travel Time and Vehicle Occupancy Rate Studies: 60
- Transport Management Centre: 1672
- Hunter Region - Bus Priority at Signals: 20
- The Entrance & Pitt RDS, Wamberal - Bus Priority: 125
- South Western Region - Rural Road Bus Bays: 82
- Southern Region - Urban Bus Bays: 430
- Southern Region - Rural Bus Bays: 260
- Princes Hwy, West Wollongong - Curve Corrections: 142
- Railway Square Sydney - Interchange Improvement: 1000
- Merrylands Interchange: 100
- Redfern Interchange: 23
- Pacific Hwy at Gosford Railway Station - Bus Access Improvements: 189
- Brisbane Water Dr at Point Clare Railway Station - Pedestrian Signals: 14
- Railway & Charlton St, Woy Woy Interchange - Roundabout: 470
- Woy Woy Railway Station - Bus Interchange: 1430
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TARCUTTA QUICK HITCH FACILITY</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOLLONGONG UNIVERSITY BUS FACILITY</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEANBEYAN BUS TERMINAL</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WERONA AVE, GORDON - CAR PARK EXTENSION</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVEN HILLS CAR PARK</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOY WOY RAILWAY INTERCHANGE - COMMUTER CAR PARK</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT OUSLEY COMMUTER CARPARK</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARELLAN RD, BLAXLAND TO APPIN - CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAKERS HILL, RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING - REPLACEMENT BY BRIDGE</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEUMEAH ROAD RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING - REPLACEMENT BY BRIDGE</td>
<td>3675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYDNEY REGION - OTHER RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING WORKS</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVENSWORTH LEVEL CROSSING - NEW LIGHTS &amp; BELLS</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN REGION - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING SIGNPOSTING</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARE ST CASINO - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWELL HWY, WEST WYALONG - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH WESTERN REGION - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING SIGNPOSTING UPGRADES</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH WESTERN REGION - LEVEL CROSSING SIGHT DISTANCE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLYMPIC WAY, GEROGERY - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN ST, YOUNG - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID WESTERN HWY, WEST WYALONG - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLAWARRA HWY, ROBERTSON - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOLAN STREET, UNANDERRA - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTTOR ROAD, MOSS VALE - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMWORTH - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADES</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN REGION - LEVEL CROSSING SIGNPOSTING</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID WESTERN HWY, BLAYNEY - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORENORE (MR61) - ADVANCE WARNING AT RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAIN CK (MR206) - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING APPROACHES</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALGETT - PUBLIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXWELL ST, WELLINGTON - LIGHTS &amp; BELLS</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLUS DR, MOREE - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD TURRAWAN RD, NARRABRI - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD BRIDGES OVER RAIL, SYDNEY REGION - BRIDGE INVESTIGATIONS</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIN BRIDGE (MR233), PARKES REGION - PROJECT DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed schedule of works for 1997-98 Public Transport Infrastructure Improvement Program is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY RD, WINNIE &amp; MURDOCH, CREMORNE - INTERSECTION TREATMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY RD &amp; SPOFFORTH ST, CREMORNE - TIDAL FLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXFORD ST, BONDI JUNCTION TO CITY - BUS PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY, RAILWAY TO ASHLEY, CHATSWOOD - TIDAL FLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY, SHIRLEY &amp; CLANVILLE RDS, ROSEVILLE - INTERSECTION TREATMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY, EDDY RD TO FULLERS RD, CHATSWOOD - TIDAL FLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY, GROSVENOR RD TO STRICKLAND AVE - INTERSECTION TREATMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITARY RD, CREMORNE TO SPIT JUNCTION - BUS BAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIT RD &amp; OURIMBAH RD, MOSMAN - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZAC PDE, GARDENERS RD TO CLEVELAND ST - T3 TRANSIT LANE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYDNEY CBD BUS PRIORITY WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADFIELD HWY, CLARENCE ST, HARBOUR BRIDGE - BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWBRIDGE RD, MILPERRA RD, MILPERRA - BUS PRIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY &amp; LIVINGSTONE ST, PYMBLE - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS PRIORITY (2 SIGNALS) - EASTERN SYDNEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY &amp; BRIDGE ST, GORDON - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN VALLEY WAY &amp; STRATHALLEN AVE, CASTLE COVE - INTERSECTION TREATMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCEVOY ST AT WATERLOO: ROUTE DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPING RD, NEAR EPPING STATION - BUS PRIORITY WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS PRIORITY WORKS BY LIVERPOOL COUNCIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUME HWY &amp; HIGHLAND AVE, YAGOONA - RIGHT TURN BAY &amp; PHASING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZAC PDE &amp; ALISON RD, KENSINGTON - INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUME HWY-CHULLORA TO ASHFIELD-BUS PRIORITY WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIT RD &amp; STANTON RD, SPIT JUNCTION - BUS BAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTORIA RD, LINK RD TO IRON COVE BRIDGE - TIDAL FLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIT RD, PARRIWI RD NTH TO SPIT BRIDGE - BUS PRIORITY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLINDERS ST, DARLINGHURST - BUS PRIORITY IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC HWY &amp; FULLERS RD, CHATSWOOD - RIGHT TURN BAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC TRANSPORT INCIDENT DETECTION SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAXLAND RD &amp; FIRST AVE, EASTWOOD-INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANE COVE &amp; WATERLOO RDS, MACQUARIE PARK - INTERSECTION RECONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PACIFIC HWY & MOWBRAY RD, CHATSWOOD - TURNING BAYS
ANZAC PDE & LANG RD, MOORE PARK - BUS PRIORITY
CHURCH ST, PARRAMATTA - BUS PRIORITY LANE
CASTLE HILL RING ROAD, CASTLE HILL - BUS PRIORITY
GT WESTERN HWY, CHURCH TO PITT STS, PARRAMATTA - TIDAL FLOW
FALCON ST, WARRINGAH FWY, MILITARY RD - BUS PRIORITY
WESTMEAD TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT PLAN - DEVELOPMENT & IMPLEMENTATION
EASTERN SYDNEY - BUS PRIORITY
WESTERN SYDNEY - BUS PRIORITY
TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT CENTRE
PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROMOTION - MODE CHOICE
TRANSIT LANE AND SPECIAL LANE PROMOTION
DEVELOPMENT OF BUS PRIORITY ALGORITHMS
HUNTER REGION - SCHOOL BUS PROPOSALS
HUNTER REGION - BUS PRIORITY AT SIGNALS
PACIFIC HWY NEAR FLORAVILLE RD, BELMONT - BUS BAY
PACIFIC HWY NEAR OXFORD ST, GATESHEAD - BUS BAY
TURTON & LAMBTON RDS, LAMBTON - BUS PRIORITY
MAIN RD & GARTH ST, EDGEWORTH - BUS ROUTE SIGNALS
PACIFIC HWY & CHAMBERLAIN ST, LISAROW - BUS ROUTE SIGNALS
HENRY PARRY & YORK, EAST GOSFORD - PED O'BRIIDGE TO IMPROVE BUS FLOW
PACIFIC HWY & NTABA RD, JEWELLS - BUS ROUTE SIGNALS
THE ENTRANCE & PITT RDS, WAMBERAL - BUS PRIORITY
WOLLONGONG - BUS SIGNAL PHASING
SOUTHERN REGION - RURAL BUS BAYS
SOUTHERN REGION - URBAN BUS BAYS
PRINCES HWY, BELLAMBI TO BULLI - CURVE CORRECTION
SOUTH WEST REGION - RURAL ROAD BUS BAYS
EPPING STATION INTERCHANGE
PARRAMATTA CBD - BUS & PEDESTRIAN ACCESS
CENTRAL STATION BUS LAYOVER
MOORE PARK BUS INTERCHANGE
MANLY INTERCHANGE
REDFERN INTERCHANGE
WOY WOY RAILWAY STATION - BUS INTERCHANGE
QUEANBEYAN BUS TERMINAL
WOLLONGONG UNIVERSITY BUS FACILITY
TAMWORTH DISTRICT - RURAL BUS STOP REMEDIAL WORKS
WENTWORTHVILLE CAR PARK
HARRIS PARK CAR PARK
LEUMEAH CAR PARK - CONTRIBUTION TO RESURFACING
WOLLONGONG RAILWAY STATION IMPROVEMENTS
THRROUL RAILWAY STATION IMPROVEMENTS
QUAKERS HILL RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING - REPLACEMENT BY BRIDGE
LEUMEAH ROAD RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING - REPLACEMENT BY BRIDGE
DUNGOG RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING - BOOM GATES
PATERSON - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE
NORTHERN REGION - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING SIGNPOSTING
FOUNTAINDALE RD, ROBERTSON - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE
CAPTAINS FLAT, BUNGENDORE - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE
NEWELL HWY, ALLEENA - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS
OLYMPIC HWY, GEROGERY - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE
BURLEY GRIFFIN WAY, STOCKINBINGAL - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE
CAROONA - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING UPGRADE
GOONUMBLA RD NEAR PARKES - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS
MOOKERWA RD AT STUART TOWN - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS
LOCAL ROADS IN PARKES - RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING IMPROVEMENTS

25. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 593, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority:

(1) What is the estimated actual expenditure to 30/6/97 in the following categories:

(a) Road Network Infrastructure

   (i) Network Development

   (ii) Infrastructure Maintenance

(b) Road Safety and Traffic Maintenance

(c) Driver and Vehicle Policy and Regulation
(d) Debt Servicing and Repayment

(e) Non-current assets

(f) Voluntary redundancies

(g) Total Expenditure

(2) What are the estimates in the above categories for 1997/98?

Answer—

(1) Estimated expenditure for 1996/97:

(a) (i) Network Development $632.5 million

(ii) Network Maintenance $560.9 million

(b) Road Safety and Traffic Management $276.9 million

(c) Driver and Vehicle Policy and Regulation $201.6 million

(d) Debt Servicing and Repayment $140.7 million

(e) Non-current assets $54.2 million

(f) Voluntary Redundancies $5.0 million

(g) Total Expenditure $2,009.5 million

(2) Estimated expenditure for 1997/98:

(a) (i) Network Development $813.6 million

(ii) Network Maintenance $525.5 million

(b) Road Safety and Traffic Management $280.3 million

(c) Driver and Vehicle Policy and Regulation $200.6 million

(d) Debt Servicing and Repayment $147.5 million

(e) Non-current assets $32.0 million
(f) Voluntary Redundancies $10.0 million

(g) Total Expenditure $2,190.3 million

*26. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 595, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority, Total Roads Program:

Please describe the timing arrangements with the Commonwealth in determining the allocation of Commonwealth funds to roads projects in New South Wales? If possible, please provide a general time line for these arrangements.

Answer—

Except for National Highways, there are no specific timing arrangements with the Commonwealth for determining the allocation of Commonwealth funds to road projects in New South Wales.

For National Highways, each State is required to submit to the Commonwealth, by 31 December each year, a Forward Strategy to assist the Commonwealth in its funding deliberations for the ensuing financial year.

As the State Budget preceded the Federal Budget, the RTA had no choice other than to prepare its budget estimates based on the Forward Strategy, agreements, discussions with the Commonwealth at officer level, information in previous budget papers, and required cash flows for individual projects.

*27. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 595, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority, Total Roads Program:

(1) In relation to the following projects:

(a) the Charlestown by-pass

(b) F3 links to major centres

(c) State Road 108, Newcastle to Port Stephens

(d) Shortland to Sandgate Road - State Highway 23

(e) Upgrade of the Gloucester to Walcha Road

(f) Widening of MR 223, Taylor Street, Cardiff to Crossroads

(g) Upgrading of MR 217 and MR 527
(h) Completion of the Bowmans Crossings Bridge

(i) Upgrade of MR 218, Swamp Creek Bridge, Abermain

(j) Upgrade of MR 220 between Cessnock and Branxton

(k) Fast track of graded intersection at Anderson Drive, Weakly Drive, Thornton Road and the New England Highway intersection at Thornton

(l) Upgrade/replace the bridge at Double Creek, near Stroud on the Buckets Way

(m) Upgrade/replace the bridge at Black Creek on the Dungog to Stroud Road

(n) Upgrade/replace the bridge at Tumbledown Creek, Glen Oak on the Seaham to Clarence Town Road

(o) Upgrade/replace the bridge at Wattle Creek Bridge on Seaham to Clarence Road

(p) Upgrade/replace bridge at Melville Ford Bridge, Aberasslyn

(q) Upgrade of the Summerland Way

(r) Upgrade of Terrigal Drive

(s) Completion of Wyong Road to Tuggerah

(t) Upgrade of Wilfred Barret Drive

(u) Construction of the Queanbeyan Bypass

(v) Construction of a New Highway linking Port Macquarie to the Pacific Highway

(w) Widening of the Windsor Road to four lanes

(x) Upgrade of the Maitland Road network

(y) Completion of the Bangor Pass, rebuilding of the bridge at Allawah, widening of the King Georges Road and completion of the reconstruction of the intersection of President Avenue and the Princess Highway at Kogarah

(2) What is the total estimated cost of these projects?

(3) How much has been spent on these projects since 1995/96?

(4) What is the estimated date for completion in each of these projects?
(2) (a-h); (j-k); (q) ; (s); & (y) - Total estimated costs of these projects is $513,765,900.

(i) - Upgrading of the bridge is complete and a route study is in progress to identify and prioritise future works.

(l-p) - These works are on local or regional roads with priority determined by Councils in consultation with other Councils in the area. Funding is available to assist the Councils from regional road block grants or on a 50/50 basis from the REPAIR program.

(r)- Upgrading is complete, however other minor intersection improvements are being planned.

(t) - Upgrading is complete, expenditure for routine maintenance.

(u - w) - Investigations in progress however it is too early to estimate cost or timing for these projects.

(x) - No estimate for upgrading the entire Maitland road network, expenditure includes improvements, maintenance, road safety and traffic management costs.

(3) $31,181,640 has been spent on these projects since 1995/96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Estimated date of completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlestown Bypass</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 links to major centres</td>
<td>2002+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR108, Newcastle to Port Stephens</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortland to Sandgate Road - SH23</td>
<td>2001+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade of the Gloucester to Walcha Road</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening of MR 22 (now 527), Taylor Street, Cardiff to Crossroads,</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading of MR 217 and MR 527</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Bowmans Crossing Bridge</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading of MR218, Swamp Creek Bridge, Abermain</td>
<td>2001+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrading of MR220 between Cessnock and Branxton</td>
<td>2001+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast track of graded intersection at Anderson Drive, Weakleys Drive, Thornton Road and the New England Highway intersection at Thornton</td>
<td>2000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade/replace the bridge at Double Creek, near Stroud on the Buckets Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade/replace the bridge at Black Creek, on the Dungog to Stroud Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade/replace the bridge at Tumbledown Creek, Glen Oak on the Seaham to Clarence Town Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade/replace the bridge at Wattle Creek Bridge on the Seaham to Clarence Town Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade/replace the bridge at Melville Ford Bridge, Aberasslyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upgrade of the Summerland Way | 2001
---|---
Upgrade of Terrigal Drive
Completion of Wyong Road to Tuggerah | 1997
Upgrade of Wilfred Barret Drive
Construction of the Queanbeyan Bypass
Construction of a new highway linking Port Macquarie to the Pacific Highway
Widening of the Windsor Road to four lanes
Upgrading of the Maitland Road network
Completion of the Bangor Bypass, rebuilding of the bridge at Allawah, widening of the King Georges Road and completion of the reconstruction of President Avenue and the Princess Highway at Kogarah.

*28. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 595, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority, Total Roads Program:

(1) What is the actual expenditure for roads projects in each state electorate in 1996/97? If these figures are not available for the full financial year, please provide the best estimates of actual expenditure.

(2) What is the breakdown of Federal and State funds actually spent in 1996/97?

(3) What is the estimated expenditure for road projects in each electorate for the 1997/98 financial year?

(4) What is the breakdown of Federal and State funds to be spent in each of these electorates in 1997/98?

Answer—

(1) & (2) The estimated expenditure in each State electorate for 1996/97 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>State Estimated Expenditure</th>
<th>Federal Estimated Expenditure</th>
<th>Total Estimated Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTORATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>1996-97</strong></td>
<td><strong>1996-97</strong></td>
<td><strong>1996-97</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBURY</td>
<td>$ 9,390 '000's</td>
<td>$ 7,440 '000's</td>
<td>$ 16,829 '000's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHFIELD</td>
<td>4,157</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUBURN</td>
<td>10,471</td>
<td>10,471</td>
<td>20,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADGERYS CREEK</td>
<td>10,499</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>15,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLINA</td>
<td>22,304</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>29,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANKSTOWN</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>6,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARWON</td>
<td>19,230</td>
<td>15,848</td>
<td>35,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATHURST</td>
<td>25,371</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>26,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAULKHAM HILLS</td>
<td>9,846</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>First Column</td>
<td>Second Column</td>
<td>Third Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bega</td>
<td>13,595</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>13,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bligh</td>
<td>4,981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains</td>
<td>26,979</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Hill</td>
<td>44,803</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>50,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulli</td>
<td>8,307</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrimudge</td>
<td>19,251</td>
<td>71,106</td>
<td>90,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabramatta</td>
<td>5,651</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>6,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>9,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
<td>7,590</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>8,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>5,938</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td>12,567</td>
<td>12,032</td>
<td>24,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlestown</td>
<td>7,360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>34,960</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>35,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffs Harbour</td>
<td>27,345</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>41,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coogee</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronulla</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummooyne</td>
<td>12,635</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbo</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>13,349</td>
<td>25,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hills</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermington</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>2,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges River</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladesville</td>
<td>10,040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosford</td>
<td>4,671</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville</td>
<td>5,663</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawksbury</td>
<td>10,833</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heffron</td>
<td>5,332</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurstville</td>
<td>6,324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra</td>
<td>5,472</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>5,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keira</td>
<td>9,434</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiama</td>
<td>13,733</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>13,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kogarah</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku-ring-Gai</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>5,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachlan</td>
<td>20,582</td>
<td>8,596</td>
<td>29,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Macquarie</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>5,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeemba</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Cove</td>
<td>9,937</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>13,522</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>13,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>Lower House</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>12,521</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>14,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>7,313</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland</td>
<td>3,946</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>9,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroubra</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrickville</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaro</td>
<td>25,769</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>27,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorebank</td>
<td>4,017</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>4,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Druitt</td>
<td>11,086</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrumbidgee</td>
<td>11,836</td>
<td>12,753</td>
<td>24,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murwillumbah</td>
<td>17,613</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>24,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myall Lakes</td>
<td>48,170</td>
<td>16,970</td>
<td>65,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>12,484</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcott</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Tablelands</td>
<td>12,078</td>
<td>11,096</td>
<td>23,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>11,706</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley</td>
<td>22,957</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>23,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>13,348</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>13,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peats</td>
<td>7,964</td>
<td>5,462</td>
<td>13,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>5,762</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittwater</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Rural Sed</td>
<td>55,259</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>63,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Urban Sed</td>
<td>44,195</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>49,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Jackson</td>
<td>30,463</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Macquarie</td>
<td>10,885</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>11,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Stephens</td>
<td>25,722</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>34,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverstone</td>
<td>25,224</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockdale</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>9,464</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>11,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td>14,072</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Highlands</td>
<td>6,547</td>
<td>7,804</td>
<td>14,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Marys</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathfield</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>9,242</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entrance</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hills</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>10,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hunter</td>
<td>20,228</td>
<td>13,376</td>
<td>33,604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VAUCLUSE                      3,067  0     3,067
WAGGA WAGGA                   15,479  7,091  22,570
WAKEHURST                     1,754  0     1,754
WALLSEND                      2,841  0     2,841
WARATAH                       2,290  18,882 21,172
WILLOUGHBY                    3,107  0     3,107
WOLLONGONG                    10,591  630   11,221
WYONG                         9,414  18,604 28,017

(3) & (4) The estimated expenditure in each State electorate for 1997/98 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBURY</td>
<td>8,601</td>
<td>8,222</td>
<td>16,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHFIELD</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUBURN</td>
<td>8,572</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADGERYS CREEK</td>
<td>7,325</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>12,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLINA</td>
<td>19,238</td>
<td>9,050</td>
<td>28,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANKSTOWN</td>
<td>3,023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARWON</td>
<td>18,138</td>
<td>14,024</td>
<td>32,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATHURST</td>
<td>23,355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAULKHAM HILLS</td>
<td>8,805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGA</td>
<td>11,356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKTOWN</td>
<td>4,633</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLIGH</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE MOUNTAINS</td>
<td>23,736</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROKEN HILL</td>
<td>32,721</td>
<td>9,132</td>
<td>41,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLI</td>
<td>9,412</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURRINJUCK</td>
<td>19,230</td>
<td>74,495</td>
<td>93,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABRAMATTA</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>6,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMDEN</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>6,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELLTOWN</td>
<td>9,902</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>10,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTERBURY</td>
<td>32,974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNOCk</td>
<td>10,994</td>
<td>18,949</td>
<td>29,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLESTOWN</td>
<td>17,680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARENCE</td>
<td>36,064</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>37,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFFS HARBOUR</td>
<td>23,856</td>
<td>14,550</td>
<td>38,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOGEE</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRONULLA</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIDSON</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUMMOYNE</td>
<td>11,253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUBBO</td>
<td>10,037</td>
<td>16,651</td>
<td>26,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST HILLS</td>
<td>9,099</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTWOOD</td>
<td>5,862</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERMINGTON</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRFIELD</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGES RIVER</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLADESVILLE</td>
<td>15,279</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSFORD</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANVILLE</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWKESBURY</td>
<td>7,672</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEFFRON</td>
<td>18,737</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HURSTVILLE</td>
<td>62,515</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>62,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLAWARRA</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEIRA</td>
<td>9,399</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIAMA</td>
<td>12,823</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOGARAH</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU-RING-GAI</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>8,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACHLAN</td>
<td>15,619</td>
<td>9,106</td>
<td>24,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE MACQUARIE</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>2,041</td>
<td>4,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKEMBA</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANE COVE</td>
<td>3,037</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISMORE</td>
<td>14,974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVERPOOL</td>
<td>8,786</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>10,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON DERRY</td>
<td>5,589</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAITLAND</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>6,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANLY</td>
<td>8,691</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAROUBRA</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRICKVILLE</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRANDA</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONARO</td>
<td>27,712</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>28,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOOREBANK</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>9,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNT DRUITT</td>
<td>11,502</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>12,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRAY</td>
<td>21,629</td>
<td>9,481</td>
<td>31,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRUMBIDGEE</td>
<td>11,138</td>
<td>13,958</td>
<td>25,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURWILLUMBAH</td>
<td>4,231</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>5,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYALL LAKES</td>
<td>47,137</td>
<td>23,050</td>
<td>70,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWCASTLE</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH SHORE</td>
<td>14,416</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHcott</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>2,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN TABLELANDS</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>9,554</td>
<td>18,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>10,375</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXLEY</td>
<td>14,271</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>17,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRAMATTA</td>
<td>22,185</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>22,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEATS</td>
<td>4,289</td>
<td>7,116</td>
<td>11,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENRITH</td>
<td>4,562</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITWATER</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL RURAL SED</td>
<td>78,404</td>
<td>10,692</td>
<td>89,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL URBAN SED</td>
<td>55,735</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>62,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT JACKSON</td>
<td>27,101</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT MACQUARIE</td>
<td>12,296</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>19,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT STEPHENS</td>
<td>37,220</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>44,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERSTONE</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKDALE</td>
<td>45,183</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITHFIELD</td>
<td>9,978</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>11,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH COAST</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN HIGHLANDS</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>7,239</td>
<td>13,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST MARYS</td>
<td>5,549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATHFIELD</td>
<td>4,328</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTHERLAND</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWANSEA</td>
<td>2,366</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMWORTH</td>
<td>8,397</td>
<td>4,511</td>
<td>12,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ENTRANCE</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>5,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE HILLS</td>
<td>7,491</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER HUNTER</td>
<td>14,484</td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>19,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAUCLUSE</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGGA WAGGA</td>
<td>11,638</td>
<td>6,057</td>
<td>17,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAKEHURST</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALLSEND</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARATAH</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>18,244</td>
<td>20,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLOUGHBY</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOLLONGONG</td>
<td>9,773</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>10,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYONG</td>
<td>8,396</td>
<td>20,637</td>
<td>29,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*29. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 595, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority, Total Roads Program:

(1) For each of the state electorates, how many 3x3 funds have actually been expended in each of the 1994/95, 1995/96 and 1996/97 financial years?

(2) For each of the above years, what proportion was spent on the Public Transport Infrastructure Improvement Program?
(3) How many 3x3 funds are estimated to be spent in each state electorate in the coming financial year?

(4) What proportion of these funds are to be spent on the Public Transport Infrastructure Improvement Program?

Answer—

(1) The majority of expenditure for 1994/95 was undertaken by the former Coalition Government and this Government is therefore not accountable for expenditure over this period. Actual expenditure figures for the 1996/97 financial year have not yet been determined.

(1) & (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>870,894</td>
<td>2,652,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td>489,637</td>
<td>2,764,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>3,562,193</td>
<td>4,429,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgerys Creek</td>
<td>3,663,275</td>
<td>712,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballina</td>
<td>1,069,670</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>587,801</td>
<td>859,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwon</td>
<td>2,484,221</td>
<td>4,166,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>6,579,646</td>
<td>9,472,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baulkham Hills</td>
<td>283,424</td>
<td>40,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bega</td>
<td>2,462,000</td>
<td>2,777,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>2,886,969</td>
<td>92,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bligh</td>
<td>225,953</td>
<td>4,097,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains</td>
<td>11,547,335</td>
<td>7,156,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Hill</td>
<td>5,479,789</td>
<td>5,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulli</td>
<td>699,830</td>
<td>698,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrinjuck</td>
<td>3,703,217</td>
<td>5,755,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabramatta</td>
<td>1,746,153</td>
<td>2,264,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>750,833</td>
<td>571,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
<td>8,678,787</td>
<td>3,578,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>1,566,908</td>
<td>2,329,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td>1,688,538</td>
<td>2,922,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlestown</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>1,872,184</td>
<td>5,582,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffs Harbour</td>
<td>10,115,766</td>
<td>14,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coogee</td>
<td>112,103</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronulla</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>220,094</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcott</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Tablelands</td>
<td>1,212,354</td>
<td>2,235,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>2,224,110</td>
<td>5,265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxley</td>
<td>231,787</td>
<td>1,088,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>2,185,297</td>
<td>8,595,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peats</td>
<td>3,068,541</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittwater</td>
<td>166,917</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Rural Sed</td>
<td>537,459</td>
<td>333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Urban Sed</td>
<td>1,685,833</td>
<td>7,562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Jackson</td>
<td>17,551,472</td>
<td>6,614,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Macquarie</td>
<td>1,630,499</td>
<td>487,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Stephens</td>
<td>3,254,158</td>
<td>16,334,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverstone</td>
<td>7,413,443</td>
<td>4,034,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockdale</td>
<td>495,502</td>
<td>51,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>2,107,641</td>
<td>2,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td>5,087,767</td>
<td>2,036,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Highlands</td>
<td>420,342</td>
<td>729,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Marys</td>
<td>2,394,279</td>
<td>1,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathfield</td>
<td>1,516,773</td>
<td>2,469,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>490,738</td>
<td>162,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>171,754</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>859,100</td>
<td>2,516,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entrance</td>
<td>169,053</td>
<td>2,598,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hills</td>
<td>2,455,002</td>
<td>842,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hunter</td>
<td>1,821,717</td>
<td>2,989,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaucluse</td>
<td>214,456</td>
<td>1,517,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagga Wagga</td>
<td>583,456</td>
<td>4,961,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakehurst</td>
<td>12,917</td>
<td>89,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallsend</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waratah</td>
<td>2,617,895</td>
<td>284,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td>178,859</td>
<td>849,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>1,919,745</td>
<td>2,785,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyong</td>
<td>6,317,051</td>
<td>3,510,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) and (4)

1994/95. Not applicable. The component was introduced from September 1995.
1996/97. Estimated expenditure of $37,045,000.
1997/98. Estimated expenditure of $50,000,000.
*30. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 595, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority, Total Roads Program:

1. What has been the actual allocation of road funds to each local government area in 1994/95, 1995/96 and 1996/97?

2. What is the estimated allocation of road funds to each local government area in 1997/98?

Answer—

(1) and (2) Details of actual and estimated expenditure in local government areas 1994/95 to 1997/98 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBURY</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMIDALE</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>6,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHFIELD</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>4,280</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>6,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUBURN</td>
<td>4,289</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>6,883</td>
<td>6,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLINA</td>
<td>5,368</td>
<td>8,087</td>
<td>6,722</td>
<td>2,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALRANALD</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>1,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANKSTOWN</td>
<td>9,601</td>
<td>13,925</td>
<td>21,355</td>
<td>9,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRABA</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATHURST</td>
<td>6,061</td>
<td>8,322</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>3,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAULKHAM HILLS</td>
<td>12,530</td>
<td>18,067</td>
<td>42,025</td>
<td>28,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGA VALLEY</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>8,131</td>
<td>6,698</td>
<td>7,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELLINGEN</td>
<td>16,172</td>
<td>25,693</td>
<td>19,058</td>
<td>9,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRIGAN</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>5,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINGARA</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKTOWN</td>
<td>31,365</td>
<td>42,430</td>
<td>45,927</td>
<td>19,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAND</td>
<td>5,412</td>
<td>8,360</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>3,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAYNEY</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>21,975</td>
<td>23,689</td>
<td>22,909</td>
<td>13,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTAINS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOGAN</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>4,825</td>
<td>2,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOMBALA</td>
<td>7,274</td>
<td>6,836</td>
<td>4,779</td>
<td>3,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOROWA</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>2,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTANY</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>1,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOURKE</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>10,516</td>
<td>6,426</td>
<td>3,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREWARRINA</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>3,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROKEN HILL</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURWOOD</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYRON</td>
<td>22,346</td>
<td>19,621</td>
<td>5,393</td>
<td>9,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABONNE</td>
<td>3,364</td>
<td>4,257</td>
<td>6,734</td>
<td>6,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMDEN</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>3,637</td>
<td>4,525</td>
<td>1,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELLTOWN</td>
<td>19,027</td>
<td>10,641</td>
<td>15,118</td>
<td>4,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANTERBURY</td>
<td>59,538</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>5,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARRATHOOL</td>
<td>6,960</td>
<td>6,946</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>3,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASINO</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL DARLING</td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>4,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESSNOCK</td>
<td>5,301</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>4,945</td>
<td>7,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAR</td>
<td>8,768</td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>4,112</td>
<td>4,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFFS HARBOUR</td>
<td>24,372</td>
<td>17,074</td>
<td>7,536</td>
<td>6,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONARGO</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD</td>
<td>5,221</td>
<td>9,699</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>3,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOLAH</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>2,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOLAMON</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>3,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOMA-MONARO</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>7,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COONABARABRA</td>
<td>7,057</td>
<td>5,837</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>5,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COONAMBLE</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>3,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOTAMUNDRA</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPMANHURST</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COROWA</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COWRA</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>8,309</td>
<td>3,823</td>
<td>3,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROOKWELL</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>1,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULCAIRN</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENILIQUIN</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUMMOYNE</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUBBO</td>
<td>11,079</td>
<td>9,712</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>4,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMARESQ</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>6,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNGOG</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROBODALLA</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>11,533</td>
<td>11,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>5,256</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>7,414</td>
<td>5,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRFIELD</td>
<td>19,489</td>
<td>19,106</td>
<td>20,036</td>
<td>6,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORBES</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>3,835</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>4,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILGANDRA</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>2,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEN INNES</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOUCESTER</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSFORD</td>
<td>19,432</td>
<td>21,178</td>
<td>26,172</td>
<td>27,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOULBURN</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAFTON</td>
<td>5,334</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>2,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT LAKES</td>
<td>54,051</td>
<td>40,267</td>
<td>9,745</td>
<td>10,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATER LITHGOW</td>
<td>10,061</td>
<td>12,152</td>
<td>11,118</td>
<td>15,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATER TAREE</td>
<td>22,170</td>
<td>28,858</td>
<td>24,286</td>
<td>29,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundagai</td>
<td>7,907</td>
<td>6,166</td>
<td>20,738</td>
<td>24,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnedah</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>6,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunning</td>
<td>41,712</td>
<td>55,435</td>
<td>20,735</td>
<td>20,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyra</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harden</td>
<td>2,689</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>12,555</td>
<td>42,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>18,651</td>
<td>11,134</td>
<td>5,882</td>
<td>10,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury</td>
<td>6,112</td>
<td>7,364</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>16,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>4,498</td>
<td>4,242</td>
<td>4,438</td>
<td>4,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holbrook</td>
<td>3,321</td>
<td>5,403</td>
<td>7,587</td>
<td>7,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holroyd</td>
<td>15,583</td>
<td>14,113</td>
<td>10,236</td>
<td>4,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>15,684</td>
<td>14,643</td>
<td>41,874</td>
<td>36,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>8,559</td>
<td>6,368</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>11,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Hill</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurstville</td>
<td>34,171</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>2,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverell</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>3,215</td>
<td>3,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerilderie</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>5,176</td>
<td>4,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junee</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>11,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiama</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>4,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOGARAH</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU-RING-GAI</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>4,325</td>
<td>5,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYOGLE</td>
<td>7,737</td>
<td>5,669</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>3,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACHLAN</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>5,803</td>
<td>2,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE MACQUARIE</td>
<td>23,059</td>
<td>16,389</td>
<td>9,422</td>
<td>10,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANE COVE</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>2,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEETON</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEICHHARDT</td>
<td>14,960</td>
<td>13,858</td>
<td>22,928</td>
<td>32,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISMORE</td>
<td>4,099</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>6,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVERPOOL</td>
<td>19,773</td>
<td>23,894</td>
<td>24,097</td>
<td>14,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCKHART</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACLEAN</td>
<td>6,327</td>
<td>5,631</td>
<td>5,161</td>
<td>14,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAITLAND</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANILLA</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANLY</td>
<td>8,073</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>1,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRICKVILLE</td>
<td>16,674</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>4,188</td>
<td>3,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERRRIWA</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>2,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOREE PLAINS</td>
<td>11,934</td>
<td>12,211</td>
<td>14,379</td>
<td>14,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSMAN</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>1,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUDGEE</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULWAREE</td>
<td>7,298</td>
<td>5,946</td>
<td>10,777</td>
<td>6,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRAY</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>1,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRUMBIDGEE</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>2,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRURUNDI</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>13,028</td>
<td>18,313</td>
<td>9,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSWELLBROOK</td>
<td>5,528</td>
<td>9,499</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>3,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMBUCCA</td>
<td>11,596</td>
<td>12,971</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>4,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARRABRI</td>
<td>9,908</td>
<td>12,551</td>
<td>11,825</td>
<td>7,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARRANDERA</td>
<td>7,766</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>5,429</td>
<td>3,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARROMINE</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>5,296</td>
<td>10,820</td>
<td>5,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWCASTLE</td>
<td>31,945</td>
<td>25,016</td>
<td>22,947</td>
<td>19,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH SYDNEY</td>
<td>14,525</td>
<td>12,466</td>
<td>8,329</td>
<td>6,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUNDLE</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYMBOIDA</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>2,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBERON</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>2,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>2,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKES</td>
<td>11,082</td>
<td>4,018</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>4,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRAMATTA</td>
<td>17,561</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>23,062</td>
<td>21,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRY</td>
<td>4,072</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>3,999</td>
<td>5,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENRITH</td>
<td>20,986</td>
<td>25,532</td>
<td>23,373</td>
<td>10,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTWATER</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT STEPHENS</td>
<td>38,581</td>
<td>31,324</td>
<td>14,393</td>
<td>17,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEANBETAN</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIRINDI</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDWICK</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND RIVER</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>12,697</td>
<td>5,705</td>
<td>7,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKDALE</td>
<td>45,749</td>
<td>4,127</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>2,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYDE</td>
<td>19,096</td>
<td>14,263</td>
<td>41,623</td>
<td>28,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYLSTONE</td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>2,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCONET</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>3,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVERN</td>
<td>3,313</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>4,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELLHARBOUR</td>
<td>8,298</td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td>5,882</td>
<td>3,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOALHAVEN</td>
<td>11,861</td>
<td>20,683</td>
<td>20,861</td>
<td>20,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLETON</td>
<td>23,657</td>
<td>17,211</td>
<td>10,391</td>
<td>6,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOWY RIVER</td>
<td>9,721</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>5,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH SYDNEY</td>
<td>16,079</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>10,521</td>
<td>4,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATHFIELD</td>
<td>11,066</td>
<td>13,217</td>
<td>17,459</td>
<td>4,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTHERLAND</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>6,412</td>
<td>9,405</td>
<td>11,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYDNEY</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td>17,303</td>
<td>16,127</td>
<td>8,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALLAGANDA</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>1,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMWORTH</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>2,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMORA</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>1,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENTERFIELD</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>9,171</td>
<td>3,154</td>
<td>3,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUMBARUMBA</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUMUT</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>3,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWEED</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>24,607</td>
<td>30,594</td>
<td>12,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULMARRA</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>9,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URALLA</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>2,388</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URANA</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>1,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGGA WAGGA</td>
<td>16,444</td>
<td>20,686</td>
<td>18,073</td>
<td>23,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAKOOL</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>4,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALCHA</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALGETT</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>5,046</td>
<td>3,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARREN</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>5,621</td>
<td>3,793</td>
<td>3,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRINGAH</td>
<td>4,188</td>
<td>4,534</td>
<td>5,133</td>
<td>6,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAVERLEY</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDDIN</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>5,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLINGTON</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>5,735</td>
<td>4,539</td>
<td>6,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENTWORTH</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>4,085</td>
<td>2,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLOUGHBY</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>4,741</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td>3,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 607, Roads and Traffic Authority, M4/M5 Cashback Scheme:

(1) What is the meaning of the line item “Less: Increase in accrued expenses”?

(2) What is the average daily use of the M4 and M5?

(3) How many of these vehicles are estimated to be eligible for the Cashback?

Answer—

(1) Deducting accrued expenses, that is expenses incurred in a year but not paid in that year, reduces the total expenses incurred to the cash outlaid.

In respect of the M4/M5 Cashback scheme, it is estimated that claims approximating $5.7 million will be incurred but not paid at 30 June 1997 and at 30 June 1998 the unpaid claims for the June quarter will be $11.7 million.

(2) During April 1997, the average daily use of the M4 was 76,125 trips and the M5 usage was 47,836 trips.
(3) It is estimated that between 60% and 65% of users are eligible for Cashback.

*32. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 594, Roads and Traffic Authority, Investing Statement:

(1) What are the RTA properties identified as surplus, the proceeds of which will go to the construction of the M5-East?

(2) How many of these properties are within County Road Reservations?

Answer—

(1) Approximately 170 RTA properties, with a potential net return of $18.1 million, are programmed for sale in 1997/98. None of the proceeds of the sale will go to the construction of the M5 East.

(2) None of the properties are within an existing county road corridor.

*33. Miss Gardiner asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 595, Program 62, Roads and Traffic Authority, Total Roads Program:

What projects does the RTA consider “Olympic-related” projects?

Answer—

The RTA does not have a specific Olympic roadworks program. However, a number of projects already in the RTA’s Development Program, which are either in progress or planned, will not only improve safety and efficiency on Sydney’s roads but will also assist in providing a network capable of better coping with the demands placed upon it by the Olympics.

The Bid Document for the 2000 Olympic Games advised that ‘No major infrastructure developments are required for the Olympics, but improvements to the road system are planned as part of the State’s continuing transport infrastructure program’.

*34. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 610, Program 63.1.1, Port Management - Properties managed for the MMHC:

Can the Minister identify the 3 properties which will no longer be managed in 1997/98? Why has this decision been taken?
The three properties under consideration for disposal are:

(1) Walsh Bay wharves 2,3,6,7,8 and 9 and bond stores bounded by Hickson Road, Pottinger and Windmill Streets and including the old MSB garage at Towns Place.

(2) Property bounded by Kent, Erskine, Napoleon and Sussex Street site, including Moretons Hotel, Down Town Service Station and the City Council’s Kent Street Parking Station.

(3) The site on the eastern side of Hickson Road bounded by High Street, Grafton Bond Store on the corner of Napoleon Street and Jenkins Street, off Kent Street, along its eastern boundary.

The reason for the decision to dispose of the properties is that they are surplus to MMHC requirements.

*35. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 613, Program 64, Waterways Authority:

Can you provide the total revenue raised from recreational boating infringements?

Answer—

Recreational Boating Infringements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996/97 Budget</td>
<td>$44K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97 Revised</td>
<td>$90K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98 Budget</td>
<td>$52K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*36. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 589, Program 61, Office of the Minister for Public Works and Services:

What is the Minister’s estimate of the total value of default by contractors non-payments to sub-contractors:

(1) on Government capital works?

(2) in the building industry generally?

Answer—
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(1) and (2) As stated within the Green Paper: *Security of Payment in the Construction Industry* released in October 1996, there is no hard evidence “which quantifies the extent of the problem in monetary terms”. The Green Paper quotes that defaults due to insolvencies, which are only part of the problem, were estimated at 0.15% of turnover on government projects over a 2 year period up to July 1996, while building sector losses on government projects were higher, averaging 0.4% to 0.5% of turnover.

The Green Paper noted that advice received from industry associations and individual sub-contractors was that the default problem was more severe on private sector projects, due to the current government initiatives on security of payment. Again, hard data is not available to support this advice.

Over the past 12 months, there have not been any insolvencies by significant contractors whilst working on Department of Public Works and Services (DPWS) projects. As a result, default losses due to insolvency are less than the averages quoted in the Green Paper.

The only firm indication DPWS receives about payment defaults is whenever a sub-contractor supplies a statutory declaration to the effect that a contractor on a DPWS project has failed to pay moneys due and payable. This is part of the standard practices adopted by all government agencies when dealing with complaints.

In the past year, DPWS was notified of 57 complaints by sub-contractors concerning non-payment by contractors on departmental projects. Outstanding moneys claimed amounted to $856,000. In many cases, the matter was settled between the parties themselves. Data is not available to support the number of such outcomes.

The number of formal complaints of defaults is extremely small when compared to the total number and value of contracts awarded by DPWS. Over the last year, DPWS awarded 837 construction contracts valued at over $50,000, in a total amount of $443 million.

*37. Mr Cohen asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 596:

What funds are allocated for bicycle ways across New South Wales?

Can the Minister provide details of the funds with a location breakdown?

Answer—

Bicycle fund allocations within locations are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1997-98 Bicycle Program</th>
<th>Allocatio n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Short Description</td>
<td>($,000s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycleway Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Ku-ring-gai BOBBIN HEAD ROAD BICYCLE ROUTE IMPVMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>CANLEY VALE LOCAL CYCLEWAY (C'LAND HWY:RAILWAY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord/Drummoyne</td>
<td>CONCORD TO HABERFIELD CYCLEWAY (P'MATTA RD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummoyne</td>
<td>HENLEY MARINE DRIVE LOCAL CYCLEWAY - DRUMMOYNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN AUBURN COUNCIL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baulkham Hills</td>
<td>Baulkham Hills LOCAL BIKEPLAN WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>BLACKTOWN LOCAL BIKEPLAN WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains</td>
<td>BLUE MOUNTAINS LOCAL BIKEPLAN WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN BOTANY COUNCIL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN IMPLEMENTATION-CAMDEN LGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN HAWKESBURY COUNCIL-IMPLEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN LEICHHARDT CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>LIVERPOOL LOCAL BIKEPLAN WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>MANLY LOCAL BIKEPLAN WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrickville</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN M'VILLE CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittwater</td>
<td>PITTWATER LOCAL BIKEPLAN WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sydney</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN SOUTH SYDNEY CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde</td>
<td>MEADOWBANK TO EASTWOOD CYCLEWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td>NAREMNBURN TO CHATSWOOD LOCAL CYCLEWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde/Hornsby/Ku-ring-gai</td>
<td>NORTH RYDE SUB-REGIONAL BICYCLE NETWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>PARRAMATTA CBD SUB-REGIONAL BICYCLE NETWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>ST CLAIR TO ST MARYS TO PENRITH LOCAL CYCLEWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kogarah/Rockdale/ Botany</td>
<td>ST GEORGE LOCAL BIKEPLAN IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney-wide</td>
<td>BICYCLE STUDIES - GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>SYDNEY CBD SUB-REGIONAL BICYCLE NETWORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwood</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN BURWOOD CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN CANTERBURY CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Area</td>
<td>Bike Plan Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN CONCORD CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Hill</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN HUNTERS HILL CCL-IMPLEMENTATIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Cove</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN LANE COVE CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosman</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN MOSMAN CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sydney</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN NORTH SYDNEY CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN PENRITH CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randwick</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN RANDWICK CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockdale</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN ROCKDALE CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN SUTHERLAN CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warringah</td>
<td>LOCAL BIKEPLAN WARRINGAH CCL-IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sydney Region: 2,763

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Area</th>
<th>Bike Plan Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Shellharbour/Kiama 1.5KM CYCLEWAY-MINNAMURRA TO DUNMORE</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>0.5KM CYCLEWAY-MR626,GVILLE-NORTH WOLLONGONG</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>CYCLEWAYS, PLANNING &amp; ANALYSIS</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>0.7KM CYCLEWAY- WINDANG BR, WINDANG</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>CYCLE FRIENDLY GRATES, STATE ROADS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingecarribee</td>
<td>1.8KM CYCLEWAY-MOSS VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL LOOP</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>0.7KM CYCLEWAY - FIVE ISLANDS RD</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>0.4KM CYCLEWAY-BELLAMBI LANE STAGE 1, BELLAMBI</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>4KM CYCLEWAY-PRINCES HWY,YALLAH-DAPTO</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>5KM CYCLEWAY-PRINCES HWY, NUDJIA ST-GHOSTS CK</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellharbour</td>
<td>4KM CYCLEWAY-MR522, WINDANG BR-JASON AVE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoalhaven</td>
<td>2.5KM CYCLEWAY,PRINCES HWY,BOLONG TO C'WARRA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoalhaven</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY, ALBATROSS RD, STH NOWRA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurobodalla</td>
<td>0.7KM CYCLEWAY, NAROOMA FORESHORE STAGE III</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Length (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bega</td>
<td>0.6km cycleway, Tathra Headland, Tathra</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queanbeyan</td>
<td>Cycleway, Stockyard Ck, Queanbeyan</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiama</td>
<td>0.7km cycleway, Kiama High School-Kiama Height</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollondilly</td>
<td>1km cycleway, Argyle St, Picton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Southern Region</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleway MT View Rd to McDonalds Rd</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleway ABERDARD Rd to MT View Rd</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleway HEDDON St HEDDON Greta</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungog</td>
<td>Cycleway BAIRO St-MELBEE ESTATE Dungog</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosford</td>
<td>Cycleway ESTWST STG3-ST EDWARD COL-WEBB St</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleway ESTWST-ADELAIDE TO RUSSELL ST</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleway KINCUMBER-HAWKE/KILLUNA STG1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Cycleway MOIRA PDE TO BENNETTS BEACH STG1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Taree</td>
<td>Cycleway BROWNS Ck-RLWY ST-WINTER ST TAREE</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Macquarie</td>
<td>Cycleway WARNERS BAY TO SPEERS POINT STAGE3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitland</td>
<td>Cycleway NEH BERESFIELD TO GRETA-MARK LANE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleway HIGH St Maitland</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriwa</td>
<td>Cycleway MERRIWA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Stephens</td>
<td>Cycleway OSBORNE AVE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Cycleway GANNY Rd, WALLSEND-LAKE MACQ BDY</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Stephens</td>
<td>Cycleway RICHARDSON Rd LAKESIDE VLGE-GTOWN R</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleway WATT ST-BENJAMINE LEE DR R TERRACE</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scone</td>
<td>Cycleway SCONÉ</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>Cycleway EXTENSION BRIDGMAN RD Cycleway</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyong</td>
<td>Cycleway SANREMO BLUEHAVEN BDG U/PASS ALLAMBE</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycleway BERKLEYVALE BLUEBELL PK CHITTAWAY</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyong</td>
<td>Cycleway - WYONG FRIDAY/SATURDAY ST</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cycleway Description</td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyong</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY-CHAIN VALLEY BAYS STG1 CARTERS/SCAYS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Hunter Region</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY ARMIDALE- TREVENNA/MADGEWICK TO UNE</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnedah</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY GUNNEDAH-VIEW STREET</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverell</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY INVERELL-SWANBROOK RD TO HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY PARRY-SH9 CHARLES TO BRAINTFARM RD</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY TAMWORTH-CALALA LANE</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uralla</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY URALLA-QUEEN ST</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uralla</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY URALLA-MR73 BUNDARA RD</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Tamworth Region</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY ADMINISTRATION NORTHERN REGION</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballina</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY BALLINA CCL LIGHTHOUSE HD TO SHELLY</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY BYRON CCL EXT MR545 TO HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY BYRON CCL KENDAL ST TO BELONGIL CK</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffs Harbour</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY FOOTWAY COFFS CCL BRAY &amp; ORLANDO STS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffs Harbour</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY COFFS CCL THOMPSONS ROAD</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copmanhurst</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY COPMANHURST MR83 GRAFTON-JUNCTION H</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY GRAFTON CCL BRIDGE TO THROUGH ST</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY GRAFTON CCL OLIVER STREET</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclean</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY MACLEAN CCL MCLACHLAN ST</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nambucca</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY NAMBUCCA RIVERSIDE DRIVE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond River</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY RICHMOND RIVER BROADWATER</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY TWEED CCL COAST ROAD</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY TWEED CCL CUDGEN ROAD</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY TWEED CCL BURRINGBAR</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY Lismore CCL PHASE 2 PLAN IMPLEMENT</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY KEMPSEY CCL RIVER STREET</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>CYCLEWAY KEMPSEY CCL RONNELLA DRIVE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Total Northern Region</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Western</td>
<td>Yass CYCLEWAY AT YASS (STAGE 3)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albury CYCLEWAY AT ALBURY (STAGE 6)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagga Wagga CYCLEWAY AT WAGGA WAGGA</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total South Western Region</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Dubbo CYCLEWAY TO WESTERN PLAINS ZOO AT DUBBO, STG 2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bathurst CYCLEWAY AT BATHURST</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General CYCLEWAYS - WESTERN REGION</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes CYCLEWAY IN FORBES</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Lithgow CYCLEWAY IN LITHGOW</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mudgee NEW CYCLEWAY IN MUDGEE</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narromine NEW CYCLEWAY IN NARROMINE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parkes NEW CYCLEWAY IN PARKES</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rylstone NEW CYCLEWAY FROM RYLSTONE TO KANDOS</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weddin NEW CYCLEWAY IN GRENFELL</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington NEW CYCLEWAY IN WELLINGTON</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Western Region</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CYCLEWAY PROJECTS</td>
<td>5,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bicycle Facilities Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>General BICYCLE HAZARD REDUCTION</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General RYDE TO BOTANY BAY CYCLEWAY-IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sydney Region</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Wollongong IMPROVE CYCLEWAY ON THE NORTHERN DISTRIBUTOR</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General BICYCLE PARKING, SOUTHERN REGION</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Southern Region</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>Newcastle ADAMSTOWN BIKE TRACK - BUILDING IMPS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>General Description</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>LOWER HUNTER CARES FACILITY</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Hunter Region</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Western</td>
<td>BICYCLE FACILITIES - SW REGION</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total South Western Region</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL BICYCLE FACILITIES PROJECTS</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Use Support Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>General BICYCLE USE SUPPORT - BIKE WEEK PROMOTION</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burwood LOCAL BIKEPLAN BURWOOD CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campbelltown LOCAL BIKEPLAN CAMPBELTTOWN CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concord LOCAL BIKEPLAN CONCORD CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holroyd LOCAL BIKEPLAN HOLROYD CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hornsby LOCAL BIKEPLAN HORNSBY CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunters Hill LOCAL BIKEPLAN HUNTERS HILL CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Randwick LOCAL BIKEPLAN RANDWICK CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waverley LOCAL BIKEPLAN WAKERLEY CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woollahra LOCAL BIKEPLAN WOOLLAHRA CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bankstown LOCAL BIKEPLAN BANKSTOWN CCL-STUDY UPDATE</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sydney Region</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>General BIKE PLAN DEVELOPMENT, COUNCILS, SOUTHERN REG</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General BIKE WEEK PROMOTIONS, SOUTHERN REGION</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Southern Region</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>General BICYCLE USE PROMOTIONS (EG. BIKE WEEK)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Western</td>
<td>BIKE WEEK PROMOTIONS - SW REGION</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COUNCIL BIKE PLAN DEVELOPMENT - SW REGION</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total South Western Region</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>BICYCLE USE SUPPORT WESTERN REGION</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Western Region</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Management Branch</td>
<td>PHASE 3 - CYCLE PROFICIENCY SCHEME</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BICYCLE SECTION - OPERATIONS</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BICYCLE USE SUPPORT</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BICYCLE USE SUPPORT - PROJECTS</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHARING THE ROAD - CYCLE FACILITIES</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BICYCLE NETWORK</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEMONSTRATION BIKE PLANS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Traffic Management Branch</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL BICYCLE USE SUPPORT PROJECTS</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Education Projects - Bicycle Components</td>
<td></td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Bicycle Education Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL BICYCLE FUNDING 1997-98</td>
<td>8,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Mr Cohen asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 596, Program 62.1.1:

Does the Minister have the estimated usage figures for the busway on the M2?

Will bus usage be monitored?

Busways will operate 18 return bus services from Mount Druitt/Riverstone contract areas to Epping Station/Macquarie Centre via Sunnyholt Road and Old Windsor Road to the M2 Motorway.

Westbus will operate 24 return bus services to the City/lower North Shore via the M2 Motorway, and 60 services to Epping Station/Macquarie Centre via the Motorway.

Current observations indicate that the services are being well patronised. However, bus travel patterns will the RTA has engaged a consultant to review busway travel patterns and the extent of bus usage.

*39. Mr Cohen asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 596, Program 62.1.1:

What funding is made for staff relocation and office refurbishment for the RTA?

What cost benefit analysis has been carried out for relocation and refurbishment?

Answer—

No specific amount has been allocated for relocation expenses in 1997/98. Funding has been provided for within existing program allocations.

The estimated cost of office refurbishment for 1997/98 is $3 million. This amount provides for work at RTA offices in Sydney, Newcastle, Wollongong, Wagga Wagga and Grafton, including the establishment of a special office in Grafton to manage the upgrading of the Pacific Highway.

The expenditure will be offset by savings through rationalisation of accommodation following the completion of the RTA’s Corporate Services Efficiency Review and the sale of surplus properties, estimated to realise $3.5 million.

Expenditure on office refurbishment forms part of the RTA’s Non-Current Assets Program. Projects funded from this Program are considered by a committee prior to approval by the Chief Executive. All proposals are subject to a financial and/or technical assessment, including a cost benefit analysis, before consideration by the committee.

*40. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Boating Safety Access Line?
(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads incurred in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) Five people are employed in what is now called the Info Line.

(2) There are three full-time employees in Info Line. There are no part-time employees. There are two casual Info Line employees.

(3) The aggregate salaries for Info Line for the 1997/98 Budget is $181,195.

(4) All staff in Info Line are located at:
   Waterways Authority
   James Craig Road
   Rozelle NSW 2039

(5) The floor space occupied is 20.2 metres squared.


*41. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Electronic Information Systems Group?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads incurred in each separate location?
Answer—

(1) 15 staff.

(2) 100% full time.

(3) Aggregated year to date gross for salaries is $864,209.

(4) Level 13, 1 Francis Street, Darlinghurst, NSW, 2010.

(5) 239 square metres (includes meeting/training room and computer service room).

(6) Maintenance and working expenses total $883,390.00.

*42. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Architects Board?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads incurred in each separate location?

Answer—

The Board of Architects is an independent statutory board entirely self funded through membership fees and is outside the budgetary process. The following details are provided, as requested.

(1) 4 staff.

(2) 50% full-time and 50% part-time.

(3) $140,000 per annum (includes contingency for one occasional casual employee).

(4) Level 2, Tusculum, 3 Manning Street, Potts Point, NSW, 2011.

(5) 87 square metres.
(6) $28,121 for staff area (includes cleaning, rubbish disposal, etc.) and $150 for hire of board room.

*43. Dr Goldsmith asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Roads and Traffic Authority?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overhead costs incurred in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) 7030 people.

(2) 89% full time; 11% casual and part time.

(3) $237 million

(4) At various offices, including motor registries, throughout the State. Staff numbers in Corporate areas, Sydney Operations Directorate and RTA regions are as follows:

Corporate areas 1246
Sydney Operations Directorate (based at Blacktown) 2291
Northern Region (based at Grafton) 854
Hunter Region (based at Newcastle) 645
Southern Region (based at Wollongong) 876
South Western Region (based at Wagga Wagga) 455
Western Region (based at Parkes) 663

(5) Estimated floor space comprises estimated areas occupied for administrative purposes and by motor registries and does not cover operational areas such as laboratories, storage sheds and technical workshops.

Corporate buildings - 37,500 square metres

Sydney Operations Directorate - administrative purposes 8,500 square metres, motor registries 14,000 square metres
Northern Region - administrative purposes 8,000 square metres, motor registries 3,500 square metres

Hunter Region - administrative purposes 3,500 square metres, motor registries 5,500 square metres

Southern Region - administrative purposes 8,000 square metres, motor registries 3,000 square metres

South Western Region - administrative purposes 4,000 square metres, motor registries 2,500 square metres

Western Region - administrative purposes 4,500 square metres, motor registries 2,000 square metres

(6) Estimated building overhead costs for 1996/97 are:

Corporate areas $12.6 million
Sydney Operations Directorate $7.2 million
Northern Region $0.71 million
Hunter Region $1.2 million
Southern Region $1.2 million
South Western Region $0.63 million
Western Region $0.67 million
*1. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

(a) catering and entertainment of any form;

(b) travel and accommodation of any form; and

(c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products?

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

*2. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s) ?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies ?

Answer—

(1) and (2) As is the case in all Westminster systems, Minister’s are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.
*3. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996/97, and at what cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip?

Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.

*4. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.
Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:

   (a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?

   (b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?

   (c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?

   (d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?

   (e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

(1) (a-e) and (2) Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.

Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

(3) The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and its funding are set out at pace 12 of the Budget Summary.
Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(2) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(3) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in Departments administered by you in 1996-97?

(4) How many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you in 1996-97?

(5) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in Departments administered by you in 1997-98?

(6) How many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you in 1997-98?

Answer—

The refurbishment, upgrading or relocation of offices are required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from the appropriate budget allocation.

Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97, and which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98, which would not have been funded but for the Olympic Games to be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/Completion Date</th>
<th>Total cost of Project</th>
<th>Total allocation to the Project 1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 33.
*9. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

How many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office in 1996-97?

Answer—

(1) and (2) It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

*10. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you ?

(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96 ?

(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees ?

(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee ?

(5) How many public servants are serving in an ex officio capacity ?

(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled ?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 government boards and committees. The database does not contain information on the large number of small trusts administered by the Department of Land and Water Conservation and the Nation Parks and Wildlife Services.

(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of boards and committees.
(3) There are approximately 6000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all member of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each Department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories of people statistical information is only available for 1918 members. Of these 3.3% who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people 11% are, people from a non-English speaking background and 5% have disabilities. Board and Committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July 1996.

11. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”?

(2) From which particular Programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.

12. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?
Answer—

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1; page 42.

*13. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at p 17), how many employees have been declared redundant, by classification and salary, that are currently employed by the Department?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available for certain cases.

*14. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration:

(1) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(2) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(3) specifically in relation to Programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

(1) to (3) Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.
15. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 1-13; Table 1.6; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you, and what was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you.

(2) (a) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97?

(b) If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?

(3) (a) Were any offices unoccupied during 1996-97 that were either, owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments?

(b) If so, what was their floor space?

Answer—

(1) to (3) Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each Department’s financial statement in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of Departments in their annual reports.

16. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 128; Sydney Water Corporation:

The Government has proposed to spend $456.1 million on the upgrade of North Head, Bondi and Malabar ocean outfall plants up until 2005.

(1) Of what will the upgrades consist?

(2) How will this target be met when only $2.9 million has been allocated in the 1997-98 Budget?

Answer—

Refer to the Legislative Assembly Hansard.

17. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; pp 719-721; Program 73.1 Environmental Planning and Housing; and Budget Paper No 4, p 125-126:

(1) What was the impact on NSW of the cut in Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement (CSHA) funding?
(a) in dollar terms?

(b) in percentage terms?

(c) what will the impact be in terms of construction of houses in 1997-98?

(2) Do you stand by your remarks on Radio 2UE on 14 May 1997 that cuts in CSHA funding would result in the loss of 2,000 jobs?

Answer—

(1) See answer to Question Without Notice in Legislative Assembly.

(2) Yes.

*18. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p A-46 and A-81:

(1) Why has the Government reduced the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning current budget for the Metropolitan Planning Program by 6.3%?

(2) Is metropolitan planning no longer a priority?

Answer—

(1) It hasn’t.

(2) N/A

*19. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 128:

Earlier this year the Government announced a major new Program to address the environmental problems caused by the 53 unsewered suburbs in Sydney and the Illawarra.

Why is there no mention of this new Program in the Budget?

Answer—

A number of programs are listed in Budget Paper No. 2.
*20. Mrs Forsythe asked:

(1) Has the Minister or the Government valued Australian Water Technologies Pty Ltd?

(2) What is its present value?

(3) Does the Government have any plans to privatise this body?

Answer—

No

*21. Mrs Forsythe asked:

(1) How many staff are now employed at Sydney Water?

(2) How many staff are expected to be employed at 30 June 1998?

Answer—

(1) 4833

(2) The actual figures are not available.

*22. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 719; Program 73.1.5; Office of Housing Policy and Housing Assistance:

At the Estimates Committee in November 1995 you advised that the Government was reviewing options for new Home Purchase Assistance Programs within the context of its overall Housing Assistance Policy. (p 2956, 2 November 1995)

What progress has been made on that Review since 1995?

Answer—

In view of the previous Governments maladministration of Homefund and their suspension of the Government Guaranteed Loan Program, the Review established that the HPA Program would not be re-introduced. In addition, the present range of loan originators and interest rate regimes demonstrates the market’s capacity to supply.
23. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; pp 719-721, Program 73.1; Environmental Planning and Housing and Budget Paper No 4; p 125-126:

(1) How much of the $315m grant from the Commonwealth Government was spent on actual housing?

(2) How much of the grant was spent on other areas especially administration?

(3) What were these areas and what funds were allocated to each area?

(4) Would you detail this expenditure?

Answer—

See answer given in Estimates.

24. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 719-721; Program 73.1; Environmental Planning and Housing and Budget Paper No 4, p 125-126:

In relation to your undated letter entitled ‘An important message about the coming changes to public housing’:

(1) Have any of the Programs referred to in your letter been introduced?

(2) If so, which Programs

Answer—

See answer given in Estimates.

25. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 719-721, Program 73.1; Environmental Planning and Housing and Budget Paper No 4, p 125-126:

In your undated letter entitled ‘An important message about the coming changes to public housing’, you announced the establishment of a ‘Public Housing Changes Infoline’.

(1) What has been the cost of this service?

(2) When was this service established?
(3) how many calls have been received?

(4) are funds provided in the 1997-98 budget for the continuance of this service?

Answer—

Already debated by way of motion in the Legislative Assembly ....refer to Hansards for details.

*26. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 719, Program 73.1.5; Office of Housing Policy and Housing Assistance:

In relation to the budget of the office, how much of these funds are targeted at Programs to overcome homelessness?

Answer—

See answer given in Estimates.

*27. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 727; Program 75.1.1; Heritage Policy and Assistance - Other Services - Financial assistance for heritage projects:

(1) What were each of the grants approved under this item in 1996-97:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Registered Address</th>
<th>Purpose of Grant</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Amount of Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Why has the allocation for this item been increased from $293,000 in 1996-97 to $3.5m in 1997/98?

Answer—

Public statements are made at the time of grants allocations. Copies of press releases are available from the Heritage Office.

*28. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 122-23; Department of Housing:

What are the details of capital works by electorate for new works and works-in-progress?
---|---|---|---|---

Answer—

The resources required to answer this question cannot be justified.

*29. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 716; Program 73.1.4: Office of Community Housing - Outputs:

What organisations have applied for crisis accommodation places funding in 1996/97?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Registered Address</th>
<th>Size of Grant (S)</th>
<th>Purpose of Grant</th>
<th>Status of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

See responses tabled at Estimates.

*30. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 727; Program 75.1.1; Heritage Policy and Assistance:

(1) Why has the level of staff provided to this program been increased from 20 in 1996-97 to 31 in 1997/98?

(2) What are the designations and grades of each of the staff provided to this Program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Answer—

The resources required to answer this question cannot be justified.
*31. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 705; Program 73; Department of Urban Affairs and Planning - Operating Statement - Other operating expenses:

(1) What proportion of this budget is allocated for Departmental advertising?

(2) If there is an allocation, what specifically is it to be used for?

Answer—

Principally, statutory advertising purposes.

*32. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4, p 128; Sydney Region Development Fund:

(1) What number of sites will be purchased?

(2) What electorates will these sites be in?

(3) How is the acquisition of sites determined?

Answer—

Acquisitions are dependant on site availability. See previous year’s answer.

*33. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 705; Program 73; Department of Urban Affairs and Planning - Operating statement:

(1) Why did the revenue retained from other Departments double from what was estimated in last year’s budget?

(2) Why will other Department revenue for the next financial year decrease so substantially?

Answer—

Essentially due to Commonwealth cuts to BBC Programs.
*34. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 707; Program 73.1.1; State and Regional Planning:

What expected impact will the decrease in staff numbers have on the processing and preparation of environmental planning and policies?

Answer—

See answer given at Estimates.

*35. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 705; Program 73; Department of Urban Affairs and Planning - Operating Statement:

(1) What proportion of the budget is allocated for the use of consultants?

(2) Can the Minister detail the specific circumstances in which consultants will be used and how much they will cost for each use?

Answer—

Consultants are used on an as-needed basis and are reported in the Department’s Annual Report.

*36. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 724; Program 74; Ministry of Urban Infrastructure Management:

(1) How much was the grant made by the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning in 1996/97 in order to fund the Ministry?

(2) What did this grant go toward?

Answer—

See Budget Papers for detail.
*37. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 722; Program 74; Ministry of Urban Infrastructure Management:

(1) How many staff will the Ministry utilise?

(2) How many of these are seconded from other Departments and how many will be funded by the Ministry?

(3) What designation and grade do each of these staff hold?

Answer—

(1) The Ministry’s core initial staff will number approximately 15. Current numbers are 12.

(2) 8 staff are currently seconded from other agencies, 3 are funded by the Ministry and 1 is partially funded by another agency and partially funded by the Ministry.

(3) The gradings of the staff are as follows:

SES (Band 2 upper)

EPO (professional) Level 3

EPO (professional) Level 2

EPO (professional) Level 1

EPO (clerical) Level 2

RPA Grade 14

RTA Engineer Grade 8

A/C Grade 11/12 (4 staff)

A/C Grade 7/8

*38. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4, p 122; City West Development Corporation - Major Works - Works in Progress:

(1) Why has the completion date of the Pyrmont/Ultimo project been delayed from the first estimated completion date of this year, to 2004?
(2) What additional work does this project include in order to justify the seven year delay in completion?

(3) What work was commenced and/or completed in 1996/97?

Answer—

Assertions in question are incorrect.

*39. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 732; Program 76.1.2; Honeysuckle Development Corporation:

What future methods of funding will the Development Corporation be exploring?

Answer—

Asset Management.

*40. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 123; Honeysuckle Development Corporation:

Given that the Development Corporation will no longer be funded in the State Budget:

(1) How is the short fall between funds allocated to the Redevelopment works?

(2) How is the estimated total cost going to be made up?

Answer—

Commonwealth cuts to BBC programs will require increased marketing effort to sell assets by the Corporation.

*41. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 123; Honeysuckle Development Corporation - Major Works - Works in progress:

(1) How much money was spent on each project the Development Corporation has undertaken during it’s existence?

(2) How much additional money will be required for all projects to be completed satisfactorily?
Answer—

More than $100 million was provided under the BBC programs.

*42. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 123; Honeysuckle Redevelopment Corporation - Major Works- Works in progress:

(1) What elements of the Redevelopment work have already been completed?

(2) What work has commenced and/or completed in 1996/97?

(3) What works remain to be conducted?

Answer—

These matters are covered in the Annual Report.

*43. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 123; Honeysuckle Development Corporation - Major Works- Works in progress:

(1) What projects have and do the Redevelopment Works specifically include? What specific sites within the Honeysuckle area does it relate to?

(2) Can the Minister provide details of the outcome of the Budget allocations for Honeysuckle?

(3) In other words, how has the money been spent?

Answer—

These matters are all covered in the Annual Report.

*44. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 123; Honeysuckle Development Corporation:

Can the Minister reconcile and explain the difference between the Capital Works allocation for Honeysuckle in the 1996-97 State Capital Program with the 1997/98 Capital Program?
Answer—

Different programs, different amounts.

*45. Mr Jones asked:

(1) Has any investigation been undertaken into the effectiveness of SEPP 44?

(2) Has any koala habitat and have any koalas been saved by SEPP 44?

(3) If so, how much habitat, how many koalas, where and when?

Answer—

Refer to answer given in Estimates.

*46. Mr Jones asked:

(1) What steps have been taken to ensure that the catchment of Warragamba dam remains pristine?

(2) What steps have been taken to minimise any pollution in the headwaters of the dam derived from intensive livestock industries?

(3) Is the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning working with local councils to ensure that no developments are approved in the area which could pollute the catchment area?

Answer—

(1) Sydney Water maintains a 3 kilometre exclusion zone around Warragamba Dam known as the Schedule 1 special area which is closed to the public, except for two access corridors for bushwalking. The remainder of the Warragamba catchment is classified as Schedule 2 special area in which only passive recreational activities are permitted.

(2) The nature of development, which may occur within the Special Areas is defined in planning instruments applying to these areas, particularly Local Environmental Plans (LEPs). Sydney Water formally inputs into the LEP preparation process where LEPs will apply to catchment areas and provisions safeguarding the quality of stored waters need to be included.

Development is further controlled through the conditions attached by consent authority to Development and Building Approvals. Sydney Water also inputs into this process.

Sydney Water currently exercises a concurrence role within most parts of the Special Areas. This means that in specified circumstances, a council cannot grant development consent without Sydney Water’s concurrence. Outside the Special Areas, but within the hydrological catchments, Sydney Water has referral role in the consent process for Development Applications.
(3) The Department of Urban Affairs and Planning works with Councils to protect Sydney’s drinking water catchments by providing guidance in the preparation of local environment plans (LEPs) for areas within those water supply catchments.

In September 1996 the Department issued a Circular to Councils (No. C28 Sydney Water Corporation-Drinking Water Catchments) which advised Councils of a direction I issued under s117 (2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 to ensure that these water catchments are adequately protected. The Circular outlines the processes to be followed and the types of planning controls that should be included in LEPs.

The Circular also refers Councils to Guidelines prepared and issued to Councils by Sydney Water which outline the types of developments and building applications on which it wishes to be consulted.

*47. Mr Jones asked:

Under SEPP 34, do approvals of intensive livestock development include provisions for shelter and other animal care facilities?

Answer—

See answer given in Estimates.

*48. Mr Jones asked:

(1) (a) Does or will Landcom use “Environmental Guidelines for Summer Olympic Games September 1993” as the criteria for the development of future Landcom properties?

(b) If not, why not?

(2) What will the environmental legacy of the Sydney Summer Olympic Games if we do not pass another sustainable development law?

Answer—

See answer given in Estimates.

*49. Mr Jones asked:

(1) What resources are being spent on the Koala Beach development?

(2) Is it your intention to fulfill your promise to ensure that this development proceeds no further?

(3) Has any assessment been made of the impact on flora and fauna of Stage 1 of the development?
(4) How will it be possible to prevent similar planning disasters on our coastline in the future and further waste of resources?

Answer—

See answer given in Estimates.

*50. Mr Jones asked:

(1) Is the Minister aware that the Honeysuckle Development Corporation (HDC) is proposing a large scale waterfront hotel/condominium development on Merewether St Wharf in Newcastle?

(2) Is the Minister aware that expressions of public opinion in response to this proposal consistently show very high levels of community opposition?

(3) Is the Minister aware that the Honeysuckle hotel/condominium development threatens another community supported hotel proposal on an adjacent commercially zoned non-waterfront site which depends for its viability on harbour views which would be largely obscured by the Honeysuckle development?

(4) Why has the Minister called in, under Section 101 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, the community and Council opposed Honeysuckle development, especially when it blocks another hotel development which the community and Council supports and wants?

(5) Is the Minister aware that the HDC placed advertisements in the Newcastle Herald which attempted to apply pressure on Newcastle Council to support the development?

(6) Is the Minister also aware that the Council expressed concern over the methods employed by the HDC in this matter?

(7) How much public money has been spent on such advertisements?

(8) Can the Minister comment on the appropriateness of a government corporation employing such methods to pressure the Council over the development issue?

(9) Can the Minister assure the Newcastle community that he will act to ensure that the Honeysuckle development provides adequate public access to the harbour waterfront and will not impose large-scale buildings on the immediate waterfront?

Answer—

See answer given in Estimates.

*51. Mr Jones asked:

(1) Does the Honeysuckle development require waterfront land to be rezoned in order for it to go ahead?
(2) If so, does your calling in, under Section 101 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, the Honeysuckle development mean that a Regional Environment Plan is required for the Newcastle area (to rezone that waterfront land)?

(3) Has your government allocated any funding to cover the cost of producing that Regional Environment Plan? If so, how much? If not, why not?

Answer—

See answer given at Estimates.

*52. Mr Jones asked

(1) How much has the waiting list for public housing increased in the past twelve months?

(2) How much of that increase is due to budgetary decisions of the Federal Government?

(3) How much of that increase is due to decisions made by your Government?

(4) Can you provide a break down of waiting list for the top most populous country towns?

Answer—

The resources required to answer this question cannot be justified.

*53. Mr Jones asked

(1) What measures have been undertaken to provide sound insulation in public housing stock affected by aircraft noise?

(2) If any, is the insulation the same quality as that fitted to private housing?

Answer—

(1) The previous Australian Government allocated funds to provide sound insulation to properties in an area adjacent to the new north-south runway. The federal body responsible for the administration of the project is known as the Sydney Aircraft Noise Insulation Project (SANIP). SANIP selects the properties to be insulated in the nominated area which must be affected by a noise reading of greater than eighty-five decibels. The maximum amount of federal funding allocated for each nominated property is $45,000.

SANIP identified thirty properties owned by the Department of Housing that met the criteria for the insulation work. Eighteen of these properties were transferred to the Office of Community Housing when it was established earlier this year. Twelve properties remain with the Department of Housing. Of these twelve properties, work has been completed on four properties, while four are currently being insulated. To date the Department has spent an
additional total amount of $3,200 on three properties, over the $45,000 allocated for each property by the Commonwealth.

With the change in the Australian Government it is understood that the extent of work and funding is to be reviewed, in the light of the reopening of the east-west runway, although all current contracts will be honoured.

(2) Yes.

*54. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 705; Department of Urban Affairs, Planning and Housing:

The “Financial Summary” item shows that other departmental revenue is estimated to decrease from $4.2 million to $620,000.

Can the Minister explain the decrease?

Answer—

The decrease on Other Departmental revenue, which includes revenue classified as Donations and Industry Contributions is explained by projected reduced levels of contributions for specially funded projects, managed by the Department. For example, the Better Cities 2 Planning Studies were only funded until 1996/97.

*55. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 707; Program 73.1.1; State and Regional Planning:

The “Outcomes” item only shows a 230 hectare increase in the Coastal zone cumulative land area in 1997/98.

(1) Given the rapid rate of coastal development which New South Wales is experiencing, is this rate of acquisition sufficient?

(2) What land is proposed to be acquired (Cullendulla, North Ocean Shores etc)?

Answer—

See answers given at previous estimates committee.

*56. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 708; Program 73.1.1; State and Regional Planning - Operating Statement:

The Operating Statement shows a grant from other agencies of $262,000 in 1996-97.
(1) Can the Minister explain where this grant came from?

(2) Can the Minister explain why no grants are estimated for 1997-98?

(3) Can the Minister indicate how grants could be procured for 1997-98?

Answer—

(1) (a) The $262,000 Grant was received from various Budget Sector Agencies, including the Department of Fair Transport and the Department of Land and Water Conservation.

(b) Grants in 1997/98 are expected to be Nil at this stage, as it is not projected that other Budget Sector Agencies will be contributing to any projects that are managed by the Department.

(c) If the Department were to undertake management of projects where potential outcomes exist for other Budget Sector Agencies, it may be possible to procure income in 1997/98.

*57. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 711; Program 73.1.2; Metropolitan Planning - Operating Statement:

The Operating Statement shows an increase in minor user charges from $15,000 to $27,000.

(1) What exactly are minor user charges and who are levied on?

(2) Why are they expected to almost double this financial year?

Answer—

(1) (a) The line items that are identified as minor user charges include Freedom of Information, Seminar income, Subleasing of Departmental floorspace, minor administrative recoveries and photocopies. As such, minor user charges are received from many users including members of the community and other agencies.

(b) While the estimates are expected to increase by $13,000, income levels are a best estimate at the time of submission, and will be subject to review during 1997/98 and may be distributed across other programs.

*58. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 711; Program 73.1.2; Metropolitan Planning - Operating Statement:

The Operating Statement shows a decrease in donations and industry contributions from $1.238 million to $220,000.

(1) Why are donations and industry contributions expected to drop by a factor of 6?
(2) Can the Minister indicate how contributions and donations are sought from industry by Metropolitan Planning?

(3) Can the Minister also indicate how more contributions and donations may be sought from industry in the forthcoming financial year by Metropolitan Planning?

Answer—

(1) (a) Donations and industry contributions in 1997/98 are projected to be at substantially reduced levels that those in 1996/97, as the Department is not managing as many externally funded projects, and therefore will not be expecting the level of contributions previously received. For example, the Commonwealth will be contributing to a lesser degree in 1997/98 towards the New South Wales Code and Amcord Project and the IMROC- Planning Sydney’s Inner West Project.

(b) Contributions received where the Department acts as project Manager.

(c) If the Department were to undertake certain projects where contributions from other agencies were possible, income may be produced.

*59. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 711; Program 73.1.2; Metropolitan Planning - Operating Statement:

The Operating Statement shows a decrease in accrued expenses from $143,000 in 1996-97 to $59,000 in 1997-98.

Can the Minister explain how accrued expenses will be more than halved?

Answer—

The level of accrued expenses in 1997/98 is based on projected expenses at 30 June 1998 accrued but not paid, being at a lower level than 30 June 1997.

*60. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p 714; Program 73.1.3; Heritage Assessment and Resources - Operating Statement:

The Operating Statement shows a decrease in donations and industry contributions from $1.67 million in 1996-97 to no contributions or donations in 1997-98.

(1) Can the Minister explain this decrease?

(2) Can the Minister indicate how contributions and donations are sought from industry by Heritage, Assessment and Resources?
(3) Can the Minister indicate how more contributions and donations may be sought from industry in the forthcoming financial year by Heritage, Assessment and Resources?

Answer—

(1) (a) Included in donations and industry contributions are specially funded contributions received from Commonwealth, State and Local Government Agencies. The decrease in 1997/98 is based on nil projected income from donations and industry contributions.

(b) The Department acts as project manager where funding is received from government agencies.

(c) Additional contributions may be made by industry or other agencies, subject to projects which the Department may manage.

*61. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 717; Program 73.1.4; Office of Community Housing - Operating Statement:

The Operating Statement shows the estimated net cost of services in 1996-97 to be $8.133 million yet $102.679 million was actually spent.

Can the Minister explain why the net cost of services was $94.564 million more than expected?

Answer—

Because it includes the Office of Community Housing.

*62. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 719; Program 73.1.5; Office of Housing Policy and Housing Assistance - Outputs - Units of new accommodation leased:

The number of units leased has decreased from 1,000 in 1995-96, to 400 in 1996-97, to 150 in 1997-98.

Why have the number of units been decreasing by approximately two-thirds each year?

Answer—

The total figure was revised from the 1996/97 Budget figure of 1,800 because the uncertainty of future Commonwealth funding arrangements for housing assistance meant that leasing arrangements which involve longer term recurrent funding commitments were curtailed.
The estimated total 1997/98 figure for new leased units is 1,000. The achievement of this target is subject to discussions with the Commonwealth on a secure source of funding for longer term commitments such as leasing. This includes all total leases from the Department of Housing and the Community Housing sector.

*63. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 720; Program 73.1.5; Office of Housing Policy and Housing Assistance - Operating Statement - Grants and subsidies:

Grants and subsidies for the Department of Housing Supply Programs in 1996-97 total $210.264 million and in 1997-98 total $125.204 million.

Can the Minister explain why there has been a decrease of $85.060 million in grants and subsidies for the Department of Housing Supply Programs?

Answer—

See answer given at Estimates.

*64. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 722; Program 74; Ministry for Urban Infrastructure Management:

The “Operating Statement” shows that employee related expenses have increased from $77,000 to $290,000.

Can the Minister explain why there has been a $213,000 increase yet average staff levels for the Ministry of Urban Infrastructure have only increased from 12 to 15?

Answer—

The Ministry of Urban Infrastructure Management was established on 20 December 1996. The staff have commenced work with the Ministry on a gradual basis over the ensuing months.

Hence the $77,000 referred to in the Operating Statement relates to only part-year costs for 12 positions, where the $290,000 relates to full-year costs for 15 positions.

*65. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 727; Program 75.1.1; Heritage Policy Assistance:

The “Operating Statement” shows that $3.504 million will be spent on financial assistance for heritage projects.

Can the Minister indicate how much of the $3.504 million will be spent on projects related to Aboriginal heritage?
Answer—

Applications are assessed on merit and in response to individual submissions.

*66. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 728; Program 75.1.1; Heritage Policy Assistance:

The “Operating Statement” shows an increase in minor user charges from $10,000 to $337,000.

Why are minor user charges expected to be 34 times higher in 1997-98 than they were in 1996-97?

Answer—

The estimates for 1997/98 brought together the Heritage Branch activities from the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning and the activities of the Heritage Conservation Fund. Estimates from 1996/97 as classified by Treasury only reflect the Heritage Branch activities.

The increase in 1997/98 is due to the consolidation of these activities resulting in an increase in minor user charges.

*67. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 727; Program 75.1.1; Heritage Policy Assistance:

The “Average Staffing” item shows that the number of staff employed by the Heritage Office has increased by 11.

(1) Can the Minister explain the increase?

(2) Can the Minister explain why, despite an increase in the number of staff, the number of conservation orders made by the Heritage Office will decrease from 3 in 1996-97 to 2 in 1997-98?

(3) Can the Minister also explain why, although the number of staff in the Heritage Office has increased by 11, the employee related expenses have increased by $657,000?

Answer—

See response given at estimates committee.

*68. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 734; Program 77.1.1, Water and Sewerage Assistance:
The Operating Statement shows an approximate $53 million budget for “Water and sewerage rate rebates for pensioners”.

Can the Minister detail what distinction, if any, there is between these rebates and those of the Department of Local Government (Budget Paper No 3; p 517; Program 52.2.1; Rate Rebates for Pensioner)?

Answer—

Water and sewerage rate rebates for water and sewerage charges.

*69. Ms Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 732; Program 76.1.2; Honeysuckle Development Corporation:

(1) How much money is the Commission of Inquiry into the proposed hotel development on the Honeysuckle Development Corporation expected to cost?

(2) How long is it expected to take?

(3) When will a final decision be made in relation to the site?

Answer—

See answer given at estimates.

*70. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 705; Program 73; Department of Urban Affairs and Planning - Operating expenses:

What was the cost to the Department for the resident’s court case in relation to the Sydney Showground?

Answer—

Case still underway - costs not yet determined.

*71. Ms Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 732; Program 76.1.2; Honeysuckle Development Corporation:

(1) What is the current level of debt of the Honeysuckle Development Corporation?
(2) Did the Minister approve borrowings and did the Government provide a guarantee to the lender for such borrowings?

Answer—

See answer to Question on Notice No. 1379 in the Legislative Assembly.

*72. Ms Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 732; Program 76.1.2; Honeysuckle Development Corporation:

(1) What was the pay-out to the Managing Director of Honeysuckle who resigned last year?

(2) Have you appointed any consultants and at what cost to find a successor?

Answer—

See answer given at estimates.

*73. Ms Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 732; Program 76.1.2; Honeysuckle Development Corporation:

(1) How much work, in terms of dollars and management time, has been spent this financial year on preparing the Honeysuckle Hotel site for which you issued a section 101 directive?

(2) In relation to that directive, what advice was the Minister given?

(3) How many staff were dedicated to reviewing the Honeysuckle Hotel site?

(4) In comparing the Honeysuckle Hotel site with other hotel development sites, did your staff do any economic analysis for the benefits to Newcastle of having two hotel plans in the area?

Answer—

See answer given at estimates.

*74. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 122; City West Development Corporation - Major Works - Works in progress:
(1) Why has the completion date of the Evenleigh South project, started in 1992, been delayed?

(2) What does this project now include and what work was commenced and/or completed in 1996/97?

Answer—

The completion date of the NSW Government’s involvement in, and funding of, the Australian Technological Park project at Eveleigh South has not been delayed.

The $25 million joint Commonwealth and State Better Cities Program which commenced in 1992 has virtually been completed. The NSW Government’s $20.2 million of Supplementary Funding, which commenced in 1994, has always been programmed over a five (5) year period to June, 1999.

The $1.456 million in the Budget Papers is part of this $20.2 million of Supplementary Funding, and comprises $1.226 million for completing re-roofing and conservation works for the Locomotive Workshops and $0.23 million for property management of the Eveleigh South site. In fact $726,000 has been brought forward from 1998/99 to 1997/98 to keep up with adaptive re-use works on the Workshops now being undertaken by Australian Technology Park Sydney Limited.

(2) The NSW Government’s involvement in funding the Eveleigh South project is now confined to the completion of its commitments in regard to $1.456 million of Supplementary Funding and $0.283 million already committed to property management assistance for Australian Technology Park Sydney Limited.

Works commenced in 1996/97 comprise $4.1 million of re-roofing and conservation works for the Locomotive Workshops as part of the State’s $20.2 million of Supplementary Funding, and $28 million of non-government funding for the adaptive re-use of the Workshops by Australian Technology Park Sydney Limited. These works will be completed next year.

Works completed in 1996/97 comprise open space infrastructure works as part of the $25 million of Better Cities programmed works. The Better Cities works are now totally expended with the exception of $0.2 million for a water re-use scheme to be implemented in the near future.

*75. Ms Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; p 3-22 and 1-13:

(1) In regard to LandCom’s contribution to the budget result, can you detail how much revenue from the accelerated sale of the Landbank assets is included in the $297 million of “Advances repaid to the Budget Sector” (page 1-13)?

(2) If LandCom asset sales are not achieved, will this impact on the overall budget result and will it be returned to a deficit?

(3) Can you indicate if you are confident of achieving the target set for 1997/98 and was the target set by Treasury?

(4) Where are these LandCom assets located?
(5) Did LandCom achieve its assets sales targets for the year 1996/97?

(6) How much of the $512 million listed on page 1-13 were LandCom assets sales and where were these located?

Answer—

See answer given at estimates.

*76. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 128 and 129; Sydney Water Corporation:

(1) Why is the Blue Mountains Stormwater Scheme included under Local Government?

(2) Why has the money gone into the Local Government budget and out of your budget?

Answer—

The Urban Runoff Control Program is administered by a Task Force which was established by the Premier and is chaired by the Hon. Bob Debus, MP. The Task Force includes the Mayor of Blue Mountains City Council as Deputy Chair, representatives from the Road and Traffic Authority, the Department of Land and Water Conservation, the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the Department of Local Government, the Environmental Protection Authority, Sydney Water and the Blue Mountains Catchment Management Committee. The Program is administered through the Minister for Local Government, the Hon. Ernie Page, MP, and is funded by a State Government contribution of $5 million per annum for the next three years.

Sydney Water’s contribution to the Task Force is solely of a consultative nature with representation on the Task Force and 2 technical committees. The program itself is funded jointly by the RTA and Local Government.

*77. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 727; Program 75.1.1; Heritage Policy and Assistance:

(1) Why has the allocation for employee related expenses increased from $1.093 million in 1996/97 to $1.75 million in 1997/98?

(2) Why has the allocation for other expenses increased from $843,000 in 1996/97 to $1.653 million in 1997/98?

Answer—

The estimates for 1997/98 brought together the Heritage Branch activities for the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning and the activities of the Heritage Conservation Fund. Estimates for 1996/97 as classified by Treasury only reflect the Heritage Branch activities.
The increase in 1997/98 for employee related and other expenses is due to the consolidation of these activities resulting in an increase in these expenses.

*78. Ms Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3; p 716; Program 73.1.4; Office of Community Housing:

(1) Where are the additional 75 crisis accommodation places to be provided?

(2) Who will benefit from the places?

(3) Does your office of Community Housing audit the level of need and unmet need and what is the Department’s assessment of the level of unmet need in terms of crisis accommodation?

Answer—

(1) The additional 75 (actually 85) crisis accommodation places to be provided in 1997/98 are part of an ongoing rolling program. Their distribution is currently at the planning stage.

The Crisis Accommodation Program (CAP), which provides accommodation, is jointly planned with the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP), which provides support services to people in that accommodation. SAAP is administered by the Department of Community Services (DOCS).

The process to be followed in distributing the additional CAP resources is to:

(a) call for CAP applications, in conjunction with DOCS, using the CAP needs indicator to provide an indicative regional split of funds; and

(b) assess these applications against the needs identified and prioritised through the Housing Assistance Planning process.

(2) The 1996/97 NSW State Plan for CAP and SAAP identified priority needs as for medium term services for women, particularly young women and single women, and medium term services for young people. These needs will continue to be priorities in 1997/98, together with special needs identified at the Regional level.

(3) The Office of Community Housing, together with DOCS, has begun analysing the recently released results if the first national SAAP data collection to monitor the levels of met and unmet need for crisis accommodation by client group and location. The Office is also implementing a monitoring system for housing providers commencing in 1997/98 which will provide regular information to assist planning and evaluation in the crisis accommodation sector.

*79. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 127; Sydney Cove Authority Major Works:
In relation to the Dawes Point Park revitalisation, what work has been completed on this revitalisation and what work is left to be completed?

Answer—

Dawes Point is the site of Australia’s first astronomical observatory established by Lieutenant Dawes in 1888- it soon also became the site of a fort to protect the colony.

The first stage of work at Dawes Point Park was an archaeological excavation which has now been completed. Planning and preliminary design work for the revitalisation of the park which will incorporate the archaeological remains is underway. When approval for this has been obtained, tenders will be let and construction commenced within 12 months.

*80. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4; p 127; Sydney Cove Authority Major Works - New Works:

(1) In relation to the 132 Cumberland Street Housing Development, is this the same project as the Cumberland Street Housing Development that was listed in last year’s Budget papers?

(2) If so, why is it again listed as new work?

(3) If not, how does it differ from the previous project and what is the status of the first housing development and what will it specifically entail?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) The project was deferred for 12 months by the Sydney Cove Authority so this year’s budget papers again list the project as new work.

An archaeological excavation on the site has been completed and the Authority is currently in the process of engaging an architect to prepare a design for the site.

(3) Not applicable.

*81. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 4, p 127; Sydney Cove Authority Major Works:

(1) Of the refurbishment and upgrade of the Police Station building listed as new work in last year’s budget, expected to finish in 1998, why does half the allocated $700,000 estimated to complete the project not appear in this year’s budget?
(2) What happened to the $350,000 that was allocated to the project last year?

Answer—

(1) The Police Station project was not commenced in the last year due to the Police Service decision not to proceed with its intended relocation.

(2) No expenditure was incurred on the project which relieved the Authority from borrowing the funds for the project.

*82. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

(7) Where are the regional offices located?

Answer—

The resources required to answer this question cannot be justified.

*83. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Rental Bond Board?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?
(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

This does not come under my portfolio of Urban Affairs and Planning and Housing.

*84. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Home Purchase Assistance Authority?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

The resources required to answer this question cannot be justified.

*85. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Land and Housing Corporation?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?
Answer—

The resources required to answer this question cannot be justified.

ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE No. 5

*1. Ms Saffin asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 381 Program 39.1.2, Protection of Conservation Assets:

The effective management of pest species is essential for nature conservation in this state.

Could the Minister please provide advice on initiatives being undertaken by the Service to control feral pests and noxious weeds within National Parks?

Answer—

The Government is committed to supporting the Service’s pest management programs on Service lands. Funding for pest management has increased from $1.5 million in 1994/95 to $4.4 million in 1996/97.

In 1995/96 more than 500 separate programs for the control of pest animals and weeds have been undertaken. Many of these are collaborative programs involving community groups, NSW Agriculture, Rural Lands Protection Boards and local councils.

PEST ANIMALS

During 1995/96 the Service conducted 399 programs aimed at minimising the impacts of animal pests.

Rabbits

To capitalise on the spread of the rabbit calicivirus disease (RCD), the Service is working closely with NSW Agriculture and Rural Lands Protection Boards to ensure effective follow-up programs are implemented. Extensive fumigation and warren destruction programs have been undertaken in Lake Mungo and Mallee Cliffs National Parks and Kinchega, Yathong, Nombinnie and Round Hill Nature Reserves. In addition over 60,000 Spanish rabbit fleas, an important vector for the myxoma virus in arid areas, have been released in the Broken Hill District.

Programs have been implemented to protect critical populations of endangered species (eg rock wallabies) from prey-switching which may occur following the release of the rabbit calicivirus.

Foxes and feral cats

In response to the spread of RCD most Districts have implemented additional fox and cat control programs to protect native animals from fox/cat prey-switching should it occur as a result of reduced rabbit densities. In addition, the Service has identified critical populations of endangered fauna most at risk. These are the yellow-
footed rock-wallaby in the Coturaundee Nature Reserve and Mootwingee National Park; brush-tailed rock-wallaby (BTRW) in the Kangaroo Valley, Warrumbungle National Park and on private land near Tamworth; and the malleefowl on several reserves in south-western NSW. The Australian Nature Conservation Agency has provided special grants to protect these populations.

A cooperative fox control program with the Coonamble, Nyngan and Walgett Rural Land Protection Boards is being undertaken in the Macquarie Marshes Nature Reserve to protect a number of endangered ground-nesting birds at risk from fox predation.

Feral goats

A collaborative program with the Topar and Koonenberry RangeCare groups to muster goats in and around the Mootwingee NP and Coturaundee Nature Reserve has been expanded to also target foxes. Goat and fox control is essential to protect the two remaining colonies of the yellow-footed rock-wallaby in New South Wales. Similar goat harvesting programs have been undertaken in Lake Mungo, Mallee Cliffs and Gundabooka National Parks and in Tarawi, Yathong, Nombinnie, Round Hill and Nocoleche Nature Reserves in south-western NSW.

In more difficult terrain successful aerial shooting programs have been undertaken at Mt Kaputar, Oxley Wild Rivers, Severn River and Kings Plain National Parks in northern NSW and in the Blue Mountains National Park.

These programs have resulted in more than 14,000 goats being removed from the Service estate during the year.

Wild pigs

Very effective pig control programs have been implemented in most reserves in western NSW. Two of the most successful were regional programs undertaken in collaboration with Rural Lands Protection Boards at Hay, along the Lachlan and Murrumbidgee Rivers, and with the Brewarrina and Walgett Rural Lands Protection Boards which removed more than 1,000 pigs from the Narran Lakes Nature Reserve.

The “Judas” pig program in the Kanangra Boyd National Park and Yerranderie State Recreation Area continued with Sydney Water during the year. In this program animals are trapped and fitted with radio collars to allow their movements and behaviour to be studied so that preferred habitats can be identified and better targeted. This has resulted in a 75% increase in the cull rate obtained in this program which is supported by the Oberon Pig and Dog Control Committee.

Wild dogs

The Service has expanded its use of the mound baiting technique to control wild dogs in problem areas. Many programs are run in conjunction with Rural Lands Protection Boards and Wild Dog Associations. For example, Eden and Narooma Districts have contracted Bega RLPB to control wild dogs in a number of reserves on the southern escarpment; Bathurst District conducts a baiting program in and around the Winburndale Nature Reserve with the local Rural Lands Protection Board, State Forests and a local farmer group; and Hunter District works closely with the Mt Hungerford Wild Dog Association and landholders to control wild dogs in and around the Barrington Tops National Park.

In conjunction with NSW Agriculture and the local Rural Lands Protection Board, Armidale District staff held a workshop and field day to encourage landholders, RLPBs and other state agencies to use this technique.

Cane toads
A major increase in the appearance of cane toads occurred during the year and observations suggest that they are now breeding as far south as Port Macquarie. A major education and awareness program has been initiated including the production of a Discovery Program Resource Kit for schools.

WEEDS

During 1995/96 the Service has undertaken 266 programs aimed at minimising the impacts of weeds. A number of botanical surveys have been undertaken and some Districts have engaged consultants to develop weed management plans. Staff from the Blue Mountains District have played a major role in developing a database to record the distribution of weeds and identify the factors favouring their establishment in the upper catchment of the Hawkesbury-Nepean River.

Bitou bush

Bitou bush is an aggressive noxious weed which has invaded more than 20 reserves in NSW where it is a serious threat to the ecological stability and biodiversity. The Service is actively involved in a cooperative program with landholders, local community groups, NSW Agriculture, and a number of other agencies in the release and assessment of bio-control agents, aerial and ground application of herbicides, and physical removal of plants.

During the year a leaf eating beetle, the tortoise beetle, was released at Botany Bay and Myall Lakes National Parks. This follows the release three years earlier of the bitou tip moth which is now well established on a number of parks. At Botany Bay National Park the tip moth significantly reduced flowering and seed production of bitou bush.

On Yuraygir and Myall Lakes National Parks the Service has treated small areas by helicopter with outstanding results with better than 95% control of bitou bush being achieved without any harm to native species. Follow up treatment with volunteer groups such as Dunecare is being fostered by the Service.

Groundsel bush

An ongoing NPWS program to control groundsel bush in the Yuraygir and Bundjalung National Parks is achieving excellent results. The program has been developed in conjunction with Maclean Shire Council and NSW Agriculture and has used a specially equipped boat to reach previously inaccessible areas. This program has been supported by grants from ANCA, the Birrigan Gargle Local Aboriginal Land Council and a special grant from the Government’s Noxious Weeds Fund.

Scotch broom

The Service has continued to participate in the cooperative program for biological control of Scotch broom. This program is a multi-agency effort involving the Service, NSW Agriculture, CSIRO, State Forests of NSW, the Hunter Pastoral Company, Barrington Tops Broom Council and NSW Government Environmental Trusts. Research is also undertaken in Europe by the International Institute for Biological Control. Three insects have been released and others are being evaluated.

The largest infestation of Scotch broom is in the Barrington Tops National Park where a containment program has been implemented. In the Blue Mountains and Kosciusko National Parks the Service aims to control infestations. The effectiveness of these programs is being closely monitored.
Serrated tussock

The Service has participated in two cooperative aerial spraying programs to combat this important agricultural weed. At Deua National Park, Narooma District staff have worked closely with landholders in the Wyanbene area while the Queanbeyan District has combined with the Cooma-Monaro Shire Council to treat infestations in and around Tinderry Nature Reserve.

The Service has also contributed towards an international program aimed at introducing pathogens for biological control of serrated tussock.

Blackberry

Many reserves in the eastern part of the State have infestations of blackberries. Major programs are underway in the Kosciusko, Oxley Wild Rivers, Werrikimbe and Wollemi National Parks and in the Little Llangothlin and Razorback Nature Reserves. In some areas the blackberry rust bio-control has established well but most programs rely on the use of herbicides for control.

*2. Ms Saffin asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 371, Sub-program 38.1.6, Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts:

How is the EPA addressing the long term protection of air quality and what are the resourcing implications?

Answer—

The EPA is coordinating the development of a NSW Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) as a comprehensive and holistic framework for addressing current and future issues relating to air quality in this State.

The Plan covers local, regional and global air quality issues, is based on wide consultation and collaboration and is a “whole of Government” agenda involving all relevant agencies and Local Government. Therefore relevant government agencies take responsibility for developing and implementing the strategies for which they have primary responsibility.

The planning and transport agencies worked as a group with the EPA to develop strategies aimed at reducing the growth in motor vehicle use over the next 25 years.

Because of its scope and complexity, the AQMP is a phased, long-term agenda reaching out to 2021. Its development is in stages focussing on key air pollutants and control strategies.

Achievements to date include:

- The Metropolitan Air Quality Study (MAQS). This has set up a significant airshed modelling system for the Sydney, Illawarra and Lower Hunter regions as a major aid to developing effective policy for air quality management.
The model is able to generate projections of the effects of pollutants and of various management strategies over time. It has already provided critical scientific information on smog formation and transportation. Over the next year it will be used to generate further information on smog and will begin the process of generating similar scientific information on fine particle pollution.

- The Health and Air Research Program (HARP) which examined the health effects of major pollutants.
- Two NSW Government green papers on the AQMP: *Developing an Air Quality Management Plan for Sydney, the Illawarra and the Lower Hunter* and *Developing a Smog Action Plan for Sydney, the Illawarra and the Lower Hunter* which were released in May 1996;
- The establishment of a Lead Reference Centre in 1996 to coordinate a “whole of Government” response to managing all lead hazards;
- A pilot study of selected air toxics in Sydney in 1996;
- Participation in the National Greenhouse Response Strategy.

The current phase of the Government’s approach to air quality management also encompasses two closely related initiatives: the review of the Clean Air Regulations in conjunction with the introduction of an economic incentive for pollution reduction through Load Based Licensing.

The Clean Air Regulations will continue to specify never-to-be exceeded emission limits for air pollutants. The intention is to ensure that health effects from localised and cumulative impacts of pollutants are minimised and that there is a mandatory, reasonable minimum performance for all premises across NSW.

With Load Based Licencing, industry licence fees will be linked to actual total emission load, and will provide a direct and significant incentive for industry to bring about maximum reductions. Together these two mechanisms will provide a flexible and effective approach to emission control from licensed premises.

The EPA is also actively participating in national initiatives on air quality:

- A National Environment Protection Measure (NEPM) for air quality covering six pollutants; (Ozone, Sulphur Dioxide, Nitrogen Oxide, Lead, Carbon Monoxide and Fine Particles)
- The National Pollutant Inventory;
- The National Inquiry into Urban Air Quality; and
- National Standards on Motor Vehicles.

The next steps in the AQMP will be a focus on campaigns to reduce photochemical smog and brown haze/ fine particle pollution in Sydney, the Illawarra and the Hunter. The brown haze/fine particle campaign will also cover affected regional centres. Smog is largely present in summer time and brown haze/fine particle pollution is largely a winter time occurrence.
The Health study has confirmed that current levels of ozone and fine particle pollution in the Greater Metropolitan Area have negative health effects on significant numbers of people especially the elderly and asthmatics. This information is being used to assist NSW and the national body of Ministers (the National Environment Protection Council) develop appropriate air quality standards.

The MAQS modelling has confirmed that, notwithstanding the major improvements to new car technology, further broad ranging interventions are necessary to avoid exceedences of the National Health and Medical Research Council air quality standards for ozone and nitrogen dioxide.

The AQMP is concentrating on strategies which will reduce emissions from all sectors including motor vehicles, heavy industry sites, commercial enterprises and domestic activities (for example solid fuel wood heaters). The approach to reducing emissions from cars and trucks includes a coordinated “whole of Government” effort to reduce the growth in vehicle kilometres travelled as well as reducing the emissions from individual vehicles.

The strategies being developed have been assessed for both their environmental and economic effectiveness. They have also been extensively canvassed through a lengthy and ongoing consultative process with all interested parties. To take an example, local government is a major player in air quality issues and has been very actively involved in the development of strategies and the approach of the AQMP.

Partnerships between State Government agencies, community groups and local government are important to many of the AQMP strategies.

The campaign to reduce brown haze pollution in Sydney will be initiated this winter. The white paper on the AQMP, covering both fine particles and photochemical smog, is scheduled for release later in the year. The EPA will also further develop its work monitoring air toxics hot spots in Sydney and regional areas.

The AQMP process constitutes a broad ranging program to which 21.8 EFT staff will be allocated in the 1997/8 year. The estimated recurrent cost for the EPA in 1997/8 is $1.306 million. In addition, the Government has provided an enhancement of $513,000 to the EPA’s budget so that it can establish an effective air toxics monitoring program in the Sydney region.

*3. Ms Saffin asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 381 program 39.1.2 Protection of Conservation Assets, fire management programs:

Could the Minister explain what action has been taken in the National Parks and Wildlife Service’s 1996/97 budget to effectively manage fire within the park system and what actions have been taken by the Service in preparation for the coming season?

Answer—

The National Parks and Wildlife Service manages some 5.5% of the land area of NSW and has some 32,000 urban and 8,000 rural neighbours. The Government supports increased resourcing of the Service and aims to enhance the professional standing of the Service and improve the management of the park system including management of fire.

The findings from the Coronial Inquiry into the January 1994 Bush Fires were handed down on 28 February 1996. In his findings the Coroner accepted and endorsed the Service’s fire management and fuel management policies as
they have been applied throughout the State. He acknowledged the Service’s consistently professional approach and its importance as a premier fire management authority.

For 1997/98 the Government has provided the Service with a specific allocation of $4 million for fire management. Part of these funds will be used to employ 30 fire management staff. The costs of this initiative are part of the funding identified in the operating and maintenance expenses allocations set out in this program.

This funding will also be applied to ensure that the Service continues its role in District bush fire management committees and assisting neighbours in being prepared for fire.

The Government will also be providing the Service with a capital allocation of $1,000,019 in 1997/98 for its fire management program. These capital funds are for the acquisition of plant and equipment required for fire fighting.

Since January 1994 $4,860,000 has been allocated to upgrading the Service’s fire management equipment. Items include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Striker slip-on units</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck slip-on units</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New tankers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanker upgrades</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer upgrade</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer transporters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile control units</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helibase upgrades</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive upgrades have been undertaken of other equipment including:

- base camp equipment
- control centre equipment
- catering equipment
- chainsaws
- hand tools
- pumps and hoses
- crew and remote area kits
- meteorology equipment
- first aid equipment

A Service operations centre - PARKOPS - has been established at Head Office to co-ordinate statewide preparedness and incident response.

A major program for upgrading the Service’s radio communications system has been undertaken. Since 1993/94, $4,400,000 has been expended on the east coast and tablelands VHF radio system and $100,000 has been expended on the first stage of the Western Region HF radio system.
The Service’s fire control performance remains sound with records to date for 1996/97 showing the number of fires started on parks and controlled on parks (118); started on parks and escaped (17); started off park and moved onto parks (29).

The Service has assisted other agencies in controlling 52 off park fires.

Extensive consultation and liaison has been undertaken by Service staff with representatives of the bush fire control agencies throughout the State.

Inter Agency training programs have been conducted by the Service in fire management skills including incident control, aerial fire management and prescribed burning.

The Service is liaising closely with local government on fire management issues and is currently implementing a neighbour relations program called “Community Fire Guard” aimed at protection of life and property. 35 Service facilitators have been trained to organise local programs.

The Service is represented on the Executives of all Bush Fire Management Committees in areas containing Service lands and has assisted in the preparation and implementation of Operations and Fuel Management Plans for those areas.

The Service has contributed to bush fire management plans for all Bush Fire Management Committees which include Service areas. These include fire control and prevention on parks and reserves and for the protection of neighbouring lands.

The Service has embarked on a project of producing Reserve Fire Management Plans for bush fire prone reserves in accordance with the NSW Biological Diversity Strategy.

The Service’s preparedness for the next fire season includes an extensive hazard reduction program and maintenance of fire trails.

Since January 1994 the Service has completed over 108,490 ha of hazard reduction burning throughout NSW in 440 operations.

Equally important has been the Service’s fire trail program with 3172 kilometres of fire trails being maintained in 1996/97.

As Service hazard reduction programs are aimed at reducing the bush fire risk to life and property, much of the Service’s hazard reduction is conducted in strategic areas of its estate which adjoin neighbouring lands.

*4. Ms Saffin asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 3, p. 387, program 39.1.4., Regional Park Management:

The Government’s Greening of Sydney Policy indicated that the Government would establish a system of new Regional Parks in Metropolitan Sydney.
Could the Minister indicate what progress has been made in establishing these parks and how the resources allocated are being used?

Answer—

The National Parks and Wildlife Act has been amended to include a new category of land reservation - regional parks.

Regional parks are areas that have been substantially modified since European occupation and that are capable of providing open space and recreational opportunities for major regional population centres.

The Government has launched a Regional Parks Policy Statement outlining the system of reservation and management of regional parks including an implementation strategy.

A Metropolitan Regional Parks Unit has been created within the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Initially 8 areas of land have been identified and assessed as meeting the criteria for regional parks.

**Metropolitan Regional Parks Unit**

The Unit’s primary role in the immediate future will be the design and establishment of an integrated system of Regional Parks. The Unit will design and develop new Parks and put in place appropriate management structure for each Park. A community Consultation and Promotion Strategy has been prepared and is being implemented. Community consultation has involved contact with nearly 500 individuals and organisations including schools, community groups, progress associations, Councils and neighbours of the proposed Parks.

**Western Sydney Regional Park**

Western Sydney Regional Park when fully established will occupy 1000 hectares and includes land originally set aside at Abbotsbury North for housing and a golf course development. It will provide residents and visitors with picnic areas, shelters, children’s playgrounds, pedestrian and cycle tracks, extended tracks for long distance walkers, horse riding trails and ponds.

The establishment of such a varied range of facilities will need to be staged over a number of years however, the Park is already accessible to the public by roads through the Park and extensive walking tracks.

A total of 392 hectares of crown land has been transferred to the Minister for the Environment for development of Stage 1 of the Park. The Stage 1 development is expected to take 4 years and work has already commenced on roads and tracks and the construction picnic facilities, revegetation activities are in progress and to date over $750,000. of trees have been planted on the site. A Contract worth $800,000. has been let for Stage 1 construction work due for completion in mid June will include picnic facilities and access roads and paths.

**Rouse Hill Regional Park**

Stage 1 of this Park occupies 42 hectares of land surrounding historic Rouse Hill House. Stage 2 will consist of additional 110 hectares of land yet to be acquired by the Government.
Rouse Hill Regional Park and the adjacent Rouse Hill House build between 1813 and 1818 will provide an invaluable scenic and recreational zone for north western Sydney. The Park will ensure that residents and visitors can enjoy large open spaces of peace and beauty. Public access to the area will be possible in early June 1997 once construction of an access road is complete.

A Contract worth $732,000 has been let for Stage 1 construction work including additional landscaping and entrance gates.

Metropolitan Regional Parks Unit is working closely with the Historic Houses Trust to ensure cooperative management of the Park and the land surrounding the house.

**Leacock Regional Park**

This 32 hectare parcel of land at Leacocks Lane, Casula will provide an important open space zone separating the suburbs of Casula and Glenfield. The ridge line provides panoramic views over Holsworthy and Sydney central business district. There is already good access to the Park.

A Plan of Management has been prepared and initial tree planting and weed control will commence in September this year.

**William Howe Regional Park**

This proposed Park is approximately 50 hectares in area and is due for transfer to the Minister for the Environment in late 1997. This Park will include land in a elevated rural area of high scenic value between new residential areas of Mt. Annan, Narellan Vale and Spring Farm near Campbelltown. There is already pedestrian access to this site.

**Parramatta River Regional Park**

The Parramatta River Regional Park is made up of three portions of land - Callan Point, Rozelle - Bedlam Bay, Gladesville and Yarralla, Concord. These lands are currently in the ownership of the Department of Health and negotiations for the transfer and management of the land are currently under way between the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Department of Health.

Callan Point on the edge of Iron Cove provides a valuable link between Leichhardt Council managed Park land. The site contains aboriginal sites and rock carvings and currently there is good public access to the site.

The area is in need of urgent bush regeneration, weed control and protection of the aboriginal sites and engravings.

Bedlam Bay, Gladesville is based on the foreshore lands of the serene Bedlam Bay on Parramatta River. National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Department of Health have agreed on the boundaries of the land to be transferred to the Minister for the Environment with the transfer to be in place in the next few weeks. Currently there is both land and water access to the site which will become a very attractive and valuable portion of park land in the area.

The Yarralla, Concord portion of the Parramatta River Regional Park will protect foreshore land and incorporate paddocks of the Dame Edith Walker Estate. It will provide an excellent range of opportunities of recreation.

Negotiations are with Department of Health, with the transfer of land to the Minister for the Environment.
Berowra Valley Regional Park

The Berowra Valley Regional Park is 4000 hectares in area comprising of mostly natural bushland along the Berowra Creek Valley. Throughout the Valley there are extensive walking tracks with picnic facilities provided. The area is currently under the care control and management of Hornsby Council. National Parks and Wildlife Service is currently discussing future management arrangements with the Council.

Future additions to the Network of Regional Parks

At the conclusion of the 2000 Olympics, areas of significance will be transferred to the National Parks and Wildlife Service and be reserved as Regional Parks. The most important initiative will see the reservation of the Penrith Lakes, the site of the Olympics Rowing, as a Regional Park.

Other areas of land are being assessed for their suitability for reservation as Regional Parks. Government commitment to ongoing reservation of suitable land for Regional Parks will continue to drive the assessment process by the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

5. Ms Saffin asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 45 and 46, State Capital Program:

Could the Minister indicate what funds will be dedicated to the acquisition of lands during 1997/98?

Answer—

Since coming to Office, this Government has provided a significant contribution to the National Parks and Wildlife Service for land acquisition purposes. The allocation for land acquisition during the 1997/98 financial year will continue this trend and will enable freehold areas of conservation value to be purchased and included in the national park and reserve system.

There are a number of parcels of land within the State that is zoned as 8(b) or 6(c). The zoning of land under these categories recognises the lands value for conservation purposes and provides a capacity for them to be managed consistent with their intended eventual inclusion within the park and reserve system. While these zonings exist over the lands, they retain their freehold status.

During the last financial year, the Government provided an amount of $3 million for the purchase of lands zoned as 8(b) or 6(c). For the 1997/98 financial year, the Government will be providing an amount of $4 million for the purchase of these lands. I would point out that there is no intention that owners will be forced to sell. The whole purpose of the program is to enable owners to sell when they believe it is an appropriate time for the use of the land to be changed from freehold to national park In addition to this allocation the Government will continue with the general land acquisition program of the National Parks and Wildlife Service with an allocation of some $2 million. These funds are used to purchase general freehold lands for inclusion within the park and reserve system. Again, land acquisitions under the general land acquisition program are not forced. Rather, in reality the opposite usually happens with owners approaching the Service to purchase their lands. Where such offers are made, the Service assesses the conservation values of the lands and if selection criteria are met, negotiations can be commenced.

As members of the Committee would be aware, the National Parks and Wildlife Service is interested in purchasing a number of parcels of freehold land in the Jervis Bay area for inclusion in the Jervis Bay National Park. It is
intended that such acquisitions would be staged over a number of years and the Government has allocated $3 million in 1997/98 towards this program. The purchase of these lands will significantly add to conservation in this State with the incorporation of the terrestrial national park areas with our Government’s promised marine national park for Jervis Bay.

In honouring its commitment to the Dunphy Wilderness Fund, the government has allocated $1 million to the National Parks and Wildlife Service in 1997/98 towards this five year, five million dollar project. The Government’s commitment of $1 million towards this program in 1997/98 continues the allocation of $1 million provided in 1996/97 to enable the Service to acquire a number of areas of high conservation value for inclusion in wilderness areas. Again, I would stress that these acquisitions will be made in negotiation and with the agreement of owners or leaseholders

In summary therefore the Government will be providing some $10 million in 1997/98 to the National Parks and Wildlife Service for its land acquisition program.

*6. Ms Saffin asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 371, Sub-program 38.1.6 Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts:

What resources will be provided for the Beachwatch and Harbourwatch programs this coming financial year, given the Government’s commitment to improving the quality of Sydney Harbour waterways?

Answer—

Proposed funding for the EPA’s Beachwatch and Harbourwatch programs for the 1997/98 financial year totals $661,000, which includes the cost of eight full time staff.

The allocation also allows approximately $225,000 for microbiological analysis of water samples, gathering samples and related information.

Key issues for the Beachwatch program in 1997/98 will be:

> improvements in reporting and public communication;

> continuation and expansion of the Harbourwatch program;

> continuation of Beachwatch in the Hunter and Illawarra;

> supply of protocols and quality assurance for water monitoring programs undertaken by other agencies, such as local councils.

Pollution in Sydney Harbour has now become the major focus for Beachwatch, and will gain increasing emphasis with the approach of the year 2000 Olympic Games. Additional sites continue to be added to the Harbourwatch monitoring and reporting program, including the nominated Olympic sailing and triathlon swimming course sites within Sydney Harbour.
The Beachwatch and Harbourwatch programs undertake monitoring of bacterial water quality in Sydney at:

35 ocean beaches from Palm Beach in the north to Oak Park in the south;

72 harbour sites in Pittwater, Port Jackson, North Harbour, Middle Harbour, Lane Cove River, Parramatta River, Botany Bay, Georges River and Port Hacking.

The Beachwatch program was established in 1989 at a time when sewage pollution was common on Sydney's beaches, prior to the construction of the North Head, Bondi and Malabar deep ocean outfalls. Pollution of ocean beaches is now relatively uncommon except after rain when stormwater pollution may be evident.

For this reason the Beachwatch Bulletin, which is issued daily in summer, is now based largely on rainfall and sewer overflow information. (Daily reports were previously based on visual inspections of beaches including aerial surveillance).

This change in daily reporting method has reduced Beachwatch operating costs by one-third, without compromising accuracy and reliability of data. Cost savings have been redirected towards addressing the sources of pollution through management of stormwater and sewer overflow programs.

Intensive water sampling undertaken by Beachwatch now includes additional sites which provide detailed information about pollution from stormwater drains. The investigation of wet weather recovery rates at selected ocean and harbour swimming sites has also commenced.

Results from the Harbourwatch program are provided promptly to local councils to assist management of sites for water-based recreation. Data is also provided to other agencies with an interest in water quality.

Beachwatch reports water quality information to the community in a variety of formats, including:

daily Beachwatch and Harbourwatch bulletins in summer, recorded on telephone information lines and faxed to the media;

monthly news releases from Beachwatch and Harbourwatch, summarising results of bacterial monitoring undertaken by the program;

Season Report released in October providing a comprehensive summary of Beachwatch activities for the year;

weekly newspaper reports in the Hunter and Illawarra regions during the summer season.

In the light of its changing role, a comprehensive review of Beachwatch is currently being completed.

As part of the review process, social research is being carried out to evaluate the extent to which the Beachwatch and Harbourwatch programs are meeting the information needs of beach users in the Sydney metropolitan area. This evaluation will be utilised to implement an improved Beachwatch communications strategy in the coming year.

Since November 1996 a beach pollution monitoring and reporting service of consistently high quality has been available in the Illawarra. Beachwatch also commenced quality assurance of data collected by the Hunter Water Corporation as part of its beach monitoring and reporting program.
Beachwatch supplies and manages sampling protocols and quality assurance of bacterial water quality monitoring by other agencies at:

18 Illawarra ocean beaches from Austinmer in the north to Werri Beach in the south;

17 Hunter ocean beaches from One Mile Beach in the north to Little Swansea in the south.

The extension of Beachwatch services to the Illawarra and Hunter regions fulfils one of the Government’s election promises and is evidence of the evolving role of Beachwatch, namely the supply of protocols and quality assurance of water monitoring programs conducted by other agencies (eg, local councils, Hunter Water and Sydney Water).

The Hunter and Illawarra programs will be reviewed during the 1997 winter season to investigate ways of enhancing the communication of beach pollution information, with public reporting recommencing in October 1997 at the start of the next swimming season.

As part of the extension to the Illawarra, Beachwatch designed a unique reporting format based on the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) guidelines. This involves the presentation of results by means of a ‘star’ rating (eg 4 stars Good, 3 stars Fair etc) – and addresses a key issue in improving public communications and reporting.

Social research is being carried out among the Illawarra community to inform continued use of this rating format in the region and possible adaptation of this format in Sydney newspapers for areas covered by Beachwatch and Harbourwatch. Initial results of the social research indicate an overwhelming preference (85%) for this method of reporting.

*7. Ms Saffin asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 359, Sub-program 38.1.1, Transport and Public Infrastructure:

What resources are being put into solving the sewerage pollution problems by the Government along the New South Wales coast?

Answer——

The Government has taken decisive action to halt sewage pollution along the entire coastline. The strategy provides for action on immediate sewage pollution problems, while providing for long-term solutions that will protect our public health and our valuable coastal waters from sewage.

The Government has put in place a moratorium on new ocean outfalls pending an examination of acceptable alternatives, such as reuse. This put an immediate halt to plans for merely disposing of a potentially valuable resource in the ocean.

Inquiry into Management of Sewage and Sewage Byproducts in the Coastal Zone

The Government has initiated a $450,000 public inquiry into management of sewage and sewage by-products in the coastal zone under section 23 of the Pollution Control Act and appointed Commissioner Michael Codd in October 1996 to run this Inquiry.
The purpose of the inquiry is to enable the Government to develop long term strategies for sewage management and alternatives in the coastal zone in the context of ecologically sustainable development. The inquiry is looking holistically at the current situation:

- the problems that exist;
- the concerns and expectations of the community; and
- how we can proceed to provide better environmental, economic and social outcomes.

A scoping paper and call for public submissions was issued in November 1996 with the closing date for submissions set as 28 February 1997.

Public hearings have been held in eight regional locations along the coast and two were held in Sydney during March, April and May 1997. In addition, the Commission has held meetings with stakeholders at these locations and four other regional centres.

The Commission has received over 200 submissions from concerned individuals, environmental and industry groups, catchment management committees, local councils, private companies and government agencies.

The Commission has advised that the public hearings have been extremely well attended and interest in the community has been high. The public response through submissions and hearing statements reflects the keen public concern about the issue of sewage pollution.

Rather than looking at the issue in a piecemeal way, the Government is using the inquiry process to canvass the question of sewage management along the entire New South Wales coastline. The Inquiry is focusing on management strategies to achieve ecologically sustainable development, including all aspects of environment protection, public health, resource management and affordability.

The Commissioner is expected to issue a draft report in August 1997 and a final report in November 1997. Some issues that appear to be emerging from the inquiry, include the need:

- to adopt principles of total catchment management, total water cycle management and a “whole-of-government” approach to sewage management;

- for clear environmental objectives for our waterways;

- for more strategic planning in sewage management;

- to give a special focus on urban growth areas;

- to explore greater use of on-site systems and move towards greater reuse; and

- to respond to calls for trialing of innovative solutions to sewage management.

The Inquiry has a total budget of $450,000, of which about $200,000 is expected to be spent in 1996/97 and the remainder in 1997/98.
The Government has also committed significant expenditure to resolve coastal sewage pollution in the State’s metropolitan areas. On May 1, the Premier announced a Waterways Package, addressing the known sewage problems associated with the intensely developed coastline from the Hunter region down to the Illawarra.

The Premier committed a $3.01 billion package to fix urban wastewater and stormwater problems in the Greater Metropolitan Region, including the Hunter and Illawarra.

The package sets goals for cleaning up Sydney Harbour and the bays, rivers and beaches in the three regions between 1997 and 2020. Under the plan, Sydney Harbour has been given top priority to ensure it is cleaned up by the year 2000.

A Special Waterways Advisory Panel has been established to report to the Premier by 31 July 1997 on proposals for cleaning up the Harbour.

The package also makes provision for:

- decreasing reliance on ocean discharges
  - $650 million upgrade of the three main Sydney treatment plants to reduce ocean discharge of solids by 50 per cent and eliminate beach grease;
  - upgrade of Cronulla STP to tertiary treatment level
- providing a fundamental system configuration that promotes effluent recycling for industry and other commercial users
- cleaning-up of Sydney Harbour by the year 2000
- eliminating 80 to 90 per cent of sewage overflows Sydney-wide
- preventing sewage pollution on bathing beaches from Palm Beach to Bombo; and
- eliminating sewage related algal blooms in the Hawkesbury-Nepean River and sewage discharge to the Georges River.

The program also includes an acceleration of the backlog sewerage program and will see 43,300 homes connected to sewer systems in the Hunter, Illawarra and Hawkesbury-Nepean catchments.

The Government is continuing with its program of decommissioning smaller, inefficient sewage treatment plants. Through its Country Towns, Water, Sewerage and Drainage Program, the Government provides financial support for upgrading existing plants. Such upgrades are required to use the best available sewage treatment technology.
The Government’s approach to overcoming the problems of sewage pollution on our coastlines is comprehensive. It requires immediate action, where needed, and seeks for the future environmentally responsible and cost-effective solutions.

*8. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

   (a) catering and entertainment of any form;

   (b) travel and accommodation of any form; and

   (c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products?

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.

*9. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s) ?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies ?

Answer—

(1) and (2) As is the case in all Westminster systems, Minister’s are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.
10. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97, and at what cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip?

Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.

11. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.
*12. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:

(a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?

(b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?

(c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?

(d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?

(e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

(1) (a-e) and (2) Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.

*13. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98; and when are such salary increases expected to be first paid?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and it’s funding are set out at pace 12 of the Budget Summary.
*14. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(b) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for these purposes?

(2) (a) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97?

(b) How many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

(3) (a) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98?

(b) How many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

Answer—

(1) to (3) The refurbishment, upgrade or relocation of offices are required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.

*15. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97, and which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98, which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/Completion Date</th>
<th>Total cost of Project</th>
<th>Total allocation to the Project 1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 33.
16. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97, what was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you, and what was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you.

(2) (a) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97?

(b) If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?

(3) (a) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97?

(b) If so, what was their floor space

Answer—

(1) to (3) Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each Department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of Departments in their Annual Reports.

17. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office in 1996-97?

Answer—

(1) and (2) It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

18. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you?
(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96?

(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees?

(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee?

(5) How many public servants are serving in an *ex officio* capacity?

(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 government boards and committees. The database does not contain information on the large number of small trusts administered by the Department of Land and Water Conservation and the National Parks and Wildlife Services.

(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of boards and committees.

(3) There are approximately 6000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all member of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each Department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories of people statistical information is only available for 1918 members. Of these 3.3% who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people 11% are, people from a non-English speaking background and 5% have disabilities. Board and Committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July 1996.
*19. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”?

(2) From which particular programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.

*20. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?

Answer—

The cross portfolio savings achieved for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1; page 42.

*21. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at page 17), how many employees are currently employed by the Department, by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96/34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available for certain cases.
22. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration:

(1) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(2) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(3) specifically in relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

(1) to (3)  Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.

23. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4; p. 45; Minister for the Environment - Work in progress-Metropolitan Air Quality Strategy-Upgraded Monitoring Network:

(1) Why has the estimate of total expenditure for this program dropped from last years estimate of $5,047,000 to $4,102,000?

(2) Does this mean the Carr Government has taken almost $1,000,000 out of the Metropolitan Air Quality Strategy for upgrading the monitoring network?

(3) If so, why?

Answer—

(1) There has in fact been no drop from last year’s estimate. Additional capital funding received for this program commenced in 1995/96 and has been or will, in the case of 1997/98 to 1999/2000, be provided as follows:
Year | Funding Capital $'000 | Funding Recurrent $'000
--- | --- | ---
1995/96 | 961 | 400
1996/97 | 945 | 400
1997/98 | 1,047 | 400
1998/99 | 1,047 | 400
1999/2000 | 1,047 | 400
Total | 5,047 | 2,000

Treasury has advised that the information presented in the 1997/98 Budget Papers referred to in this question were in fact incorrect and that the correct Estimated Total Cost figure should have been $5.047 million not the $4.102 million quoted, and funding for 1996/97 should have been shown as $0.945 million not $0.961 million.

However, funding and expenditure against the program can be confirmed by the fact that the 1996/97 and 1997/98 Budget Papers both show total capital funding support of $7.816 million for the Environment Protection Authority, which is inclusive of the 1996/97 allocation of $0.945 million for the program and which clearly demonstrates that this funding has remained intact.

See 1996/97 Budget Paper No. 4; page 48 which shows a capital allocation of $7.816 million for the Environment Protection Authority, including $0.945 million for the program in question and 1997/98 Budget Paper No. 3; Volume 2; page 358, which also shows and confirms a final capital allocation of $7.816 million for 1996/97.

In addition to the above capital funding provided for the program, the Environment Protection Authority has also received additional annual recurrent funding of $0.400 million to support the program.

(2) & (3) Not applicable.

*24. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4; p. 45; Minister for the Environment-Work in progress-Metropolitan Air Quality Strategy-Upgraded Monitoring Network:

The estimated expenditure to 30 June 1997 is identical with the amount of $961,000 in last year’s estimates which was estimated to be expended to 30 June 1996.

(1) Is the amount that is to be allocated to be spent to 30 June 1997 the same amount as allocated up to 30 June 1996 because you did not spend those funds?

(2) If not, why not?
Answer—

(1) No.

(2) Not applicable.

*25. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4; p. 45; Minister for the Environment-Work in progress-Metropolitan Air Quality Strategy-Upgraded Monitoring Network:

(1) Does the amount of $4,102,000 include any studies undertaken by the EPA or in which the EPA is involved to consider testing and/or monitoring of vehicle exhaust emissions?

(2) If not, why has the Government failed to introduce vehicle emission testing as per its pre-election promise?

Answer—

(1) The amount of $4,102,000 is for the upgrading of the EPA’s network of stations which monitor criteria pollutants in ambient air. These pollutants include many of those which are emitted from motor vehicles together with those which are formed in the atmosphere from reactions between pollutants emitted from motor vehicles, *inter alia*. However, each pollutant has a number of sources of emission.

(2) Work to develop a program of routine vehicle testing for emissions is not included under this item.

The EPA and the Roads and Traffic Authority are currently developing a joint proposal for the annual emission testing of motor vehicles for consideration by the Government.

*26. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 359; Program 38.1.1; Transport and public infrastructure:

It is noted that for 1996/97 there have been 3,400 infringement notices issued for smoking vehicles as opposed to 3,004 for the previous year. In each of those years:

(1) (a) How many of these fines were actually paid?

(b) What was the total income from these fines in each year?

(2) How much total administrative costs were applied to utilising enforcement of infringement notices?

(3) Was there a net loss to the EPA in enforcing infringements?
Answer—

(1) (a) & (b) The Infringement Processing Bureau (IPB) of the NSW Police Service handles penalty infringement notice fine collection activities. As this information is held by the IPB, I suggest that this question be directed to Minister Whelan.

(2) The EPA estimates a total administrative cost of $230,000 per annum for the enforcement of penalty infringement notices for smoky vehicles.

(3) The smoky vehicle fines are paid into Consolidated Revenue and not to the EPA. The EPA does not separate the costs of the enforcement of penalty infringement notices for smoky vehicles from other programs as the work is carried out as part of the EPA’s general environment protection activities. The net cost to the EPA of enforcing penalty infringement notices for smoky vehicles is estimated to be $230,000 per annum.

*27. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 359; Program 38.1.1; Transport and public infrastructure:

There were 3,400 smoking vehicle infringement notices issued and 800 noisy vehicle penalty notices issued.

(1) How many of these notices were issued as a direct result of complaints to the Pollution Hotline?

(2) What were the total number of complaints regarding smoking and/or noisy vehicles issued to the Pollution Hotline?

Answer—

(1) Warning letters are sent as a result of Pollution Line complaints, not penalty infringement notices. A number of issues are being considered regarding the EPA issuing penalty infringement notices based on community complaints, including legislative implications, training of community members and resource implications.

(2) Between 1 August 1996 and 31 May 1997, 11.6% of calls to the EPA Pollution Line were reports regarding smoky and/or noisy vehicles.

*28. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; Program 38.1.1; p. 359; Transport and public infrastructure:

How many of the:

(1) 3,400 penalty notices issued for smoking vehicles; and

(2) 800 penalty notices issued for noisy vehicles
were issued as a direct result of an EPA officer in the first instance noting the smoke and noise of the vehicle, i.e. without a complaint being lodged by a member of the public?

Answer—

(1) and (2) All of the penalty infringement notices were issued as a result of a report by an officer authorised under the relevant environment protection legislation. Warning letters are sent as a result of Pollution Line complaints, not penalty infringement notices. A number of issues are being considered regarding the EPA issuing penalty infringement notices based on community complaints, including legislative implications, training of community members and resource implications.

*29. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; Program 38.1.1; p. 359; Transport and public infrastructure:

What was the average penalty imposed in regard to each of the categories of:

(1) smoky vehicles; and

(2) noisy vehicles?

Answer—

(1) The statutory amount for a penalty infringement notice for a smoky vehicle in 1996/97 is $109.

(2) The statutory amount for a penalty infringement notice for a noisy vehicle in 1996/97 is $250.

*30. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 368; Program 38.1.5; Cross Sectoral Strategies-Outputs

It is noted that in 1996/97 there was an average of 12,500 calls to the pollution line service per month:

(1) What were the various categories of complaints lodged by calls and how many calls were made in each category?

(2) The average 12,500 calls per month produces an annual number of 150,000 calls. How many of these 150,000 calls resulted in successful prosecution?

(3) How many prosecutions were defended?
Answer—

(1) The EPA Pollution Line’s calls between 1 August 1996 (the commencement date of Pollution Line’s new database becoming operational) and 31 May 1997 can be broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident reports: (13.4% of total calls)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-odours</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical &amp; waste</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical-hazardous waste</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical-toxic spill</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise-scheduled premises</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-algae</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-fish kill</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-oil spill</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-stormwater</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motor vehicle reports (11.6% of total calls)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor smoke</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor noise</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information calls (75% of total calls)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beachwatch</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-stormwater</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) While some calls to Pollution Line do result in EPA prosecutions, the number of completed prosecutions is less than the number of calls. This is because calls only result in prosecution where all of the following are the case:

1. the caller reports a pollution incident;
2. under the relevant legislation, the pollution incident is one within the province of the EPA and is not a council responsibility;
3. the EPA is able to collect sufficient evidence (i.e., beyond reasonable doubt) that an identified person has caused the incident thereby committing an offence; and
4. the prosecution would be in accordance with the publicly available prosecution guidelines developed and endorsed by the Board of the EPA.

From 1 July 1996 to 31 May 1997, the EPA completed 137 prosecutions. Only 7 charges were dismissed during this period.

(3) Of the 137 prosecutions, 31 were "not guilty" pleas.

*31. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 368; Program 38.1.5; Cross Sectoral Strategies:

It is noted that there was an average of 12,500 calls during 1996/97 regarding pollution line service.

(1) What time of the day does the pollution line service cease taking calls about motor vehicles?

(2) How do you justify the line service not taking complaints at least during daylight hours in relation to smoky vehicles?

Answer—

(1) Callers are able to phone in reports of smoky vehicles at any time 24 hours a day. Callers who have smoky vehicles reports can keep details and phone these through up to ten days after the sighting. People may also fax through their reports via the Pollution Line fax number. The fax line is operational 24 hours.

(2) Not applicable.

*32. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing regional cumulative impacts-Operating statement-Grants to organisations:

It is noted that last year there was $57,000 in grants and in 1996/97 there were no grants to organisations.

(1) What organisations previously received grants?
(2) Why have you excluded those organisations from grants during 1997/98?

Answer—

(1) & (2) At the time of preparation of the 1996/97 Budget Papers it was envisaged that the Environment Protection Authority would pay grants totalling $57,000 to Catchment Management Committees in the southern and northern regions of the State for worthwhile projects which arose during the year.

However, the funds were ultimately applied directly by the EPA to address environmental priorities during 1996/97 rather than being allocated as grants through Catchment Management Committees. It should be noted however that the Environment Protection Authority, via its regional operations, does provide substantial in kind resources each year in support of the activities of Catchment Management Committees.

*33. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing regional cumulative impacts:

It is noted that there were 75% of weeks in which monitored sites in the Hawkesbury/Nepean River met NSW blue green algae task force guidelines allegedly for the 1997/98 year. How was this estimate arrived at when the year has not even commenced?

Answer—

This estimate is a guide only and was based on the average number of weeks that monitored sites met Blue-Green Algal Task Force Guidelines in the past. The actual figure for any year is subject to variation because of climatic conditions.

*34. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing regional cumulative impacts:

It is noted that there were 75% of weeks in which monitored sites in the Hawkesbury/Nepean River met NSW blue green algae task force guidelines as opposed to 76% of weeks in the previous year. Why has the Government failed to improve substantially the water quality in the Hawkesbury/Nepean River which appears to have stood at 75% and 76% in the two preceding years?

Answer—

A major report comparing data from monitoring carried out between 1990 and 1993 with data from a 1979 to 1981 survey found that water quality in the Hawkesbury-Nepean River has improved. Phosphorus and ammonia-nitrogen loads are down and the nitrogen load has remained stable despite the increased population in the catchment.

There are a wide range of activities in the catchment with the objective of improving water quality including the following:
The Government’s Water Reform Package. The Healthy Rivers Commission is currently running a Public Inquiry in the Hawkesbury-Nepean catchment to set water quality objectives and flow regimes, as part of the Government’s Water Reform Package.

In partnership with the Hawkesbury-Nepean Catchment Management Trust, the EPA is implementing actions to enhance public education about catchment related environmental issues as well as community participation in programs designed to improve river health.

The EPA and Sydney Water Corporation (SWC) are co-ordinating an extensive program of monitoring studies on the environmental condition of the River.

In addition, the EPA has worked with SWC to develop a trial "bubble" licensing scheme to reduce nutrient discharges from sewage treatment plants in the South Creek sub-catchment to the River in a cost effective manner.

*35. Mr Ryan asked:

Referring to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 374; Program 38.1.7; Waste Planning and Management Fund:

It is noted that the Government estimates it will allocate $18,190,000 next year to waste reduction.

(1) Did the Government last month receive advice from the Local Government Recycling Co-operation that it needed $3 million to keep the kerb-side recycling program from collapsing?

(2) Was this recently reviewed to $10 million?

(3) What is the Government’s response to this request for the financial plugging of the recycling black hole?

Answer—

(1) (2) & (3) There is no recycling black hole. Kerbside recycling has been highly successful in NSW and Australia generally. Since the introduction of kerbside collection services in NSW recycling rates have risen by over 110 per cent. In the Sydney metropolitan area alone over 200,000 tonnes of waste per annum are now diverted from landfill through kerbside collection services.

The Government has always been aware of the vulnerability of kerbside recycling to price fluctuations, due mainly to international prices for virgin and recycled materials.

To address this the Government has promoted the establishment of long term collection contracts for collection and supply of recyclables with fixed minimum buy-back prices for collected materials. It has also instituted a regional and heavily resourced waste management regime through the Waste Planning and Management Fund. 85% of the Waste Planning and Management Fund has been allocated to support regional waste planning and programs. This will establish waste reduction initiatives on a more viable scale.

The Government also recognises the invaluable contribution of the Local Government Recycling Cooperative to sourcing and negotiating long term contracts for recyclables and has consistently supported the Cooperative in its efforts.
The Cooperative has been maintaining buy-back prices to its councils in the wake of the current decline in market prices. The Government has advised the Cooperative that it will provide a $2 million interim support package from the Waste Planning and Management Fund to assist it to stabilise kerbside recycling.

It should be recognised that this package is only interim support and that the negotiation of long term, transparent cost sharing arrangements between industry and local government is being advanced as a matter of urgency. The EPA is currently representing NSW in the negotiation of a National packaging protocol which is being negotiated at CEO level between State, Commonwealth, Local Government and Industry.

The Government has also made it clear to industry in NSW that it must make commitments in Industry Waste Reduction Plans (IWRP) to ensure that waste reduction and recycling are properly planned for, including sharing the cost for the support of kerbside recycling.

The requirement for regional waste boards to review existing waste and recycling infrastructure as part of their regional waste plan will provide a much needed impetus to more consistent and cost-effective recycling collection services and long term contracts in many local government areas.

*36. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 374; Program 38.1.7; Waste Planning and Management Fund:

It is noted that the Government expended in the present financial year the sum of $13,711,000.

(1) What was the total amount raised from waste levies?

(2) Why did the Government fail to hypothecate these funds to waste reduction and instead paid them into consolidated revenue?

(3) What is the Minister’s reaction to the criticism of this action by the Local Government Association, Industry and Environment groups during the recent inquiry into Waste Minimisation and Management by the Standing Committee on State Development?

Answer—

(1) & (2) & (3) Table 3.4 on page 13-3 of Budget Paper No. 2 indicates that a total of $24 million is expected to be raised from the section 72 levy for 1996/97.

The levy is designed to ensure that waste disposal prices cover the significant social and environmental costs of waste disposal. This will ensure that underpricing of landfill does not result in excessive waste disposal and undermine efforts to establish viable waste recycling and reprocessing industries.

The State Government is providing a record level of financial support for waste minimisation, with $32.5 million allocated for the first three years (and a further $24.2 million indicated for the fourth and fifth years, subject to a review in the third year).

While there is no direct link between the levy and funding for waste management, the funding of waste management over time is generally more than the levy collected.
Between 1996 and 1999, waste management expenditure through the Waste Planning and Management Fund will amount to $46.6 million and expenditure by the EPA is approximately $10 million per year totalling $76.6 million for this three year period. The amount of levy collected during the same period is expected to be around $73.5 million.

In addition, the Waste Service NSW in conjunction with the private sector will be spending over $100 million on programs which will help to achieve the Government’s 60% waste reduction target.

*37. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p, 374; Program 38.1.7; Waste Planning and Management Fund:

(1) What funds were allocated in the current financial year to establishment of the MURF recycling facility at Jack’s Gully?

(2) Is the Minister aware that up to 60% of all materials taken from kerb-side recycling are not being recycled after processing at the MURF and are being dumped into landfill?

(3) What action has the Government taken to remedy this complete breach of faith with the hundreds of thousands of residents of western Sydney councils who carefully put out their household recyclables for collection expecting recycling and not dumping?

Answer—

(1) Waste Service advises that nil funds were received from the Waste Planning and Management Fund for the Jacks Gully MRF, however they advised that funds have been allocated from their Capital Works Program 1996/97.

(2) I have been advised by Waste Service NSW that claims that 60% of curbside recyclables are being dumped at landfill are untrue. Recycling services have teething problems with contamination of loads where people have been unsure of what could and what could not be recycled. What goes to landfill is waste. It is material which is contaminated and not suitable or appropriate for recycling through the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF).

(3) There has been no breach of faith with residents of Western Sydney. Councils and the Regional Waste Boards are working on community education programs to improve the quality of materials collected for recycling that subsequently should reduce contamination to acceptable levels.

Material which can be recycled through the MRF is clean paper and cardboard, plastic bottles, ice-cream containers, aluminium cans, tin food cans, bottles and jars and juice and milk cartons.

*38. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 374; Program 38.1.7; Waste Planning and Management Fund:

It is noted that the EPA’s Regulatory Impact Statement accompanying the Waste Minimisation and Management Regulation 1996 indicated that waste levies would raise over $39.7 million in 1997/98. What is the Government
doing with the difference ie. approximately $21 million between the total income of $39.7 million and the amount of $18,190,000 it proposes to expend in the next 12 months?

Answer—

Whilst there is no direct relationship between the levy and funding for waste management, it should be noted that the funding of waste management over time is generally more than from the levy.

The Government is providing a record level of financial support for waste minimisation, with $32.5 million allocated for the first three years (and a further $24.2 million indicated for the fourth and fifth years, subject to a review in the third year).

Between 1996 and 1999, expenditure on waste management through the Waste Planning and Management Fund will amount to $46.6 million and expenditure by the EPA is approximately $10 million per year totalling $76.6 million for this three year period.

The amount of levy collected during the same period is expected to be around $73.5 million.

In addition, the Waste Service NSW in conjunction with the private sector will be spending over $100 million on programs which will help to achieve the Government’s 60% waste reduction target.

*39. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 374; Program. 38.1.7; Waste Planning and Management Fund:

It is noted that in 1994/95 there was a 17.1% reduction from 1990 waste levels. When the Government came to power in 1995, the waste level reduction from 1990 reduced to 14.7% and in 1996/97 was only 15.7%.

(1) How then does the Government expect in the year 1997/98 to reduce waste by 19.3%?

(2) Do you agree there is no chance of reading the 60% target in the next 2.5 years?

Answer—

(1) and (2) Sydney residents are currently disposing around 2.96 million tonnes of waste per year or 860 kg per person. This is 220 kg per person more than we should be if we are to reach the 60% waste reduction target by the year 2000.

The 60% target is unashamedly ambitious. It will achieve fundamental changes such as achieving a total industry re-think about resource management are notoriously challenging when undertaken by one jurisdiction in a national system.

However, the 60% target is already playing an important role as a guide to all stakeholders that the Government is very serious about improved waste management in this State.
The formation of regional waste boards will ensure the introduction of more wide ranging, cost effective waste minimisation programs and the adoption of Industry Waste Reduction Plans will ensure that industry accepts far greater responsibility for its waste. Specific wastes are also being targeted through the Government’s Green Waste Action Plan and a draft Construction and Demolition Waste Action Plan which is being prepared by the EPA.

I am confident that programs now being put in place to reduce waste are beginning to pay dividends.

*40. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.4; p 90; Waste Service NSW-Development of Solid Waste Management Centres:

It was noted in last year’s budget (at p 93 of the same volume) that work under this program was to commence in 1996 and to be completed in the year 2001 at an estimated total cost of $28,500,000.

(1) Why then does the 1997/98 Budget Paper state that work on this project will not be completed until 2002 and the estimated total cost has more than doubled to $61,685,000?

(2) What will the additional $33,185,000 estimated expenditure be spent upon?

Answer—

(1) I have been advised by Waste Service that the comparative figures to the amount of $61,685,000 in last year’s (1996) Budget Papers is the amount of $28,500,000 under New Works plus the amount of $37,062,000 under Works in Progress. These two amounts in last years Capital Program total $65,562,000.

(2) The above explanation means that there is an actual reduction of $3,877,000 instead of the increase of $33,185,000 referred to in the Question.

*41. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 366; Program 38.1.4; Household and Commercial Activities-Operating Statement-Expenses-Waste minimisation and management initiatives:

It is noted that $13,650,000 was applied to waste minimisation management initiatives in the last financial year.

(1) How much of these funds was expended in establishing Regional Waste Boards?

(2) (a) What is the breakdown of expenditure for each Regional Waste Board to date?

(b) What are the estimated expenses for each Regional Waste Board in 1997/8?

(3) Which Regional Waste Boards are considered by the Government to have had monies improperly spent by Board Directors?
(4) (a) What monies have been inappropriately spent?

(b) What action has the Government taken to discipline officers responsible?

Answer—

(1) An amount of $9.5 million was allocated from the Waste Planning and Management Fund for 1996/97 establishment and recurrent expenses for waste boards and the once-off costs of preparing regional waste plans. Waste boards have also recently received grants totalling $1.64 million to commence priority waste reduction programs which will support the regional waste plans which are currently being prepared.

(2) (a) Waste board expenditure will be fully disclosed in the audited financial statements for each waste board at the end of each financial year.

(b) A total of $5.5 million has been allocated for the recurrent expenses of waste boards and the establishment of additional waste boards during 1997/98, and a further $10.78 million has been allocated for waste reduction programs of waste boards during the year.

(3) My views on this matter were accurately recorded in an article in the Sun Herald on 11 May by reporter Martin Chulov. The article reflected concerns about some financial expenditure, or planned expenditure, by some regional waste boards.

The importance of waste boards employing proper financial management and discipline in accordance with the requirements of the Public Finance and Audit Act has been stressed in notices and addresses which I have delivered to waste boards on a number of occasions. An additional notice which will further clarify financial accountabilities will be issued shortly following the work of a joint EPA, Treasury and Local Government working party.

(4) (a) & (b) Not applicable.

*42. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4; p. 90; Waste service NSW (Residue Processing at Lidcombe Plant):

In the 1996/97 budget it was stated that the project Residue Processing at Lidcombe Plant would be commencing in 1996 and concluded in 1998 with an estimated total cost of $5,000,000. It would appear that the project had $1 million allocated to it in 1996/97.

(1) What has been undertaken on this project thus far?

(2) What is the allocation for 1997/98 for the project?

(3) How much additional moneys will be spent on Lidcombe to cater for the toxic waste from Castlereagh Toxic Waste Dump when it is closed in December 1997?
Answer—

(1) The Government in April 1995 announced that the operation of the Castlereagh Waste Management Centre would be phased out and Waste Service were asked to draw up a plan for the closure of the centre by December 1997. Between 80% and 90% of industrial wastes received at the Castlereagh Waste Management Centre (AC) is residue from the Lidcombe Liquid Waste Plant (LWP).

Waste Service developed alternative management options to achieve the closure date. The preferred strategy of the Waste Service is to convert the residues into a waste-derived fuel (WDF) for use in processes such as cement manufacture, and alternative equipment installed for stabilisation of the wastes into a form suitable for landfilling at a conventional solid waste landfill, subject to formal approval by the EPA. This method of disposal is in line with world-class environmental waste management. The back-up equipment can be designed, procured and installed by the time the Castlereagh WMC closes in December 1997.

Waste Service has issued contracts for the Project Management of this project and for supply and installation of the equipment.

(2) The Capital Program for 1997/98 is for expenditure of $12.473 million on the residue processing plant.

(3) Waste Service advises that the Residue Processing Plant at Lidcombe is for the treatment of the residue from the processing of liquid industrial waste at the Lidcombe Plant. The Plant reduces the amount requiring final treatment or at present disposal at the Castlereagh Secure Landfill by 82% of input.

The Capital Works Program included in the 1996 Budget was for expenditure by Waste Service of $1 million in 1996/97 and $4 million in 1997/98 which was a first estimate for a technology that had not been identified or researched at the time of compiling the Capital Program. The Capital Program included in 1997 Budget Paper No. 4; page 90 is for expenditure of $2.808 million in 1996/97 and $12.473 million in 1997/98. The total cost of $15.281 million is for a residue processing plant that will meet world best practices and allow the orderly closure of the Castlereagh site.

*43. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 366; Program 38.1.4; Household and Commercial Activities; Operating Statement-Expenses-Waste Minimisation and management initiatives:

It is noted that $13,650,000 was applied to waste minimisation management initiatives in the last financial year.

(1) How many of the Regional Waste Boards that were established have actually set up regional waste management plans?

(2) (a) Has there been an increase or decrease in each regional waste area since the establishment of the regional waste boards?

(b) What has been the specific amount of the increase and/or decrease?
Answer—

(1) Draft regional waste plans are due to be submitted to me by 1 October 1997 for assessment and approval. The State Waste Advisory Council will coordinate the assessment of these Plans and provide advice to me as the Plans are submitted.

(2) (a) There has been no change to the waste regions or waste boards since they were gazetted.

(b) Not applicable.

*44. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2; Chapter 4; p. 4-107; Environment Protection Authority:

It is stated that “the Environment Protection Authority’s objectives are to protect, maintain and restore the quality of the environment, having regard to the need to maintain ecologically sustainable development and to reduce the risks to human health and prevent the degradation of the environment”.

(1) What monies have been allocated in 1997/98 to address the issues of:

(a) rural waterways;

(b) coastal waterways;

(c) Sydney Harbour;

(d) Wallis Lake;

(e) Lake Macquarie?

(2) What monies have been set aside to carry out an environmental survey on the coastal zone to identify priority lands to be protected under the marine park system proposed by your Government in its pre-election policy documents?

Answer—

(1) EPA programs and related outcomes and outputs shown in the Budget Papers reflect the current EPA corporate plan and expected strategic direction for 1997/98. The EPA does not dedicate resources for specific issues as the question implies, rather the EPA allocates resources as and when necessary. Resources are provided or allocated as and when the environmental demand occurs and will vary depending on the nature and extent of the issue. Nevertheless, the EPA has comprehensive programs to improve waterways and water quality.

The Government has recently announced its Waterways Package which allocates $3 billion to combat stormwater and urban wastewater pollution in Sydney Harbour and in other urban waterways.
Wallis Lake - The EPA has committed substantial resources and staff time to the “whole of Government” response to the outbreak of Hepatitis A linked to Wallis Lake oysters.

Lake Macquarie - Costs of EPA initiatives to protect the Lake Macquarie environment are primarily in terms of staff time. EPA staff are involved in tasks such as catchment/estuary management initiatives, review of licences and implementation of new regulatory initiatives, and incident investigation and response.

The Government has established the Healthy Rivers Commission to develop and recommend approaches that contribute to sustainable management of NSW rivers, both in terms of their ecology and of resource use. The Healthy Rivers Commission has a budget of $1,090,000 in 1997/98.

(2) The EPA has not set aside any monies to carry out an environmental survey on the coastal zone to identify priority lands to be protected under the marine park system as responsibility for the marine park system rests with the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

*45. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts:

(1) What monies have been expended by the Environmental Protection Authority in 1996/97, and will be spent in 1997/98, in “identifying current...environmental impacts” related to:

(a) Homebush Bay Olympic site?

(b) Homebush Bay itself?

(2) Who have these monies been paid to?

(3) What monies are being allocated to clean up Homebush Bay to remove from it the dangerous levels of dioxins, phalates and heavy metals?

Answer—

(1) (a) & (b)The EPA has no capital or recurrent funding in 1996/97 or 1997/98 for specific projects relating to the Olympic Games. However, the EPA has and will continue to provide environmental advice on the development of Olympic facilities, including identification of likely environmental impacts of these facilities. The EPA has a responsibility to me for the administration of environmental protection legislation in NSW, which entails the routine expenditure of funds and some of this expenditure will relate to the Olympics.

(2) See answer to question (1).

(3) The EPA has no allocation of funds for the remediation of contaminated sediments at Homebush Bay as the EPA’s responsibilities are concerned with the regulation and supervision of remediation activities. As responsibility for this matter rests with the Office of Marine Administration, this question should be directed to Minister Scully.
*46. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts:

(1) (a) Has the EPA undertaken sampling/testing of the Newington Munitions Depot site in or adjacent to the Haslems Creek area?

(b) If so,

(i) how often?

(ii) at what cost per each sampling during 96/97?

(iii) what will occur in 97/98?

(2) What chemicals were found to be present in the samples and what monies will be spent in 1997/98 in addressing the removal of such pollutants?

Answer—

(1) and (2) As responsibility for remediating the site of the Newington Munitions Depot rests with the Olympic Coordination Authority this question should be directed to Minister Knight.

*47. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts:

(1) (a) What funds have been spent by the EPA in testing samples of the hundred of thousands of tonnes of heavily polluted materials removed from the Newington Munitions Depot and dumped adjacent to Silverwater Prison?

(b) To whom have those funds been paid?

(2) (a) How often have the tests been undertaken?

(b) By whom?

(c) At what cost?

(3) (a) What measures is the Government undertaking to stop the pollutants leaching into Parramatta River?

(b) What is the cost of these measures?

Answer—

(1) (a) None.
(b) Not applicable.

(2) (a) Not applicable.

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Not applicable.

(3) (a) & (b) Whilst the EPA is responsible for administering environment protection legislation to prevent pollution of waters, responsibility for the remediation of contaminated land at Homebush Bay and adjacent to the Parramatta River rests with the Olympic Coordination Authority. I therefore suggest that this question is directed to Minister Knight.

*48. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts:

(1) What is the cost paid to consultants to undertake studies of the pollution levels of Homebush Bay or the adjacent Olympic sites, including

(a) name of each consultancy that has been engaged by the EPA or by any other Government department consulted by the EPA;

(b) cost of each such consultancy;

(c) date of each of the reports so produced.

(2) What is the cost anticipated for removal or reduction of pollution levels referred to in each of the preceding reports?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The EPA has not engaged any consultants and, in this regard, recommends that the question be directed to the Ministers responsible for the Olympic Coordination Authority and the Office of Marine Administration.

*49. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 381; Program 39.1.2; Protection of Conservation Assets:

It is noted that there were 400 feral animal programmes commenced in 1996/97 and it is anticipated there will be 400 in 1997/98. Given that you and the Federal Government have announced increases in feral animal programmes:

(1) Why will the programmes be maintained at the same numbers as last year?
(2) (a) Where will those programmes take place?

(b) What will they target?

Answer—

(1) Total expenditure on the control of pests (feral animals and weeds) by NPWS in 1997/98 is expected to be approximately $5 million. Approximately half of this will be used to target pest animals.

A large number of programs targeting feral animals was undertaken last year (400). Many of these programs are ongoing and the additional funding this year will be used to expand the scope of the programs (e.g. more intensive baiting, expansion of aerial shooting of wild pigs and goats). Some programs have been completed and some new programs will commence.

Some of the additional funds will be used for increased salary commitments (salary increases and additional staff).

At this stage there has been no advice on what funds, if any, the Commonwealth Government will make available for pest species control programs.

(2) (a) Feral animal control programs will be undertaken in every NPWS District. Key programs include but are not restricted to:

- rabbit, pig and goat control throughout western parks
- wild dog control throughout the tablelands
- goat and pig control on the tablelands
- fox control throughout the State but especially to protect rock-wallabies in Coturaundee NR, the Kangaroo Valley, Warrumbungle NP and on private land near Tamworth and the malleefowl on several reserves in south-western NSW

(b) The Service targets all major vertebrate pests which include rabbits, feral pigs, wild dogs, foxes, feral goats and feral cats.

*50. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4; p. 46; Pest Species Management:

It is specified that this item will have $510,000 spent on it during 1997/98, which is a reduction of $2 million over the preceding year. What will this amount be applied to during this coming financial year?

Answer—

From Budget Paper No. 4 it is noted that the capital allocation for the National Parks and Wildlife Service’s Pest Species Management Program will be $510,000 in 1997/98. Mr. Ryan states that this is a reduction of $2 million over last year’s program.
I believe that this statement requires some clarification. From the entry on page 46 of Budget Paper No. 4 attention needs to be drawn to two columns, the one headed “Start” and the one headed “Est. Expend to 30.6.97”. From the “Start” column, it is noted that this program commenced in 1994 and from the “Est. Expend to 30.6.97” column the figure is reported as $2,532,000. The 1997/98 allocation is some $2 million less than the larger figure.

In saying this however, it is stressed that the figure in the “Est. Expend to 30.6.97” column represents expenditure to date over the life of the program and not the expenditure in any one year.

In examining the specific allocations of the program, I would advise that in 1994/95 an initial allocation of 1,486,000 was provided to enable “catch-up” initiatives to be pursued. Since that time the National Parks and Wildlife Service has received an annual allocation of $500,000 adjusted for cost of living adjustments for this program. The allocation of $510,000 for the program in 1997/98 indicates our Government’s commitment to providing the National Parks and Wildlife Service with resources to effectively manage the threat that pest species pose for native species living within the national park and reserve system.

During the coming financial year, the allocation of $510,000 for pest species management will provide the National Parks and Wildlife Service with a capacity to replace equipment necessary for pest species management as it reaches its use by date and to purchase additional equipment where the need arises. The funds could be used to replace rippers for rabbit control, spray units for the management of weed infestations, various forms of traps for other species and the like. The actual need will vary from one location to another and from one time to another. Decisions as to what to acquire and when to acquire the different types of equipment are left to managers in the various districts.

*51. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget paper No. 3; p. 381; Program 39.1.2; Protection of Conservation Assets-Operating statement-Expenses-Grants to organisations:

It is noted that grants to organisations for 1996/97 were $500,000, but no allocation is made for 1997/98.

(1) Which organisations benefited from grants last year?

(2) Why will there be no such grants this year?

Answer—

(1) In respect of the amount of $500,000 paid in 1996/97 as grants to organisations and reported in program 39.1.2 Protection of Conservation Assets, this amount refers to a contribution being made by this Government to the Blue Mountains Council to assist with the acquisition of environmentally sensitive land.

In the lead up to the 1995 election, our Government committed an amount of $500,000 towards the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands in the Blue Mountains area. It is intended that these lands, once acquired would be included within the Blue Mountains National Park.

As the source of funding for this initiative was not determined at the time the 1996/97 Budget was tabled in the Parliament, a decision was taken not to include a formal allocation at that time. During the course of the year, the Treasurer approved an increase of $500,000 in the budget for the National Parks and Wildlife Service to enable the initiative to be commenced.
(2) As the initiative was for a one-off allocation of $500,000 to be provided towards the costs of the identified lands and given that this amount was paid during 1996/97 there is no need for an allocation to be made in respect of the 1997/98 financial year.

*52. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 382; Program 39.1.2; Protection of Conservation Assets- Retained revenue- Taxes, fines and regulatory fees:

It is noted that there was $55,000 retained revenue for taxes, fines and regulatory fees in 1996/97 and the estimate is $56,000 for 1997/98.

(1) What is the breakdown of the amount for last year?

(2) What is the estimated breakdown for the coming year?

Answer—

In responding to this question, I believe a more pragmatic response could be given by providing an answer that covers the entire agency rather than only one program within the agency.

While an amount of $55,000 is reported in respect of retained revenue from taxes, fines and regulatory fees in 1996/97 for program area 39.1.2, an amount of $88,000 is reported against this item in program area 39.1.1 and an amount of $178,000 is reported against the item in program 39.1.3. This brings total retained revenue within this category to $321,000 for the year.

(1) In looking at the breakdown of this amount for the 1996/97 financial year, the item reflects revenue obtained from the imposition of parking fines, court imposed fines and miscellaneous fines for breaches of the National Parks and Wildlife Service Act and Regulations. As the fines and fees apply in respect of the Services’ entire operations, the amounts obtained each year are dissected across each program area.

(2) In respect of the 1997/98 financial year, the budget amount closely reflects the actual results obtained in the previous financial year. The National Parks and Wildlife Service’s principal activities relate to conservation and not revenue generation from the imposition of fines. Indeed, fines are applied in cases where other means are unable to achieve the desired outcomes. Revenue obtained from the imposition of fines represents a small proportion of the revenue retained by the National Parks and Wildlife Service for conservation purposes.

*53. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 46; Acquisition of Plant and Equipment:

The estimated expenditure to 30 June 1997 was $42,621,000. In 1997/98 the estimated expenditure will be $7,301,000.

(1) What plant and equipment has already been obtained under the program to date?
(2) What plant and equipment will be obtained in 1997/98?

Answer—

In answering this question, I believe there is a need for some general comment to be made before the specifics of the question can be answered.

From Budget Paper No. 4 it is noted that the capital allocation for the National Parks and Wildlife Service’s Acquisition of Plant and Equipment program will be $7,301,000 in 1997/98 and the estimated expenditure to 30.6.97 will be $42,621,000.

I believe that this statement requires some clarification. From the entry on page 46 of Budget Paper No. 4 attention needs to be drawn to two columns, the one headed “Start” and the one headed “Est. Expend to 30.6.97”. From the “Start” column, it is noted that this program commenced in 1989 and from the “Est. Expend to 30.6.97” column the figure is reported as $42,621,000.

In saying this however, it is stressed that the figure in the “Est. Expend to 30.6.97” column represents expenditure to date over the life of the program and not the expenditure in any one year. Hence, the expenditure of $42,621,000 represents expenditure that has occurred over an eight year period.

In answering the specific aspects of the question, the following is provided:

(1) At the present time the National Parks and Wildlife Service purchases its own plant and equipment. The allocation is made up of both a Consolidated Fund contribution as well as the proceeds obtained from the sale of plant and equipment items that have reached the end of their life insofar as the Service’s needs are concerned.

The plant and equipment purchases from July 1989 to June 1997 primarily cover the purchase and replacement of motor vehicles, tractors, graders, trailers and the like that are used to enable the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to undertake their conservation duties throughout the State. In addition, the allocation has also been used over that time to purchase photocopy machines and other office equipment.

(2) In relation to the 1997/98 financial year, the allocation will provide for a continuation of existing policies in relation to the turning over of vehicles and other items of plant and equipment.

*54. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 46; Creation of 24 new National Parks:

It is noted there is a total cost of $12,113,000. To 30 June 1997 the estimated expenditure of that amount will be $4,718,00 and in 1997/98 there will be $5,793,000. What is the $5,793,000 going to be applied to during 1997/98?

Answer—

In 1995 the Labor Party made a pre-election commitment that it would create and resource 24 new National Parks within its first twelve months in Office. After coming to Office, our Government has more than met this commitment to the environment. To date our Government has declared 39 new national parks and reserves and has significantly increased the size of a further 18 parks and reserves.
The Government clearly recognised that these parks needed to be professionally managed, particularly in respect of fire, pest species, visitor facilities and other specific issues of direct concern to neighbours, interest groups and communities. For these reasons, not only has our Government declared the new areas but it has provided the National Parks and Wildlife Service with the resources to manage them.

From Budget Paper No. 4 it is seen that a capital allocation of $5,793,000 has been made to the National Parks and Wildlife Service in respect of the new parks program. These funds will be used in a variety of ways throughout the year to enable the parks to be seen by the community as well managed. The specifics of where the allocation will be directed cover such areas as vegetation restoration works, provision of visitor facilities so that the areas can be appreciated without their reason for existence being degraded, purchase of equipment necessary for pest species management and fire management purposes as well as resolution of fencing issues with neighbours.

*55. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4; p 46; Preservation of Endangered Species:

It is noted that there is a program that commenced in 1996 and is finishing in 1998 for preservation of endangered species and that the estimated total cost was $1,003,000. $900,000 was estimated to have been spent last year and the remaining amount will be spent in 1997/98.

(1) Why is the Government not allocating substantially more funds for the preservation of endangered species?

(2) To which program will the $103,000 for 1997/98 be applied?

Answer—

(1) I would point out that the figures quoted in the question only relate to the capital component of the Government’s Threatened Species Conservation Act initiative.

As part of last year’s budget process the Government committed funding for the establishment of the necessary staffing and implementation costs of this significant legislation. This brought with it an increase in the recurrent allocation of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

Because of the need for the additional staffing resources provided to the NPWS to effectively participate in conservation initiatives throughout the entire State, it was also necessary for additional equipment and vehicles to be purchased. The capital works funding of $900,000 was provided for that purpose.

In relation to the 1997/98 financial year, the Government has increased the recurrent funding of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to enable the next phase of implementation of the legislation, preparation of species recovery plans, to occur. The increase in recurrent funding provided by this Government shows that the Government has in fact allocated substantially more funds for the preservation of endangered species.

The provision of capital funds is generally to meet one off costs and this has occurred in respect of this initiative of the Government.

(2) The capital works allocation of $103,000 for 1997/98 is not intended to be applied to any specific species program. It represents the provision of funding for the purchase of equipment that will apply across all threatened
species actions taken by the Service over coming years. As a consequence the funding will not be apportioned to any one species program.

*56. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 47; Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust-Work in progress:

It is noted that there was to be a continuation of the work on Stage 2 of the Brown Building extension and fit out. In last year’s budget papers, the work was stated to have started in 1995, but in this year’s budget papers it is stated to be starting in 1996.

(1) Why was there a delay in the commencement of this work?

(2) Why has the estimated total cost of $2,278,000 as disclosed in the previous year’s budget documents been reduced to $2,013,000?

Answer—

(1) Stage 2 of the Brown Building extension commenced during the 1995/96 financial year as planned. The project cash flow for 1995/96 was $237,000 which was less than the original estimate of $1,000,000 due to delays in the tendering process.

(2) The original budget for Stage 2 of the Brown Building extension was $2,250,000. This figure was escalated to $2,278,000 in the 1996/97 Budget Papers after allowing for inflation. The latest estimated total cost of the project is $2,250,000 (the original budget figure). The estimated total cost figure of $2,013,000 shown in the 1997/98 budget papers did not include the $237,000 expended in 1995/96.

*57. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 47; Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust-New Works:

It is noted that there is a new program commencing in 1997 for the long-term improvement of water quality and rehabilitation of the Park’s water resources and the total amount estimated to be spent will be $6,114,000. What work will be undertaken for the expenditure of the $1,199,000 over 1997/98?

Answer—

As part of the Trust’s 1996/97 Capital Works Program, the sum of $6,114,000 was provided towards the implementation of stage 1 of the pond program. Actions implemented focussed on the Model Yacht Pond, Fly Casting Pond and Musgrave Pond and included:

- Bio-manipulation of pond ecology;
- Foreshore stabilisation and landscape planting;
- Sediment removal works at inflow points;
- Ongoing weed eradication program in and around ponds;
- Ongoing monitoring of blue green algae and water quality.

In 1997/98 the Trust will expend expenditure of $1,199,000 to implement stage 2 of the pond program which will focus on Musgrave Pond, One More Shot Pond and Willow Pond. Actions include:

- Installation of a Gross Pollutant Trap at the Musgrave Pond inlet;
- Bio-manipulation of pond ecology;
- Ongoing carp management program;
- Landscaping and erosion control of foreshore areas.

These and future works will provide for the gradual improvement in water quality in the parklands ponds system as well as reducing the occurrence of blue green algae outbreaks.

*58. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4; p. 47; Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust-Major works-Long term improvement of water quality and rehabilitation of the Park’s water resources:

(1) Is the number of dogs visiting the Park annually approximately 1 million, ie. almost the same number as the entire dog population of Sydney?

(2) Is a great deal of the problems with phosphates and nitrates and blue green algae in the Park directly attributable to the number of dogs entering the Park?

(3) Has the Government considered banning dogs from Centennial Park and Moore Park but deferred its decision until after the next election?

Answer—

(1) Yes. This includes repeat visits.

(2) No. There is no evidence to suggest this. The principal source of phosphates/nitrates due to stormwater from outside the parklands.

(3) No. Banning dogs is not considered an option for the parklands. The Trust, as part of its management planning process, will seek to review and update its policy on dogs and those parts of the parkland they can be exercised in.

*59. Mr Ryan asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 4; p. 47; Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust:
There appears to be no funding set aside for establishment of parking under Moore Park in accordance with the traffic study plan completed in 1994.

(1) Is the Government going to make arrangements to establish parking under Moore Park in order to minimise the vehicles entering the Park?

(2) If so,

(a) When will such work be undertaken?

(b) How will it be funded?

(3) If not, what arrangements does the Government plan to make to minimise the number of vehicles entering Centennial and Moore Parks?

Answer—

(1) The Government has established a Premier’s Working Party to formulate and report upon the implementation of a precinct parking management strategy. If the Eastern Distributor proceeds, a $5m contribution will be provided towards establishing a car park.

(2) (a) Moore Park Transport Committee is currently developing a strategy.

(b) Private sector funding with Government contribution.

(3) The Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust via the Moore Park Transport Committee is assessing a number of options to minimise the number of cars to the precinct which includes integrated ticketing, improved public transport and cycle ways.

*60. Mr Ryan asked:

Referring to Budget Paper No. 4, p. 48; Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust; Upgrading and Provision of Basic Facilities at Moore Park Golf Course:

It is noted that approximately $595,000 will be expended over 4 years upgrading facilities.

(1) What funds were raised from the sale of sand at Moore Park by the Trust in the last financial year?

(2) Were those funds applied to the upgrading of the Golf Course?

(3) If not, to what were those funds applied?

Answer—

(1) No funds were raised from the sale of sand at Moore Park by the Trust.
(2) N/A (see 1 above).

(3) A contract was let for the last redevelopment phase of the golf course to McKay and Sons which involved the:
- redevelopment of 4 fairways;
- redevelopment of championship tees
- establishment of 4 temporary greens
- redevelopment of 4 new greens and surrounds.

The reshaping of fairways which was carried out by a sub-contractor resulted in excess sand materials on site which was removed from the site at no cost to the Trust. The savings to the Trust in the overall project was in the order of $100,000 as machinery, materials and turfing costs of fairways were met by the subcontractor carrying out this component of the works.

61. Mr Ryan asked:

   In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; p. 400; Program 41; Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust-Investing Statement-Acquisition of property, plant and equipment:

   The revised figure for 1996/97 was $4,600,000. In 1997/98 the estimate is $23,315,000.

   (1) Why is there such a dramatic increase in this amount?

   (2) What items will be subject to this expenditure?

   Answer—

   (1) and (2) The Trust’s original capital program of $2.8 million for 1996-97 was revised to $4.6 million.

   This resulted from the Government providing an additional $2.1 million in 1996-97 to enable the stables area of the Showground to be redeveloped as an Equestrian Centre for businesses and individual riders. Work commenced in April 1997 following completion of the last Royal Easter Show to be held at the Paddington site.

   The 1997-98 capital program increases to $23.3 million, with $19.6 million allocated from the Consolidated Fund and the balance from Trust sources.

   The significant increase this year is a consequence of the special allocations of $18.6 million for Showground redevelopment works and $1.2 million for relocating the Frank Saywell kindergarten from land required for the Eastern Distributor.

   The Showground redevelopment works comprise $14 million for refurbishment of the Hordern Pavilion and the Royal Hall of Industries and $4.6 million for completing the Centennial Parklands Equestrian Centre.

   The remainder of the 1997-98 allocation will provide for further restoration of the Centennial Park Ponds, upgrading of Driver Avenue, and a range of tree planting, landscaping and minor works programs.
62. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Port Kembla Copper Smelter:

(1) Was the Director-General of the EPA quoted in the Hamilton Case in the Land and Environment Court on 29 May 1997, as having described the Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning’s decision to allow the upgraded/expanded copper smelter at Port Kembla to exceed EPA standards 150 times as “madness”?

(2) Did that description relate to the Minister’s approval of the first EIS for the project and or the second altered EIS?

(3) Was the EPA also quoted in that court case as having informed the Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning’s office that the EIS massively underestimated the lead emissions which would be produced by the upgraded/expanded copper smelter by a factor of 4 to 6?

(4) Did that underestimation relate to the first EIS for the project or the second altered EIS?

(5) Has the EPA stated in a document that the upgraded/expanded copper smelter will be the largest emitter of lead and sulphur dioxide pollution in NSW?

(6) Will the alterations to the EIS fail to eliminate these emissions?

(7) Did the consultants who produced the EIS produce reports in 1989 and 1993 documenting shallow and deep water table contamination and soil contamination not include that information in the EIS?

(8) Will the EPA issue a pollution licence to allow the smelter to produce contaminants in excess of normal EPA guidelines?

Answer—

(1) The EPA was not party to the Hamilton case and was not in attendance at Court and therefore is unable to comment on the accuracy of statements attributed to the Director-General of the EPA.

(2) The answer to question 1 relates to the Commission of Inquiry for the initial EIS.

(3) Again I am unable to comment on the accuracy of statements alleged to have been made in the Court.

(4) See answer to question 3.

(5) The EPA has not stated this. Various statements may have been made by EPA officers in internal working papers.

(6) Alterations to the proposal will lead to substantial reductions in expected lead and sulphur dioxide emissions compared to the initial EIS.

(7) The inclusion of information in the EIS is not within the responsibility of my portfolio and is a matter for the Department of Urban Affairs and Planning.
(8) The EPA has stated it will issue a licence which requires compliance with all the NSW Clean Air Act Regulation emission limits. No ambient air quality guidelines have formally been adopted for NSW. The relevant National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia guidelines for sulphur and lead were adopted at the time of the development proposal and the EPA licence will require that once the smelter is commissioned these goals will never be exceeded. In addition the EPA licence will require that the smelter be designed to meet the more stringent World Health Organisation goals and further require that these more stringent goals must be met most of the time.

**63. Mr Jones asked:**

In relation to Goonengerry Koala Sanctuary:

What negotiations are taking place with State Forests to set up the Goonengerry Koala Sanctuary so that your election promise may be fulfilled?

Answer—

This Government is currently working towards the establishment of a comprehensive, adequate and representative (CAR) reserve system in the State’s native forest. This process is the Comprehensive Regional Assessment and will also result in the finalisation of Regional Forest Agreements (RFA). The decision on the nature reserve in Goonengerry State Forest will be made as part of this larger process. The NPWS is currently undertaking assessment of conservation values in the State’s native forests and will be involved in developing options for the CAR reserve system. The NPWS is making a substantial commitment through its involvement in the Comprehensive Regional Assessment. State Forests NSW will be involved in the final decision for the CAR reserve system and the RFA.

**64. Mr Jones asked:**

In relation to the Koala Recovery Plan:

(1) Has any start has been made to the koala recovery plan as required under the Threatened Species Act?

Answer—

The koala is a vulnerable species under the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. Priority for recovery plan preparation is given by that Act to species listed as endangered nationally, endangered in NSW and then to vulnerable species. Consequently, no formal recovery team or recovery plan has been prepared for the koala at this stage.

However, given the high public profile of the koala, the NPWS is engaged in a number of initiatives as a precursor to the preparation of a recovery plan.
**65.** Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Marine Parks legislation:

(1) What resources are available this year to implement the Marine Parks legislation?

(2) Why was the legislation watered down from its original draft?

(3) (a) Who watered down the legislation?

(b) Under pressure from whom?

Answer—

(1) to (3) In respect of the 1997/98 financial year, the Government has provided an amount of some $1,200,000 in recurrent funds and some $400,000 in capital funds to enable initial management of the two marine parks to occur.

The legislation in its original draft form is the version that has been tabled in Parliament. There has been no ‘watering down’ of legislation and indeed this is not possible, other than through amendments to the Bill as part of the normal legislative process of which the Hon Richard Jones is a part.

**66.** Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Koala and Endangered Species Trust Fund:

(1) Does the annual report of the Zoological Parks Board of NSW 1995-96 provide a statement of income and expenditure of the Koala and Endangered Species Trust Fund which was established in 1992?

(2) Does the Trust consider applications for financial assistance by individuals and organisations for the conduct of research and conservation projects related to vulnerable, threatened or endangered species in NSW?

(3) (a) Was the income for 1995 $31,735?

(b) Was the income for 1996 $28,409?

(4) Why have no projects been approved to date?

(5) Have projects been submitted but not approved?

(6) (a) Will any projects be approved for 1997?

(b) If so, which ones?
Answer—

(1) The Trust is administered by the Zoological Parks Board of NSW and for administrative purposes the Trust’s Annual Report for 1995-96, including the statement of income and expenditure, is included as an appendix in the Board’s 1995-96 Annual Report.

(2) Pursuant to the Trust Deed the trustees hold the Trust Fund exclusively for the purpose of providing financial assistance to organisations and members of the public for the conduct of research and conservation of vulnerable, threatened or endangered species.

(3) (a) No, the total operating income for the Trust for the year ended 30 June 1995 was $31,751.

(b) No, the total operating income for the Trust for the year ended 30 June 1996 was $28,704.

(4) To date one project has been approved by the Trust. This project was approved in February 1997 and aims to assess genetic diversity, define conservation units and understand population processes in the koala by developing evolutionary relationships and levels of genetic variation.

(5) At the Trust’s February 1997 meeting a proposal was tabled for consideration. The trustees agreed that this proposal would be reviewed by the Project Committee at its next meeting in August 1997.

(6) (a) and (b) It is anticipated that further projects will be approved by the Trust in 1997. This will obviously be dependant on research proposals satisfying the Trust’s project approval criteria.

*67. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to food waste composting:

(1) What progress is being made in collecting food waste from markets, shops, restaurants, hospitals and Parliament House for converting into compost?

(2) How many new composting plants have been established in the environs of Sydney in the past 12 months?

(3) What is being done to assist their establishment?

Answer—

(1) to (3) The Government recognises that green waste, which includes garden, food and wood waste, is a major component of waste going to landfill, and diversion of this waste stream to reprocessing will be crucial in achieving the waste reduction target.

I have recently announced the successful applicants for grants under the Government’s Waste Reduction Program Grants Scheme, funded out of the Waste Planning and Management Fund. A total of $3.3 million has been allocated to 61 grant recipients including Waste Boards, local councils, community groups, industry, consultants and educational institutions.
Diversion of green waste was identified as a funding priority under these grants and 16 grants totalling $864,753 have been awarded for initiatives in the area of green waste reduction. Several of these have a focus on food waste.

In addition to the funding of initiatives to reduce green waste, the EPA is currently finalising the Government’s Green Waste Action Plan which identifies 52 actions to address the regulatory, economic, technical and information barriers which currently work against the diversion of green waste from landfill. The actions include clear guidance to waste boards to include green waste diversion targets and initiatives in regional waste plans and the identification of green waste as a funding priority for programs funded from the Waste Planning and Management Fund.

Other initiatives to support green waste reduction include the EPA Green Waste Reduction Grants which were awarded in late 1996 and funded by the EPA. Examples of projects relevant to food waste management include production of guidelines on how to set-up a mid-scale on-site composting system for garden and kitchen wastes, and trials of collection and processing of food and vegetable wastes from commercial premises such as supermarkets.

The Government’s own waste management service provider, Waste Service NSW, is also committed to contributing to the waste reduction effort by providing green waste reprocessing facilities. The Green Waste Action plan commits the Waste Service to establishing a $10.5 million state-of-the-art enclosed composting facility (operated by the private sector on contract to the Waste Service).

In November 1996, I opened the Waste Service’s new Eastern Creek Waste Composting Facility. The facility is part of a $4.5 million partnership with the private sector. It will produce a range of landscape and horticulture products including decorative mulches, compost products, soil mixes, organic top dressing and a range of products for cut flower and horticulture industries.

*68. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to South East Forests National Park:

(1) When will the extra 30,000 hectares be added to the South East Forests National Park?

Answer—

The Government’s forestry reform package announced on 23 September 1996 included the identification of 120,000 ha of national park in the South East Forests. 90,000 hectares was reserved immediately and has since been proclaimed. The remaining 30,000 hectares is to be confirmed through the Eden Comprehensive Regional Assessment.

*69. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Section 121 licences:

(1) Why has the issuing of Section 121 licences to shoot ducks risen since the ending of the duck season?

(2) Are shooters using the licensing system as a back door way to bypass the recreational shooting ban?
(3) Does the NPWS issue Section 121 licences to kill native wildlife on demand to whomever wishes to have them?

(4) If not, what proportion of licence applications are checked by officers to determine whether there is a genuine need as opposed to a desire to hunt native wildlife?

(5) (a) Does the NPWS charge for these licences on a cost recovery basis?

(b) If not, why not?

Answer—

(1) The last duck hunting open season was held in 1994. In 1993/94 513 Section 121 Occupiers licences were issued to rice farmers to cull ducks for damage mitigation over their crops. The number of licences issued in subsequent years were 1994/95 - 384; 1995/96 - 422 and 1996/97 - 966.

The reason for the increase in the demand for Occupier’s Licences may be a combination of:

(a) a consequence of increased NPWS community relations, enforcement and research activity to regulate and monitor duck culling in the rice growing districts with a greater awareness among ricegrowers of their responsibility to be legally licensed to cull ducks; and

(b) a possible increase in duck numbers and consequently greater pressure on rice growers as a consequence of there being no open seasons.

(2) The last open season in NSW was conducted in 1994 when 6407 shooters were licensed. During the 1993/94 rice growing season 3711 shooters were licensed to assist ricegrowers to cull ducks over rice fields to protect crops from damage by ducks. Shooters licensed in subsequent seasons were 1994/95 - 2800; 1995/96 - 3480 and 1996/97 - 3456. These figures show that there has been no increase in the number of shooters licensed to shoot over ricefields to assist in crop protection since open seasons for duck hunting were banned after the 1994 season.

(3) Section 121 Occupiers Licences are a mechanism to allow the owner or occupier of land to legally cull native fauna which are causing damage to pasture, crops or other property. The NPWS uses a combination of management techniques to assess the legitimacy of each individual application, including inspections, local knowledge, past records relating to the applicant and the property or locality concerned and culling limitations under management plans.

(4) The proportion of properties inspected prior to the issue of Section 121 licences depends on the species involved and the locality. In respect to the culling of macropods in the non-commercial zone for example, about 50 percent of properties are inspected; for flying-foxes almost all are inspected and for all other species combined, the inspection rate may be as high as ninety percent. With respect to ricefields and kangaroo culling in the commercial zone, the problems caused by the animals are well known and documented and Section 121 licences are issued on demand in accordance with management programs in force.

(5) (a) There has never been a charge on the issue of occupiers licences.

(b) The Section 121 provision was included in the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974 as a means of providing an avenue for owners or occupiers of land to legally cull animals which cause damage and/or economic loss. The NPWS believes that the licences should be issued as a free service to encourage
landholders to seek a licence. This improves the opportunity for the NPWS to liaise with landholders and to encourage conservation objectives as well as to regulate and monitor legal culling.

*70. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Flying Fox populations:

(1) What resources will the NPWS use in 1997 to check the status of Flying Fox populations?

(2) Are their populations declining or rising?

(3) Will the NPWS ensure funds are available for officers to make adequate checks of properties wishing to obtain a licence to shoot flying foxes?

(4) (a) Will NPWS officers make random unannounced spot checks at night to ensure that shooters abide by licence conditions?

(b) If not why not?

(5) What efforts are being made to end the shooting of flying foxes?

(6) (a) What percentage of orchards are now netted?

(b) What percentage of unnetted orchards do not seek a licence to shoot flying foxes?

Answer—

(1) The NPWS does not have a research program to monitor flying-fox populations. It often makes on ground assessments or seeks advice from interested local flying-fox support groups on numbers when management issues arise.

(2) While there is no reliable method for estimating flying-fox abundance, there is no evidence that any species of flying-fox has declined in recent times in NSW. The Grey-headed and Little Red Flying-foxes are regarded as common and widespread. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the population of the threatened Black Flying-fox may be increasing and its range expanding.

(3) Yes.

(4) (a) Yes.

(b) N/A.

(5) In order to gain a better understanding of the biology of flying-foxes and the options available for their management, in 1995 the National Parks and Wildlife Service commissioned a report by a noted expert on these animals, Ms Peggy Eby. Ms Eby consulted with the NSW Farmers’ Association and numerous other fruit grower
associations in the course of preparing the report which was released by the Service for public discussion early in 1996.

The observations and recommendations made by Ms Eby, such as the phasing out of the issue of culling licences, have subsequently been discussed with a wide range of community and professional groups, government departments and fruit industry groups. As a consequence of those discussions, the Service acknowledges that while exclusion netting has been found by some orchardists to be very effective against raids by flying-foxes, it is not the universal panacea as claimed by some sections of the community.

The Service, nevertheless, is continuing to promote the use of exclusion netting where this is appropriate and will support applications to appropriate bodies for funding of research into other means of protecting crops from flying-fox damage, such as proposed olfactory deterrents.

(6) The NPWS does not have figures available to answer this question.

*71. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to the Legal Section of the NPWS:

(1) How many staff are there in the legal section of the NPWS?

(2) What is the budget for this department?

(3) How many prosecutions have there been in the past 12 months?

(4) How much did each prosecution cost the Service?

(5) (a) Did the NPWS launch a prosecution on the illegal clear felling at Pine Creek State Forest authorised by State Forests?

(b) If not, why not?

Answer—

(1) 10 staff: 5 lawyers, 2 administrative staff & 3 law enforcement officers

(2) $700,000 to meet salaries and day to day operating costs. The Service accepts that because of the nature of the work provided, legal services and law enforcement costs are generally in excess of the amount allocated and additional costs are met as the need arises.

(3) During the last 12 months the Service has prosecuted 110 offences. Offences dealt with by infringement notice are in addition to this figure.

(4) The Service is unable to say as costs vary from case to case and prosecutions are not separately costed.

(5) (a) No
(b) The evidence did not disclose a breach of the licence conditions.

*72. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to diesel vehicle pollution:

(1) What is the EPA planning to do by way of regulation or otherwise to reduce particulate matter pollution from diesel vehicles?

Answer—

(1) The emissions from diesel vehicles are being addressed through:

New vehicle standards - as these are set at the national level, the EPA is pushing for the revision of the Australian Design Rule (ADR 70) relating to diesel emissions to more stringent standards. The current ADR 70 was introduced in 1995/96.

Inspection/Maintenance program - the EPA is working on extending the regular emission testing system used for petrol engined light vehicles to diesels. However, as there is no recognised short diesel emission test world wide, the EPA is currently researching a suitable short in-service test with the Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA).

Diesel Measure - through the National Environment Protection Council process, NSW is seeking to establish a diesel measure covering:

- reference to ADR 70 and any subsequent revision for diesel emissions;
- a short in-service test for diesel vehicles similar to those developed for petrol engined vehicles;
- a tighter fuel specification for diesel fuel.

Smoky vehicle enforcement program - the Government has recently announced the extension of the ‘smoky vehicle’ program by using both EPA and RTA officers to detect and take action on smoky vehicles, resulting in around 500 officers in NSW clamping down on smoky vehicles in NSW. Members of the public may also report smoky vehicles.

Alternative Fuels - in conjunction with the Commonwealth, the RTA and Sydney Buses, the EPA is undertaking an assessment of a range of alternative fuels such as Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG), Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) and ethanol blends (diesohol (15% ethanol in diesel) and petrohol (10% ethanol in petrol)) to determine their viability and environmental impact as replacements for either petrol or diesel in the NSW fleet.

*73. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Kangaroo Management:

(1) Did the Chairman of the Kangaroo Management Review Committee (KMRC) and the Regional Manager of the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS), Neil Ward, advise the kangaroo industry, at a meeting between the NPWS and the Kangaroo Industry Association (KIA), to lobby politicians to change the status of the kangaroo
management program from damage mitigation to a sustainable resource based program to allow for increased commercial kill?

(2) Is it your intention to turn kangaroos into just another agricultural resource or to maintain their status as protected native wildlife?

(3) Who made the decision to change a proportion of the quota this year to sustainable use?

(4) What discussion and public input took place before that decision was made?

(5) Will you submit to the skin industry’s pressure to allow skin only shooting, bearing in mind this facilitates the illegal skin trade?

(6) Can you explain why the offering of 500 illegal skins to Ray Davis was left off the minutes of the last meeting of the KMRC?

(7) Does the NPWS give priority to the interests of the commercial kangaroo industry over the conservation of kangaroos?

(8) Why are meetings held between Service officers and industry association people when no one representing conservation interests is present, for example the meeting held at Broken Hill on 6th February 1997?

Answer—

(1) No. The Kangaroo Industry Association was advised that amending the fundamental policy of the program was a political matter.

(2) To maintain their status as protected wildlife.

(3) No such decision has been made in NSW.

(4) N/A.

(5) The option of skin only shooting has not been excluded. As provided for in the Kangaroo Management Program, NPWS intends to allow this option only as a last resort.

(6) This hearsay matter was raised as an aside and had no bearing on the Kangaroo Management Review Committee deliberations.

(7) No.

(8) The 6 February meeting canvassed purely administrative matters relating to field operations.
*74. Mr Jones asked:

(1) Is the Minister aware of the review of the NSW Kangaroo Management Review Committee by Ross Shea of the Department of Land and Water Conservation which recommends that the kangaroo industry be the operator of the management program?

(2) Will this model be rejected for the management of kangaroos in this State?

Answer—

(1) No.

(2) As I have no knowledge of what the Department of Land and Water Conservation is doing I am unable to comment.

*75. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to aerial kangaroo surveying:

(1) Was there a review of the aerial survey methodology commissioned and received in 1996?

(2) Does that report recommend changes to improve the efficiency and accuracy of kangaroo population estimates?

(3) (a) Has funding been made available to implement those changes this year?

(b) If not, why not?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) (a) No.

(3) (b) Priority of available 1996/97 funds was directed to the development and implementation of a new centralised main-frame computer based licensing/monitoring system.

*76. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Red Kangaroo quota:

(1) When was it discovered that the quota for Red Kangaroos was overrun by 24,370 in six zones last year?
(2) Was the Minister informed of this overrun, which could have lead and may still lead to a successful challenge to the kangaroo management program in the Administrative Appeal Tribunal?

(3) How was the overrun allowed to happen?

Answer—

(1) In November 1996 it was anticipated that the grey and/or red kangaroo quota could be filled before the end of 1996.

(2) Yes.

(3) Monitoring quotas indicated a possible overrun towards the end of 1996 and action to close zones and cancel licences took longer than anticipated and resulted in the 4.8% overrun across 360,000 square kilometres of the State.

The overrun has been debited against the 1997 quota. The system for issuing licences and tags has been changed so that numbers cannot exceed the available quota.

*77. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Red Kangaroo quota:

(1) (a) Why was 67% of the Red Kangaroo Quota for 1997 issued in the first three months of this year in Bourke?

(b) Why was approximately 50% of the quota issued in the Lower Darling, Cobar and Griffith zone?

(2) Does this indicate that the industry in these areas will run out of quota half way through the year again and demand a bigger quota?

(3) Does the NPWS have sufficient resources to ensure that the quota will not be overrun in these areas?

Answer—

(1) (a) 67% of the quota was not issued. 38% of Bourke’s red kangaroo quota for 1997 was issued and 24% actually culled as at 31/3/1997.

(b) 50% of the quota was not issued. The red kangaroo quota issued for the Lower Darling, Cobar and Griffith zones was at 31/3/97: Lower Darling = 34% issued, 27% culled; Cobar = 32% issued, 23% culled; Griffith = 28% issued, 23% culled.

(2) These figures indicate the rate of cull is within acceptable limits for 1997 in these areas.

(3) Yes.
*78. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to fee increases:

(1) Why did the NPWS not get support for fee increases in order to fund new biologist and manager positions?

(2) Was this refusal of a fee increase a result of industry lobbying?

(3) Who made the decision and on what grounds?

(4) Why is the kangaroo industry in NSW still subsidised by taxpayers?

(5) When will the NPWS ensure that fees are increased so that they cover the costs of running kangaroo management in this state?

Answer—

(1) No fee increases have been sought, however NPWS is currently developing a proposal for the ongoing management of the kangaroo industry including a revision of the fee structure for my consideration.

(2) No decision has yet been made.

(3) No decision has yet been made.

(4) The kangaroo industry is not directly subsidised by taxpayers.

(5) Refer to Question 78 (1).

*79. Mr Jones asked:

In relation to Sydney Metropolitan Wildlife Services:

(1) Did the Minister launch a wildlife group known as Sydney Metropolitan Wildlife Services, NSW General Licence 1761, on 12th May 1997?

(2) Was this on the advice of Mr Jeff Hardy Manager of NPWS Wildlife Licencing Unit?

(3) Was the Minister advised that the Committee is made up of paid permanent ex-employees of the Wildlife Information and Rescue Service (WIRES)?

(4) (a) Are four of these being sued by WIRES?

(b) Have they been issued with subpoenas to produce all financial records before the Supreme Court?

(5) Are there allegations of misallocation and misappropriation of WIRES funds?
(6) Has a WIRES database been allegedly misappropriated from WIRES Head Office?

(7) Why has another wildlife rescue service been set up when two other rescue operations, Fund for Animals and SAFE Australia, have been consistently refused licences by the Wildlife Licencing Unit on the grounds that the Service had a policy of allowing only one volunteer wildlife rescue licence for native fauna in the area?

(8) Is there any connection with this new organisation and the rejection by WIRES of the NPWS Proposed Licensing Systems for Agriculture, Reptiles and Amphibians presented by Mr Jeff Hardy in July 1995?

Answer—

(1) Yes.

(2) No.

(3) No. I was informed that the new group arose from internal conflict within WIRES and the consequent mass resignation of a large proportion of the WIRES Sydney region membership.

(4) I am only aware of internal conflict within WIRES and that some legal proceedings were initiated.

(5) I am aware of allegations of misappropriation of funds within WIRES and that these allegations have or are being investigated within that organisation or by appropriate authorities.

(6) I have no knowledge of such an allegation.

(7) It is not correct that there is only one wildlife rescue licence for the Sydney area, or that the reason quoted was the reason that licence applications by some organisations may have been refused. All applications for licences under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974 are considered on their individual merits. Wildlife rehabilitation licences have been issued in Sydney for WIRES; the Australian Wildlife Ambulance Rescue Emergencies Inc (AWARE); The Kangaroo Protection Cooperative Inc and International Fund for Wildlife Australia; and, the Sydney Metropolitan Wildlife Service. A wildlife rehabilitation program is also managed by Taronga Zoo.

(8) No.

*80. Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper 2; page 4-106; Minister for the Environment:

The overview item states, “the increase in capital payments for Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust in 1997-98 reflects refurbishment of the Centennial Park Equestrian Centre and the Hordern Pavilion/Royal Hall of Industries.”

(1) Is the Centennial Park Equestrian Centre being operated on a user pays basis?

Answer—
(1) The Trust is investigating management options for the site. These include both in house and outsourced operations. The proposed redevelopment and future management of the stables will provide an opportunity for both individual owners and businesses to operate from the site. Call for proposals for the future management and further redevelopment of the site have recently been undertaken and are currently being evaluated.

Details of the operational and management requirements and the detailed design of the site are currently being determined in consultation with existing users of the site through the Stables Redevelopment Working Party. This process will be used to establish a fair return on the use of stable facilities by user groups.

*81 Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; page 356; Program 42; Summary of Average Staffing:

(1) Why are average staffing levels for the NPWS projected to decrease yet the number of National Parks has increased?

(2) Why are the average staffing levels for the EPA projected to decrease, yet employee related expenses have increased from $48.512 to $50.297 million?

Answer—

(1) Budget Paper No. 3 provides an average staffing level for the National Parks and Wildlife Service in respect of the 1996/97 and the 1997/98 financial years. The Hon R Jones is concerned at the apparent decrease in average staffing levels between the years at the same time as the Government has increased the number of national parks required to be managed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

This Government is proud of the fact that it has declared a greater number of new national parks than the target it set itself in its pre-election commitment to the environment. At the same time, our Government pledged that it would adequately resource the new parks and nothing has occurred to detract from this. Under the Government’s new parks initiative, we have increased the staffing levels of the National Parks and Wildlife Service by 142 staff. At the same time it has also had an increase in its Consolidated Fund allocation to meet the costs of managing the new areas.

In looking at the average staffing summary reported on page 356 of Budget Paper No. 3, it needs to be borne in mind that these numbers include the total staff employed within the National Parks and Wildlife Service, irrespective of the source of funds. While the Consolidated Fund, through the Environmental Trusts, has provided the additional staffing required to manage the new park areas, staff within the NPWS are also employed through the general recurrent allocation from the Consolidated Fund, the Capital Works Program and through funds obtained by the National Parks and Wildlife Service from sources external of Government.

During the year, a number of capital works projects within the NPWS were concluded. A result of this is that staff employed on those projects were released from employment. In examining the staffing levels of the NPWS, a number of staff are funded from funds obtained from the Commonwealth and other bodies for specific projects to be undertaken. Given that the nature and extent of such projects are often difficult to predict, the NPWS adopts a conservative approach in budgeting for the staffing impacts of such initiatives. There may ultimately be a difference between the estimated number and the actual number achieved over the course of a year. While a decrease is currently reflected, the provision of additional resources from external bodies could in fact result in an overall increase being achieved.
In preparing its budget each year, the Government is also required to ensure that services are provided across a broad spectrum and there is often a need to redirect resources from one area of its operations to another. In respect of the 1997/98 financial year, this has been no different. For the coming year, the Government has determined that agencies’ budget allocations were to be reduced to achieve efficiencies in the level of support functions undertaken as well as some across the board savings to enable scarce resources to be reallocated for the greatest overall benefit to the community. Nearly all Government agencies had reductions of these types applied and the NPWS was no exception.

The NPWS is currently examining ways to ensure that the savings are achieved in a manner that meets the government’s overall requirements for efficiencies in operation to be achieved. I have instructed the Director-General of the National Parks and Wildlife Service that the reductions are not to be made against the resources being provided for the establishment of new park areas. The NPWS expects that any reductions will occur in the area of support roles and functions.

(2) The reason for the budgeted increase in employee related costs is attributable to two factors:

(a) provision for a possible 3% wage rise in 1997/98 amounting to approximately $1.3 million; and

(b) provision of $0.5 million for salary progressions for staff who, under the EPA’s Consent Award, are remunerated within a salary band that is subject to annual review for progression to the next salary level.

*82 Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; page 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts:

(1) Can the Minister explain why there has been a decrease in staff of 32 (from 182 to 150), yet the outputs have remained virtually identical?

Answer—

EPA programs and related outcomes and outputs shown in the Budget Papers reflect the current EPA corporate plan and expected strategic direction for 1997/98. What needs to be understood however is that these programs do not mirror EPA functional structures, which remain substantially unchanged both in terms of staffing and resources.

Staffing and resources shown against EPA programs in the Budget Papers are a representation of equivalent staff time and resources necessarily required to meet the environmental demands, pressures and priorities expected to arise in 1997/98 against these programs. These demands are dynamic and subject to change and as a result, the resources required to deal with them do not always remain static from one year to the next.

Whilst there is a different expectation in terms of staff equivalent time to be spent against this program, the specified outputs shown under the program are expected to be achieved from within the allocated resources.

*83 Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; page 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts—Operating statement:
(1) Why have there been no grants to organisations?

Answer—

(1) At the time of preparation of the 1996/97 Budget Papers it was envisaged that the Environment Protection Authority would pay grants totalling $57,000 to Catchment Management Committees in the southern and northern regions of the State for worthwhile projects which arose during the year.

However, the funds were ultimately applied directly by the EPA to address environmental priorities during 1996/97 rather than being allocated as grants through Catchment Management Committees. It should be noted however that the Environment Protection Authority, via its regional operations, does provide substantial in kind resources each year in support of the activities of Catchment Management Committees.

*84 Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; page 371; Program 38.1.6; Managing Regional Cumulative Impacts—Operating statement:

(1) Why are there no user charges revenue for Ozone Protection Act licences?

Answer—

(1) The receipt of fees under the Ozone Protection Act 1989 and Ozone Protection Regulation 1991 commenced in early 1992. It was anticipated that approximately $300,000 would be received in the first year with a decrease of approximately 20% per subsequent year due to the resultant drop in consumption of CFC's over those years. As a result of the success of these measures, little to no fees are expected from this source in 1997/98 and the years thereafter.

*85 Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; page 396; Program 40.1.3; Interpretation, Education and Visitor Services:

The item shows that the number of visitors to Sydney Botanic Gardens, Mount Tomah Gardens and Mount Annan Gardens will all increase. The item also shows that the number of community education programs developed and implemented will decrease from 44 to 40.

(1) Why, given the increases in visitor number, will the number of community education programs developed and implemented decrease?

Answer—

The community education program is reviewed each year and modified according to public demand. In response to community evaluations and requests, programs have been extended and repeated, thereby providing the opportunity for considerably increased numbers of participants. However, some shorter programs have been incorporated into major programs thus reducing the number of overall programs being implemented. It should be noted that the total participation numbers are up on 1996 by over 50%.
Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; page 396; Program 40.1.3; Interpretation, Education and Visitor Services; Acquisition of property, plant and equipment:

(1) Why will this amount increase from $120,000 to $1.605 million?

Answer—

The increase in the acquisition of Property, Plant and Equipment for the Interpretation, Education and Visitor Services Program is due to proposed funding by sponsorship of a number of projects to improve visitor facilities and establish an Urban Greening Garden at Mount Annan Botanic Gardens.

Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; page 400; Program 41; Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust-Acquisition of property, plant and equipment:

(1) Why will this amount increase from $4.6 million to $23.315 million?

Answer—

(1) The Trust’s original capital program of $2.8 million for 1996-97 was revised to $4.6 million.

This resulted from the Government providing an additional $2.1 million in 1996-97 to enable the stables area of the Showground to be redeveloped as an Equestrian Centre for businesses and individual riders. Work commenced in April 1997 following completion of the last Royal Easter Show to be held at the Paddington site.

The 1997-98 capital program increases to $23.3 million, with $19.6 million allocated from the Consolidated Fund and the balance from Trust sources.

The significant increase this year is a consequence of the special allocations of $18.6 million for Showground redevelopment works and $1.2 million for relocating the Frank Saywell kindergarten from land required for the Eastern Distributor.

The Showground redevelopment works comprise $14 million for refurbishment of the Hordern Pavilion and the Royal Hall of Industries and $4.6 million for completing the Centennial Parklands Equestrian Centre.

The remainder of the 1997-98 allocation will provide for further restoration of the Centennial Park Ponds, upgrading of Driver Avenue, and a range of tree planting, landscaping and minor works programs.

Mr Jones asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3; page 401; Program 41.1.1; Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust-Operating Statement-Rents and leases:
(1) Why is there a decrease in the amount shown for this item from $2.042 to $1.355 million?

Answer—

(1) The reduction in revenue is due to a decline in car parking which is because of the relocation of the Royal Easter Show and the Royal Agricultural Society to Homebush.

*89 Mr Jones asked:

In relation to NPWS Officers and native birds:

(1) Has Mr Jeff Hardy, Manager of the NPWS Wildlife Licensing Unit received native birds directly from former members of WIRES?

(2) Are these birds included in his fauna record books?

(3) When was the last time Mr Hardy’s private aviary inspected by authorised officers of the NPWS?

(4) What species does Mr Hardy have in his aviary and do they include Major Mitchells and Glossy Black Cockatoos?

(5) Were these birds recorded in his fauna record books?

(6) Were any of these birds sold to other fauna dealers?

Answer—

(1) I am advised that Mr Hardy has not received native birds directly from former members of WIRES.

(2) N/A

(3) I am advised that Mr Hardy does not have any private aviaries and does not keep native birds.

(4) I am advised that Mr Hardy does not have possession of any native birds.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) I am advised that Mr Hardy is not a fauna dealer and has not sold any birds to fauna dealers.

*90 Mr Jones asked:

In relation to sex ratio shot kangaroos:
(1) Has the percentage of male kangaroos shot by the commercial industry reduced in recent years?

(2) What was the percentage of red kangaroo and grey kangaroo males shot in

(a) 1981?

(b) 1986?

(c) 1991?

(d) 1996?

(3) What was the average carcase weight of red kangaroo and grey kangaroo males shot in

(a) 1981?

(b) 1986?

(c) 1991?

(d) 1996?

(4) What was the average carcase weight of red kangaroo and grey kangaroo females shot in

(a) 1981?

(b) 1985?

(c) 1991?

(d) 1996?

(5) Is there a marked sexual dimorphism in kangaroos?

(6) Do shooters prefer large male kangaroos?

(7) Why is the percentage of males killed not much higher?

(8) What percentage of males shot would indicate that the population is in crisis?

Answer—

(1) Across all species the percentage of male kangaroos shot has been relatively stable and reduced only slightly from 67.7% in 1993 to 62.9% in 1996.
(2) The NPWS has only collected cull information by species, sex and weight since 1993.

   (a) N/A.

   (b) N/A.

   (c) N/A.

   (d) 64%

(3) (a) N/A.

   (b) N/A.

   (c) N/A.

   (d) 22.2 kg

(4) (a) N/A.

   (b) N/A.

   (c) N/A.

   (d) 15.6 kg

(5) While there may be some small differences in different age groups, there is no marked sexual dimorphism in kangaroos.

(6) Shooter preferences vary considerably, some taking near to 100% males and some around 50%, the majority range in between.

(7) Refer to (6).

(8) There is no scientific basis known to the NPWS, for establishing a relationship between the percentage of males shot and a population in crisis.

91. Mrs Forsythe asked:

   In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

   (1) How many people are employed in the Zoological Parks Board?

   (2) What proportion are full time and part time?
(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

In response to the Hon Mrs Forsythe’s questions on notice relating to the Zoological Parks Board of NSW referenced to the Budget Paper No. 2, p1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments I wish to advise that the Board will not receive Government funding in the 1997/98 year through this line item. Nevertheless I will answer the questions raised by the Hon Mrs Forsythe without reference to the nominated line item.

(1) The Zoological Parks Board of NSW is responsible for the operation of Taronga Zoo, Mosman and Western Plains Zoo, Dubbo. The Board employees 352 full time and part time employees and 139 casual employees. The equivalent full time number of employees is 340.

(2) Of the 352 full time and part time employees 321 are full time and 31 are part time.

(3) The Zoological Parks Board of NSW salaries and wages budget for the year ending 30 June 1998 is $15,340,000.

(4) Staff of the Zoological Parks Board of NSW are located at Taronga Zoo, Mosman and Western Plains Zoo, Dubbo.

(5) The majority of the Board’s staff are outdoor staff (e.g. keepers, horticulturalists, cleaners, work and trades technicians etc.). Taronga Zoo is 30 hectares in area and Western Plains Zoo is set on 300 hectares.

(6) The total budgeted running costs for Taronga Zoo in respect of the 1997/98 financial year are $23,606,000 and $6,301,000 for Western Plains Zoo.

*92. Mrs Forsythe asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Environment Protection Authority?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?
(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armidale</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>3,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buronga</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatswood</td>
<td>5,205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

(7) What is the replacement cost of the lab?

(8) Where are the country offices located?

(9) How many staff are employed in these country offices?

(10) How many staff are employed in the metropolitan offices?

Answer—

(1) The Equivalent Full-time Staff Number as at pay period ending 29/5/97 is 739 (funded through Consolidated Revenue) and 27 (externally funded). This figure includes temporary staff from agencies, staff on paid leave and Sewage Effluent Management Inquiry staff. It excludes Minister’s Office and Healthy Rivers Commission staff. The average staff level to date for the 1996/97 financial year is 714.4 (funded through Consolidated Revenue) and 27 (externally funded).

Note: Certain positions which are externally funded have been established as part of special projects (eg joint projects with other agencies).

(2) 5% of total staff are employed for less than 35 hours per week.

(3) The anticipated aggregate salaries for the EPA (excluding salary related overheads) for the 1996/97 financial year is $39.2 million. These figures do not include salary related costs for the Minister’s Office or the Healthy Rivers Commission.

(4) EPA offices are located at Albury, Armidale, Bankstown, Bathurst, Buronga, Chatswood, Dubbo, Gore Hill, Gosford, Gunnedah, Grafton, Griffith, Lidcombe, Manly, Moree, Murwillumbah, Muswellbrook, Newcastle, Penrith, Queanbeyan, Wollongong, and Wyong.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dubbo</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosford</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnedah</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moree</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murwillumbah</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muswellbrook</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queanbeyan</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James Centre</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyong</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,468m²</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: The above figure reflects the total area of office space occupied by the EPA in leased premises. It excludes the area occupied in Government buildings at the Lidcombe Laboratories Complex and the Lead Reference Centre at Gladesville and the Ecotoxicology Unit at the University of Technology Sydney campus at Gore Hill. This space is deemed primarily as laboratory space and only a small proportion is used for offices.

(6) In preparing the answer to this question, the EPA has interpreted the term “overheads” as meaning items such as rent, cleaning, outgoings, electricity/gas and car parking spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>42,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armidale</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>1,190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buronga</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatswood</td>
<td>2,655,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbo</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosford</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>42,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnedah</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidecombe</td>
<td>320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>58,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moree</td>
<td>12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murwillumbah</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muswellbrook</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>164,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queanbeyan</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St James Centre</td>
<td>90,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>179,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyong</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,039,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Overheads are not included for the Lead Reference Centre at Gladesville and the Ecotoxicology Unit at Gore Hill as these costs are not paid by the EPA by agreement with other authorities.

(7) In preparing the answer to this question, it is understood that the term “lab” refers to the EPA Chemistry Laboratory at Lidcombe.

The present day replacement cost of this Laboratory is estimated at $6.7 million, which is the insurance figure advised to the NSW Treasury Management Fund.

(8) EPA country offices are located at Albury, Armidale, Bathurst, Buronga, Dubbo, Gosford, Grafton, Griffith, Gunnedah, Moree, Murwillumbah, Muswellbrook, Newcastle, Queanbeyan, Wollongong and Wyong.

(9) As at pay period ending 29/5/97 there were 120 Equivalent Full-time staff members (funded through Consolidated Revenue) and 1 externally funded staff member employed in country offices (South Coast, Northern Region and Western Region).

(10) As at pay period ending 29/5/97 there were 619 Equivalent Full-time staff members (funded through Consolidated Revenue) and 26 externally funded staff members employed in metropolitan offices. Many of these staff perform functions directly relevant to the EPA’s non-metropolitan activities.
*1. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 511, 52 - Recurrent Services:

Will the Minister explain the increase in this amount from 1996/97 to 1997/98?

Answer—

The increase in 1997/98 is due to the carry forward of capital grants funding from 1996/97 for the Blue Mountains Urban Stormwater Run-off Project; an increase in Pensioner Concession Subsidy funding and an increase in Employee Related Expenses.

*2. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 511, Program 52, Summary of Average Staffing:

At what level will the extra 6 staff will be placed within the Department?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

*3. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 514, Program 52.1.1, Program Objectives:

(1) Does the Minister feel that the role of the General Manager has been clearly defined?

(2) If so, why have more than 30 General Managers been removed from their positions?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

*4. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 512, Program 52, Operating Statement - Expenses - Maintenance:

(1) Why was there such an increase in the budgeted amount in 1996/97 compared to the revised figure?
(2) What form did this maintenance take?

Answer—

(1) and (2) Expenses increased due to increased maintenance agreements for computer and related equipment.

*5. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 512, Program 52, Operating Statement - Expenses - Other Services:

(1) Why was there such a large increase in the Budgeted amount compared to the revised figure?

(2) Why was this increase not reflected in the budget for 1997/98?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

*6. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 513, Program 52, Capital program - Acquisition of property, plant and equipment:

(1) Why in 1996/97 was there no budgeted funding for this item when there was a revised figure of $150,000?

(2) What will the $40,000 budgeted for 1997/98 be spent on?

Answer—

(1) The Department self-funded an enhancement to its Local Area Network (LAN) with the agreement of Treasury and was able to commence the project during 1996/97 rather than wait until the 1997/98 year. The project will increase the availability of information on local government and will bring services in line with industry standards.

(2) As the LAN enhancement project is due to be completed in 1997/98, the $40K is the balance of this project.

*7. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 514, Program 52.1.1, Development, Oversight of and Assistance to Local Government:

Why has the number of new and simplified amendments to legislation and regulations introduced been halved?
Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

*8. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 514, Program 52.1.1, Operating Statement - Other operating expenses:

Why has there been a decrease in this amount when in 1996/97 the revised figure was higher than the budgeted figure?

Answer—

The 1996/97 Actual is an increase on the original budget due to a revised computer replacement program, associated with the LAN enhancement and several contingent commitments. The estimate for 1997/98 is in line with the original 1996/97 budget estimate.

*9. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 515, Program 52.1.1, Operating Statement - Grants from other organisations:

(1) Why is there no allowance for this amount in the 1997/98 budget?

(2) Why has this cut been made?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The funding shown under this line item was a grant from the Department of Industrial Relations for the employment of trainees under the Australian Traineeship Scheme. Although no further grants will be made available for the Scheme in 1997/98, the salary costs of trainees, currently 2 are employed, will be met from the Department budget allocation.

*10. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 516, Program 52.1.1, Investing Statement - Outflows - Acquisition of property, plant and equipment:

(1) Why has this amount been reduced in 1997/98 from the revised figure for 1996/97?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.
11. Mr Gay asked:

(1) Were all complaints received by the Department of Local Government concerning local councils during 1996/97 processed?

(2) What action has been undertaken by the Department or the Minister with respect to each complaint?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard. Pages from the Department’s Schedule of Complaints, showing the number and nature of complaints and a graphic depiction, were tabled.

12. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 514, Program 52.1.1, Development, Oversight of and Assistance to Local Government - Outputs:

(1) Why is a 50% decrease in Regulatory determinations expected in 1997/98?

(2) Why is there such a large decrease when there was a large increase the year before?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

13. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 512, Program 52, Operating Statement - Expenses - Employee related:

Why is employee related expenditure for 1997/98 an extra $492,000 for 15 less staff than were employed by the Department in 1994/95?

Answer—

This question was asked in Committee and the Minister was provided with a copy of the 1994/95 Budget Paper No 3, page 370, to clarify question.

On reviewing the information provided by Messrs Gay and Kersten with the 1997/98 Budget Papers, the discrepancy questioned cannot be found.

The copy of Budget Paper No 3 provided by Messrs Gay and Kersten shows the estimate for 1994/95 staffing for the Department as 145, with the estimated Employee Related Expenses being $8,623,000. The 1997/98 Budget Papers show the estimate for 1997/98 staffing as 131 with the estimated Employee Related Expenses being $8,043,000.
*14. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 512, Program 52, Operating Statement - Expenses - Other services:

Is the estimate of $45,000 correct, considering the same estimate was made in last year’s budget but the revised figure blew out to $212,000, an increase of 317%?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

*15. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 512, Program 52, Operating Statement:

(1) Is the new 1% development consent levy to be charged by Sydney City Council another new tax?

(2) How much will the 1% levy raise for Sydney City Council?

(3) How much was raised by the old Section 94 contributions?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

*16. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 514, Program 52.1.1, Development, Oversight of and Assistance to Local Government - Outputs:

(1) How many members of the Department’s staff were assigned to work on the City of Sydney Amendment Bill Working Party?

(2) What was the cost of conducting this work?

(3) Was a member of staff conducting an economic impact statement of the Bill?

(4) What were the results of this work?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.
*17. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 511, Program 52:

Has the Minister referred all complaints against Councillors regarding their pecuniary interests to the Local Government Pecuniary Interests Tribunal?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

*18. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No. 3, p. 514, Program 52.1.1, Development, Oversight of and Assistance to Local Government:

(1) Can the Minister explain the lack of response to some complaints made to the Department over the past 12 months?

(2) How many complaints remain unresolved?

Answer—

Answered in Committee and recorded in Hansard.

*19. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What was the total amount spent by each of your Departments in 1996-97 on:

(a) catering and entertainment of any form;

(b) travel and accommodation of any form; and

(c) the provision and maintenance of indoor and outdoor plants and garden products?

Answer—

Any expenditure on these items is required to be approved in line with the relevant Treasurer’s Directions and Departmental expenditure and accounting procedures.
20. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by your Department(s):

(1) How many bodies exist whose function is, or includes, the supervision or evaluation of the administration of the functions of Programs administered by your Department(s)?

(2) What is the estimated total cost of operating such bodies?

Answer—

(1) and (2) As is the case in all Westminster systems, Minister’s are accountable to the Parliament for the administration of their portfolios. Further, Departments and agencies are subject to the scrutiny of bodies such as the Auditor General, Independent Commission Against Corruption and the Ombudsman. The Budget Papers show the cost of the State’s administration.

21. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What official travel has been undertaken by persons employed by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97, and at what cost?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Officer</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Benefit to taxpayer of trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) What leave was taken by officers so travelling prior to them returning to the origin of their trip?

Answer—

(1) Official travel undertaken by persons employed in Departments is required to be in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Premier’s Department. In relation to official overseas travel, the details of overseas visits and their purposes is required to be published in each Department’s Annual Report.

(2) Requests to undertake private leave while undertaking overseas travel are not encouraged and are subject to Ministerial approval.
22. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s), how many officers are employed as members of the Senior Executive Service, and at what grade and salary band are each employed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES grade</th>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Number of Officers Employed in 1996-97</th>
<th>Number of Officers expected to be Employed in 1997-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

Each Department is required to publish in their Annual Report the number of executive positions at each level for the current and previous year.

23. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1996-97:

(a) What expenditure occurred on advertising in all forms?

(b) Why was such advertising considered necessary?

(c) What was the cost of each such advertising campaign?

(d) Which advertising agencies were awarded the contract for each campaign?

(e) In which media outlets was advertising conducted, and what was the total cost of advertising in each individual media outlet?

(2) In relation to each of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s) in 1997-98, what is the total anticipated expenditure on advertising in all forms?

Answer—

(1) (a-e) and (2) Advertising by Government Departments is required to be undertaken in line with guidelines on advertising and subject to the expenditure controls of each Department and as issued through Treasurer’s Directions from time to time.
*24. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What salary increases have been agreed to in relation to any of the staff employed by any of the Programs administered by each of your Department(s)?

(2) (a) How many employees will receive such salary increases in 1997-98?

(b) When are such salary increases expected to be first paid?

(3) What additional allocation has been made to provide for such salary increases?

Answer—

(1) and (2) In general wages and salaries move in line with the relevant public sector industrial instruments and, where relevant, the annual determination of the Statutory and Other Offices Remuneration Tribunal.

(3) The Government’s forecasts in relation to wage growth and it’s funding are set out at page 12 of the Budget Summary.

*25. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) (a) What expenditure was made in 1996-97 for refurbishing, upgrading or relocating offices occupied by officers of the Departments administered by you?

(b) What expenditure has been allocated in 1997-98 for these purposes?

(2) (a) Which particular offices were refurbished, upgraded or relocated in 1996-97?

(b) In 1997-98 how many officers worked in offices which were refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

(3) (a) Which offices will be refurbished or relocated in 1997-98?

(b) In 1997-98 how many officers are employed in offices which will be refurbished, upgraded or relocated, in Departments administered by you?

Answer—

(1) to (3) The refurbishment, upgrading or relocation of offices are required to be made in line with relevant guidelines and from appropriate budget allocations.
26. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments-Other:

(1) What specific projects in Departments administered by the Treasurer were provided with capital or recurrent funding in 1996-97, and which will be provided with such funding in 1997-98, which would not have been funded but for the fact that the Olympic Games will be held in Sydney in the year 2000?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Start Date/Completion Date</th>
<th>Total cost of Project</th>
<th>Total allocation to the Project 1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer—

New initiatives impacting on current outlays are detailed in Budget Paper No. 2, Chapter 1, page 33.

27. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many staff members have been:

(1) assigned duties directly in support of your Ministerial Office; or

(2) seconded from Departments administered by you to your personal Ministerial Office in 1996-97?

Answer—

(1) and (2) It is required that staff temporarily employed and seconded to provide assistance in Ministerial Offices are engaged in accordance with the guidelines and procedures of the Premier’s Department relating to Ministerial staff. These staff, except those performing functions of Departmental Liaison Officers, are required to be paid for from the global budget allocation for each Minister’s Office.

28. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) How many Boards and Committees exist in the portfolios administered by you?

(2) How does this number compare with 1994-95 and 1995-96?

(3) How many people serve on those Boards and Committees?
(4) How many members of those Boards and Committees are remunerated, and what is the total cost of such remuneration for each Board and Committee?

(5) How many public servants are serving in an *ex officio* capacity?

(6) How many members of those Boards and Committees are female; Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, of a non-English-speaking background, or disabled?

(7) How do these figures compare with one year and two years ago?

Answer—

(1) Premier’s Department database contains records of some 680 government boards and committees. The database does not contain information on the large number of small trusts administered by the Department of Land and Water Conservation and the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

(2) The database does not contain historical information on the number of boards and committees.

(3) There are approximately 6,000 people serving on the 680 boards and committees registered on the Premier’s Department database.

(4) A third of all members of boards and committees are remunerated. This remuneration may be either daily sitting fees or an annual fee. Premier’s Memorandum 93-43 set the guidelines for the categorisation of boards and committees and remuneration of executive directors and part time members. Remuneration levels for chairpersons and members of boards and committees were determined by the former Government in 1993. Remuneration levels are based on surveys of fees for non-executive chairpersons and directors of major Australian corporations, as well as movements in the CPI.

(5) Details of public servants serving on committees and significant statutory bodies are required to be included in each Department’s Annual Report.

(6) Currently, twenty seven per cent of all people serving on boards and committees are women. For the other categories of people statistical information is only available for 1918 members. Of these 3.3% who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Island people, 11% are, people from a non-English speaking background and 5% have disabilities. Board and committee members are not obliged to disclose this information.

(7) The statistical data for members of boards and committees was collected for the first time in July, 1996.

*29. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) What expenditure savings have Departments administered by you achieved in 1996-97 pursuant to the Premier’s memorandum of 25 July 1996 (No. 96-13) to fund the announced “$100 million increase to the health budget”? 

From which particular programs have such savings been achieved?

Answer—

(1) and (2) The Council on the Cost of Government’s Corporate Services Benchmarking Study model was used to derive $27 million of cost savings in corporate services announced in the recent budget. Other savings were achieved in the area of the procurement of goods and services.

*30. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

What savings have Departments administered by you contributed to the corporate services efficiency project outlined in the Government’s 1995 Financial Statement in each of the years 1995-96 and 1996-97?

Answer—

The cross portfolio savings for corporate services is outlined in Budget Paper No 2, Chapter 1, page 42.

*31. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In implementing the Government’s policy of prohibiting involuntary redundancy (which was noted in the Auditor-General’s Report to Parliament, 1997 Volume One, at page 17), how many employees are currently employed by the Department, by classification and salary, whose positions have been declared redundant?

(2) What has been the cost to date, and what is the total anticipated cost, of retaining these employees until such time as they elect to accept voluntary redundancy, or until they can be re-deployed?

Answer—

The Government’s policy on managing displaced employees is set out in Premier’s Memorandum 96-5 and PEO Circular 96-34. The focus of this policy is on redeployment of officers. Each Department or agency is now responsible for providing support and assistance, including financial assistance, to voluntary redundancy clients. Additional Budget funding is available in certain cases.

*32. Mr Gay asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p. 1-13, Departmental Payments - Other:

How many Rural Impact Studies have been completed in relation to policy initiatives undertaken by Department(s) under your administration?
(1) in the period 25 March 1995 to 30 June 1996;

(2) in the period 1 July 1996 to date; and

(3) specifically in relation to programs contained in the 1997 Budget?

Answer—

(1) to (3) Premier’s Memorandum 96-13 sets out the circumstances in which Rural Communities Impact Statements are to be prepared. Guidelines for the Preparation of Rural Communities Impact Statements were formally launched on 10 March, 1997. More than 600 copies have now been supplied to a wide range of government agencies, community and industry groups, and individuals.

The new requirements have raised awareness of rural concerns within Government. They have helped bring about a cultural change whereby rural impacts are considered in the development of a proposal rather than as an afterthought.

*33. Mr Gay asked:

In relation to Budget Paper No.2, p. 1-13; Departmental Payments - Other:

(1) In respect of the year 1996-97:

   (a) What was the total rent paid on offices rented by Departments administered by you?

   (b) What was the total floor space of offices rented by Departments administered by you?

(2) (a) Were any such rented offices not occupied during the year 1996-97?

   (b) If so, what was the total rent paid on them, and what was their floor space?

(3) (a) Were any offices owned by the Departments administered by you, or publicly owned and under the control of your Departments, not occupied during the year 1996-97?

   (b) If so, what was their floor space?

Answer—

(1) to (3) Office accommodation expenses generally appear under each Department’s financial statements in their Annual Reports. Assets, such as buildings, also appear in financial statements of Departments in their Annual Reports.

*34. Mr Kersten asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:
(1) How many people are employed in the Local Government Department?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?

Answer—

(1) As at 31 May, 1997, 127 actual staff were employed.

(2) 122 staff were employed on a full time basis and 5 on a part time basis which equates to an EFT staffing level of 124.

(3) Aggregate of salaries paid - $5,524,519

(4) Staff are located at Bankstown and Sydney CBD.

(5) Bankstown - 3,090.9 m².
    Sydney, CBD - 373.8 m²

(6) Bankstown - $1,514,475 as at 31 May, 1997
    Sydney, CBD - $151,761 as at 31 May, 1997

*35. Mr Kersten asked:

In reference to Budget Paper No 2, p 1-13, Table 1.6; Departmental Payments:

(1) How many people are employed in the Local Government Boundaries Commission?

(2) What proportion are full time and part time?

(3) What is the aggregate of salaries paid?

(4) Where are the staff located?

(5) What is the area of floor space occupied in each separate location?

(6) What are the overheads in each separate location?
Answer—

No staff are employed in the Local Government Boundaries Commission. Commissioners are appointed for a term and paid a set retainer. The Commission is supported by the Department on a needs basis. No officer is allocated to the Commission on a full time basis.
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