

Water, Property and Housing – Responses to Supplementary Questions

Hearing: Tuesday 10 March 2020

Question #	Question #	Response
	NSW Coastal Dredging Strategy	
1	<p>1. How much of the NSW Coastal Dredging Strategy has been distributed to date?</p> <p>(a) Which Councils have applied?</p> <p>(b) Which Councils applications have been successful?</p> <p>(c) Which Council's applications have been rejected?</p> <p>(d) How much to which electorates?</p>	<p>The NSW Coastal Dredging Strategy provides an outline of dredging investment priorities and in itself is not a funding package. The Rescuing our Waterways (ROW) program is available to local coastal Councils to help improve the accessibility and environmental health of the state's waterways. Since 2012, when the program began, around \$8.0M has been committed across six rounds.</p> <p>The responses below are in relation to funding requests under the Rescuing Our Waterways program since it commenced in 2013. In some cases, Councils submitted multiple applications under the program.</p> <p>a) Wyong Shire Council (now Central Coast Council), Waringah Council, Sutherland Shire Council, Shoalhaven City Council, Shellharbour City Council, Port Macquarie-Hastings Council, Nambucca Shire Council, MidCoast Council, Hunter's Hill Council, Hornsby Shire Council, Greater Taree City Council (now MidCoast Council), Great Lakes Council (now MidCoast Council), Gosford Council (now Central Coast Council), Georges River Council, Eurobodalla Shire Council, Coffs Harbour City Council, Central Coast Council, Bellingen Shire Council, Ballina Shire Council.</p> <p>b) Port Macquarie-Hastings Council, Great Lakes Council (now MidCoast Council), Wyong Shire Council (now Central Coast Council), Eurobodalla Shire Council, Gosford</p>

Council (now Central Coast Council), Shoalhaven City Council, Nambucca Shire Council, Sutherland Shire Council, MidCoast Council, Central Coast Council, Ballina Shire Council, Georges River Council, Hornsby Shire Council, MidCoast Council, Coffs Harbour City Council, Shellharbour City Council

c) Ballina Shire Council, Great Lakes Council (now MidCoast Council), Wyong Shire Council (now Central Coast Council), Gosford Council (now Central Coast Council), Central Coast Council, Waringah Council, Shoalhaven City Council, Eurobodalla Shire Council, Bellingen Shire Council, Hunter's Hill Council.

d)

Ballina	\$230,000
Coffs Harbour	\$95,000
Oxley	\$10,000
Port Macquarie	\$375,000
Myall Lakes	\$1,080,000
Port Stephens	\$2,450,000
Wyong	\$67,000
The Entrance	\$1,025,000
Gosford	\$1,250,000
Hornsby	\$45,000
Cronulla	\$300,000
Oatley	\$100,000
Heathcote	\$225,000
Shellharbour	\$15,000
South Coast	\$740,000
Bega	\$57,000

2

2. How are waterways selected to be included on the NSW Coastal Dredging Strategy?

(a) What criteria are used to select:

i. Key Investment Locations (north to south)

ii. Priority Regional Locations (north to south)?

(b) Why is The Entrance Channel not include in either of these categories?

Waterways are included in the Coastal Dredging Strategy based upon the criteria referred to below.

(a) The criteria are clearly described in the Maritime Infrastructure Plan and in the Coastal Dredging Strategy.

i. Key Investment Locations were determined through multi-criteria analysis to evaluate the relative strategic importance of each location combining the economic performance and potential with the assessment of alignment to broader

government policy priorities and directions. This analysis focussed on commercial fishing and aquaculture, tourism, recreational boating, overall economic performance, demographic trends and growth, safety, and environmental considerations.

ii. Priority Regional Locations are navigational channels providing access to state owned maritime infrastructure that are not already included as Key Investment Locations.

(b) The Entrance to Tuggerah Lake is classified as a local waterway as it does not meet the criteria of a key investment location under the Maritime Infrastructure Plan, nor the criteria to be a priority waterway under the Coastal Dredging Strategy. There is no state-owned maritime infrastructure within the waterway and therefore Council is responsible for navigational dredging and is eligible for funding under the Rescuing our Waterways program for this purpose.

NSW Government property sales by Local Government Area

3

3. How many government properties have been sold in the following local Government Areas since FY2011-2012 to date and what was is the total value of these sales?

- (a) Albury
- (b) Armidale Regional Council
- (c) Ballina Shire
- (d) Balranald Shire
- (e) Bathurst
- (f) Bayside Council
- (g) Bega Valley Shire
- (h) Bellingen Shire
- (i) Berrigan Shire
- (j) Blacktown, City of
- (k) Bland Shire
- (l) Blayney Shire
- (m) Blue Mountains
- (n) Bogan Shire
- (o) Bourke Shire
- (p) Brewarrina Shire
- (q) Broken Hill, City of
- (r) Burwood Council
- (s) Byron Shire
- (t) Cabonne Shire
- (u) Camden Council
- (v) Campbelltown, City of
- (w) Canada Bay, City of
- (x) Canterbury-Bankstown
- (y) Carrathool Shire

See Appendix 12.

(z) Central Coast Council
(aa) Central Darling Shire
(bb) Cessnock
(cc) Clarence Valley Council
(dd) Cobar Shire
(ee) Coffs Harbour
(ff) Coolamon Shire
(gg) Coonamble Shire
(hh) Cootamundra-Gundagai
(ii) Cowra Shire
(jj) Cumberland Council
(kk) Dubbo Regional Council
(ll) Dungog Shire
(mm) Edward River Council
(nn) Fairfield
(oo) Federation Council
(pp) Forbes Shire
(qq) Georges River Council
(rr) Gilgandra Shire
(ss) Glen Innes Severn Council
(tt) Goulburn Mulwaree
(uu) Greater Hume Shire
(vv) Griffith, City of
(ww) Gunnedah Shire
(xx) Gwydir Shire
(yy) Hawkesbury, City of
(zz) Hay Shire
(aaa) Hills Shire
(bbb) Hilltops Council
(ccc) Hornsby Shire
(ddd) Hunter's Hill
(eee) Inner West Council
(fff) Inverell Shire
(ggg) Junee Shire
(hhh) Kempsey Shire
(iii) Kiama
(jjj) Ku-ring-gai Council
(kkk) Kyogle Council
(lll) Lachlan Shire
(mmm) Lake Macquarie
(nnn) Lane Cove
(ooo) Leeton Shire
(ppp) Lismore
(qqq) Lithgow
(rrr) Liverpool
(sss) Liverpool Plains Shire
(ttt) Lockhart Shire
(uuu) Maitland, City of
(vvv) Mid-Coast Council
(www) Mid-Western Regional
(xxx) Moore Plains Shire
(yyy) Mosman Council
(zzz) Murray River Council
(aaaa) Muswellbrook Shire
(bbbb) Nambucca Shire
(cccc) Narrandera Shire
(dddd) Narrabri Shire
(eeee) Narromine Shire
(ffff) Northern Beaches Council

(gggg) North Sydney Council
(hhhh) Oberon Shire
(iiii) Orange, City of
(jjjj) Parkes Shire
(kkkk) Parramatta Council
(llll) Penrith
(mmmm) Port Macquarie-Hastings Council
(nnnn) Port Stephens Council
(oooo) Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional council
(pppp) Randwick
(qqqq) Richmond Valley Council
(rrrr) Ryde
(ssss) Singleton Council
(tttt) Shellharbour
(uuuu) Shoalhaven
(vvvv) Snowy Monaro Regional Council
(wwww) Snowy Valleys Council
(xxxx) Strathfield
(yyyy) Sutherland Shire
(zzzz) Sydney
(aaaa) Tamworth Regional Council
(bbbb) Temora Shire
(cccc) Tenterfield Shire
(dddd) Tweed Shire
(eeee) Upper Hunter Shire
(ffff) Upper Lachlan Shire
(ggggg) Uralla Shire
(hhhhh) Wagga Wagga
(iiiiii) Walcha Shire
(jjjjj) Walgett Shire
(kkkkk) Warren Shire
(lllll) Warrumbungle Shire
(mmmmm) Waverley Council
(nnnnn) Weddin Shire
(ooooo) Wentworth Shire
(ppppp) Willoughby
(qqqqq) Wingecarribee Shire
(rrrrr) Wollondilly Shire
(sssss) Wollongong
(ttttt) Woollahra
(uuuuu) Yass Valley Council

4

4. Of these properties, identify what properties were land and Housing Corporation properties in the following Local Government Areas since FY2011-12 to date?

- (a) Albury
- (b) Armidale Regional Council
- (c) Ballina Shire
- (d) Balranald Shire
- (e) Bathurst
- (f) Bayside Council
- (g) Bega Valley Shire
- (h) Bellingen Shire
- (i) Berrigan Shire
- (j) Blacktown, City of
- (k) Bland Shire
- (l) Blayney Shire
- (m) Blue Mountains
- (n) Bogan Shire
- (o) Bourke Shire
- (p) Brewarrina Shire
- (q) Broken Hill, City of
- (r) Burwood Council
- (s) Byron Shire
- (t) Cabonne Shire
- (u) Camden Council
- (v) Campbelltown, City of
- (w) Canada Bay, City of
- (x) Canterbury-Bankstown
- (y) Carrathool Shire
- (z) Central Coast Council
- (aa) Central Darling Shire
- (bb) Cessnock
- (cc) Clarence Valley Council
- (dd) Cobar Shire
- (ee) Coffs Harbour
- (ff) Coolamon Shire
- (gg) Coonamble Shire
- (hh) Cootamundra-Gundagai
- (ii) Cowra Shire
- (jj) Cumberland Council
- (kk) Dubbo Regional Council
- (ll) Dungog Shire
- (mm) Edward River Council
- (nn) Fairfield
- (oo) Federation Council
- (pp) Forbes Shire
- (qq) Georges River Council
- (rr) Gilgandra Shire
- (ss) Glen Innes Severn Council
- (tt) Goulburn Mulwaree
- (uu) Greater Hume Shire
- (vv) Griffith, City of
- (ww) Gunnedah Shire
- (xx) Gwydir Shire
- (yy) Hawkesbury, City of
- (zz) Hay Shire
- (aaa) Hills Shire
- (bbb) Hilltops Council

See Appendix 13.

(ccc) Hornsby Shire
(ddd) Hunter's Hill
(eee) Inner West Council
(fff) Inverell Shire
(ggg) Junee Shire
(hhh) Kempsey Shire
(iii) Kiama
(jjj) Ku-ring-gai Council
(kkk) Kyogle Council
(lll) Lachlan Shire
(mmm) Lake Macquarie
(nnn) Lane Cove
(ooo) Leeton Shire
(ppp) Lismore
(qqq) Lithgow
(rrr) Liverpool
(sss) Liverpool Plains Shire
(ttt) Lockhart Shire
(uuu) Maitland, City of
(vvv) Mid-Coast Council
(www) Mid-Western Regional
(xxx) Moore Plains Shire
(yyy) Mosman Council
(zzz) Murray River Council
(aaaa) Muswellbrook Shire
(bbbb) Nambucca Shire
(cccc) Narrandera Shire
(dddd) Narrabri Shire
(eeee) Narromine Shire
(ffff) Northern Beaches Council
(gggg) North Sydney Council
(hhhh) Oberon Shire
(iiii) Orange, City of
(jjjj) Parkes Shire
(kkkk) Parramatta Council
(llll) Penrith
(mmmm) Port Macquarie-Hastings
Council
(nnnn) Port Stephens Council
(oooo) Queanbeyan-Palerang
Regional council
(pppp) Randwick
(qqqq) Richmond Valley Council
(rrrr) Ryde
(ssss) Singleton Council
(tttt) Shellharbour
(uuuu) Shoalhaven
(vvvv) Snowy Monaro Regional
Council
(wwww) Snowy Valleys Council
(xxxx) Strathfield
(yyyy) Sutherland Shire
(zzzz) Sydney
(aaaaa) Tamworth Regional
Council
(bbbbb) Temora Shire
(ccccc) Tenterfield Shire
(ddddd) Tweed Shire
(eeeee) Upper Hunter Shire

	<p>(ffff) Upper Lachlan Shire (gggg) Uralla Shire (hhhh) Wagga Wagga (iiii) Walcha Shire (jjjj) Walgett Shire (kkkk) Warren Shire (IIII) Warrumbungle Shire (mmmmm) Waverley Council (nnnn) Weddin Shire (oooo) Wentworth Shire (pppp) Willoughby (qqqq) Wingecarribee Shire (rrrr) Wollondilly Shire (ssss) Wollongong (tttt) Woollahra (uuuu) Yass Valley Council</p>	
	Social Housing	
5	<p>5. The Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute has identified a current social housing shortfall of 137,000 properties in NSW. Please provide clarification;</p> <p>(a) The current number of social housing properties in NSW;</p> <p>i. Public ii. Community iii. Indigenous</p> <p>(b) How many social housing properties were available for tenancy in 2018-19?</p> <p>(c) How many social housing properties were available for tenancy in 2017-18?</p> <p>(d) How many social housing properties are available 2019-2020 or to current?</p>	<p>(a) i-iii Data for 2019-20 financial year will not be available until Q1 2020/21. Refer to: https://public.tableau.com/profile/facs.statistic/s#!/vizhome/Social_Housing_Residential_Dwellings/Dashboard</p> <p>(b)</p> <p>i. Public: 100,623 ii. Community: 41,629, which includes 27,311 owned by LAHC iii. Indigenous: 9,576 (4591 managed by Aboriginal Housing Office; 4985 managed by Indigenous Community Housing)</p> <p>(c)</p> <p>i. Public: 111,341 ii. Community: 30,757, which includes 17,278 owned by LAHC iii. Indigenous: 9574 (4603 managed by Aboriginal Housing Office; 4971 managed by Indigenous Community Housing)</p> <p>(d) Data for 2019-20 financial year will not be available until Q1 2020/21. Refer to: https://public.tableau.com/profile/facs.statistic/s#!/vizhome/Social_Housing_Residential_Dwellings/Dashboard</p>
	Community Housing	

6	<p>6. The Communities Plus Program – please provide information regarding how many additional social housing properties are currently available as part of the Communities Plus Program?</p> <p>(a) What Commitment has the Government made under Communities Plus in terms of additional social housing stock?</p> <p>(b) Understand that Communities Plus has a 10 year time frame; please provide information of the number of new social housing properties since the implementation to current?</p> <p>(c) Please further identify;</p> <p>i. Social Housing properties /dwellings</p> <p>ii. Affordable Housing /dwellings</p> <p>iii. Private dwellings</p> <p>(d) What is the estimated profits from private developers have earned to date from the Communities Plus program?</p>	<p>As at February 2020 there has been a total of 1,748 dwellings delivered under the Future Directions program.</p> <p>a) The Future Directions program indicated that 23,000 new and replacement social housing would be committed over the 10 year timeframe.</p> <p>b) Since 1 July 2016 to 29 February 2020 LAHC has completed 1,748 new social homes.</p> <p>c) i. As at February 2020 there have been 3,868 social housing commitments</p> <p>ii. As at February 2020 there have been 420 affordable housing commitments</p> <p>iii. As at February 2020 there have been 7,633 private dwelling commitments</p> <p>d) This information is not available.</p>																																		
Sirius Building Sale																																				
7	<p>7. Please provide a breakdown of how and where the \$150million received from the Sirius Building has been delivered into new social housing projects?</p>	<p>Net proceeds from the Sirius sale is forecast to deliver approximately 352 dwellings in the following suburbs:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="815 1115 1423 1709"> <thead> <tr> <th>Suburb</th> <th>Number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Sefton</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr><td>Warwick Farm</td><td>52</td></tr> <tr><td>Campsie</td><td>28</td></tr> <tr><td>St Marys</td><td>26</td></tr> <tr><td>Chester Hill</td><td>20</td></tr> <tr><td>Padstow</td><td>17</td></tr> <tr><td>Guildford</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>Bexley North</td><td>24</td></tr> <tr><td>Gosford</td><td>41</td></tr> <tr><td>Queanbeyan East</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr><td>Dubbo</td><td>22</td></tr> <tr><td>Nowra</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr><td>South Kempsey</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>Tweed Heads</td><td>40</td></tr> <tr><td>Wagga Wagga</td><td>14</td></tr> <tr><td>Wauchope</td><td>12</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Suburb	Number	Sefton	14	Warwick Farm	52	Campsie	28	St Marys	26	Chester Hill	20	Padstow	17	Guildford	10	Bexley North	24	Gosford	41	Queanbeyan East	18	Dubbo	22	Nowra	6	South Kempsey	8	Tweed Heads	40	Wagga Wagga	14	Wauchope	12
Suburb	Number																																			
Sefton	14																																			
Warwick Farm	52																																			
Campsie	28																																			
St Marys	26																																			
Chester Hill	20																																			
Padstow	17																																			
Guildford	10																																			
Bexley North	24																																			
Gosford	41																																			
Queanbeyan East	18																																			
Dubbo	22																																			
Nowra	6																																			
South Kempsey	8																																			
Tweed Heads	40																																			
Wagga Wagga	14																																			
Wauchope	12																																			
Vacant properties																																				

8	<p>8. Understanding that a benchmark of 20 days to turn around properties with maintenance contractors in-between tenants.</p> <p>(a) How many properties were consider void or vacant during;</p> <p>i. 2018-2019 ii. 2019-to current</p> <p>(b) What was the total number of days properties were vacant between tenancy and or awaiting maintenance for;</p> <p>i. 2018-2019 ii. 2019 to current</p> <p>(c) How many properties 2019-to current have been written off due to safety concerns or other reasons?</p> <p>(d) What is the number of properties that need maintenance over the next 5 years?</p>	<p>a) i) Of the properties managed by DCJ on behalf of LAHC, in 2018/2019, a total of 7,697 dwellings were vacated and returned to service.</p> <p>ii) Of the properties managed by DCJ on behalf of LAHC, as at 20 March 2020, a total of 5,441 dwelling were vacated and returned to service.</p> <p>b) i) The average turnaround time by LAHC was 22.79 calendar days.</p> <p>ii) For 2019/20, as at 31 January 2020, the average turnaround time for LAHC was 19.52 days.</p> <p>c) From 1 July 2019 to 25 March 2020, 89 properties were sold and/or demolished due to damage.</p> <p>d) Maintenance requirements change on a daily basis. It is not possible to provide an exact number.</p>
MP Maintenance Line		
9	<p>9. Provide the number of enquiries to the MP Maintenance</p> <p>(a) How many made by phone 1800809107</p> <p>(b) How many made by email mp-maintenance@facns.nsw.gov.au?</p>	<p>9a&b) From June 2016 (inception) until 20 March 2020, a total of 4,850 enquiries through the MP Maintenance line have been received since its inception on 14 June 2016. LAHC logs each contact, but does not track how the contact was made.</p>
Funding		
10	<p>10. Why has social housing expenditure fallen \$200 million (15% and over) in two years according to the Productivity Commission Report on Government Services?</p> <p>(a) What is the Government doing to improve the conditions of public housing dwellings? NSW have the worst dwelling conditions in the country, only three quarters (75.9%) of dwellings are of an acceptable condition compared to national average of 80.3%? Please provide a detailed plan of how NSW will improve these statistics.</p> <p>i. What is the time frame to get to the National average?</p> <p>(b) Why is the proportion of public housing being occupied is at an all-time low of 98.1 % from a high of 99.9% when the Government took office?</p> <p>(c) Why has the proportion of new public housing tenancies allocated to households with special needs has collapsed and is now the</p>	<p>The increase in expenditure was driven by an additional maintenance budget allocation during the initial period of the new maintenance contract.</p> <p>a & i.) LAHC - The Productivity Commission Report on Government Services (RoGS), based on 2018/19 sample survey data (point in time only) is not as broad in terms of dwelling condition as the NSW RTA clean, safe and habitable standard.</p> <p>The RoGS defines minimum acceptable standards for dwelling condition as “A dwelling is assessed as meeting minimum acceptable standards if it has at least four working facilities (for washing people, for washing clothes/bedding, for storing/preparing food, and for removing sewerage) and not more than two major structural problems.”</p> <p>Based on the above definition NSW public housing would essentially be 100% compliant with the minimum standard for dwelling condition.</p>

second lowest percentage in the country (55.6%)?

(d) Why has real spending on assistance for Indigenous community housing has fallen 45% from \$16,659 (2013-14) to \$9,226 (2017-18) and is well below the national average of \$11,786?

LAHC ensures its properties are habitable and fit for purpose through its maintenance and property condition standards, which are designed and implemented to align with the *NSW Residential Tenancies Act 2010* (RTA) clean, safe and habitable standard. LAHC achieves the above by undertaking a range of property assessment surveys on an annual basis which assist in providing up to date knowledge of the asset condition. These results show that around 85 per cent of LAHC's properties are either maintained or well maintained.

AHO - AHO has been able to substantially reduce its maintenance backlog and increase its portfolio condition scores over recent years as the agency has implemented strategies to increase the performance and condition of its portfolio.

The strategies include the following:

- Targeted Maintenance (Component based)
 - The AHO uses both Property Assessment Survey (PAS) and Annual Condition Assessment (ACA) data to develop its annual cyclical programs. The ACA is an annual condition assessment completed on key components within the dwelling. AHO uses this information to target specific properties across the portfolio that is most in need of repair. AHO then delivers its own Aboriginal led planned "cyclical" maintenance program. Generally the spend averages about \$35k (per property) and focuses on major areas such as kitchens, bathrooms, painting and floor coverings. This allows the AHO to address more properties across the portfolio each year.

- Improved component and fitment schedule
 - The AHO have updated and improved the schedule of approved/compliant fitments for the portfolio. AHO ensure that all Prime Cost (PC) fixtures and fittings are hard wearing and have significant lifespan. Investment in quality products upfront ensure reduced maintenance costs in the future

- Sale/Demolition/Redevelopment – When properties become vacant the AHO takes the opportunity to address each property strategically. The maintenance liability and age of stock is reviewed and matched against demand in the area. The AHO then decides on sale, demolition or development. Sale is extremely rare, with the exception of sales to tenants under home ownership initiatives. The most recent PAS sample survey reveals

		<p>that overall, approximately 79% of dwellings are considered to be maintained or well maintained. This represents an improvement on the 2012-14 full PAS survey results when 71% of dwellings fell within this category. Whilst it is a fraction behind the national average it shows that using our strategies we are making inroads into the backlog maintenance and ensuring improvement of overall portfolio property condition ratings.</p> <p>(b) This is a matter for the Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services</p> <p>(c) This is a matter for the Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services</p> <p>d) In 2013-14 the Aboriginal Housing Office was in the middle of a ten year Commonwealth program called NPARIH - National Partnership Agreement Remote Indigenous Housing. In 2017-18 this program was winding down, hence the reduction in spend on Indigenous Community Housing.</p>
	Millers Point	
11	<p>11. What is the status of the Millers Point social housing sell off?</p> <p>(a) How many properties have been delivered as a result of Millers Point?</p> <p>(b) Were all the Millers Point residents transitioned to new homes?</p> <p>(c) Are there any future plans for additional large or high value social housing sales?</p>	<p>(a) Response: to 29 February 2020, a total of 1,416 units have been completed with 295 more currently under construction.</p> <p>(b) Response: Millers Points tenants who resided in properties subsequently sold were relocated by the Department of Communities and Justice (formerly the Department of Family and Community Services).</p> <p>(c) Response: LAHC continually reviews its portfolio.</p>
	Bellambi	
12	<p>12. Are there any plans to sell any properties in the Bellambi area?</p> <p>(a) Are there any future plans to re-develop any social housing properties in Bellambi?</p> <p>(b) How many new social housing properties have been built in Bellambi FY2011-12 to current date?</p>	<p>There is one property in Bellambi that was significantly damaged by fire and is currently being considered for sale.</p> <p>a) LAHC continually reviews its housing portfolio to ensure its housing stock is fit for purpose and meets the needs of tenants. LAHC has not announced any plans for the redevelopment of Bellambi. Any future plans will be prepared with appropriate community consultation, including public housing residents living in the area.</p> <p>b) Since 2011, LAHC has built 20 new social housing dwellings in Bellambi.</p>
	Aboriginal Housing	

13. What is the Stronger Families Stronger Communities strategy?

- (a) How much funding does it receive?
- (b) How many assets are in the portfolio?
- (c) How many have been sold?
- (d) What is Services our Way?
- (e) How much funding does it receive?
- (f) If not extended beyond 30 June 2020, how many job losses will that see?
- (g) Provide a breakdown of regional vs non-regional job losses?

Strong Family, Strong Communities is the NSW Government's Aboriginal social housing strategy, released in July 2018. The strategy is focused on breaking the cycle of disadvantage through culturally appropriate evidence, and or best practice initiatives that address long term socio economic barriers, and improve quality of life and outcomes for Aboriginal people, and families living in NSW through access to safe, secure and affordable housing. The Strategy aims to create positive change and boost opportunities for Aboriginal families and communities in NSW.

(a) As part of the 2018 Budget, Strong Family, Strong Communities received \$33.1 million over the four year period from July 2018 – June 2022.

(b) How many assets are in the portfolio? The Aboriginal Housing Office has 6,034 properties as at 29 February 2020. Since 2011/12 the AHO has grown its portfolio by 22% adding a net 1,085 properties.

(c) How many have been sold? Since 2011/20112, 56 properties have been sold from the portfolio. AHO sale of properties are typically to Aboriginal tenants as part of home ownership initiatives. Any monies arising from these sales to tenants is re-invested in replacement stock either in the immediate LGA or in areas of highest demand. The AHO does not carry out any sales of properties to fund the operations of the agency.

(d) Services Our Way is Aboriginal designed, led and staffed, providing essential targeted support to Aboriginal people. The program has a holistic approach focusing on linking families to the support they need in the community and with other government and non-government agencies instead of replicating these connections and services. It also transfers culturally appropriate skills and behaviours to non-Aboriginal partner organisations so they better service and engage with Aboriginal families. The program operates from Penrith, Nowra, Armidale and Tamworth, with an outreach service to Pilliga. Over 300 Aboriginal families are supported through the program each year.

(e) Services Our Way received two years funding as part of the 2018 Strong Family, Strong Communities Phase 1 funding. A total

		<p>of \$6.3 million has been allocated for the two years ending June 2020.</p> <p>(f) Eleven (11) permanent roles will be lost if Services Our Way is not extended beyond June 2020. Of these, ten are Aboriginal staff. A further three contractor roles will also be lost (two are Identified roles).</p> <p>(g) Of the 14 staff employed through Services Our Way, 9 roles are Regionally based:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 3 positions are based in Nowra, NSW. ii. 4 positions are based in Tamworth, NSW (including the Pilliga Outreach Aboriginal Specialist) iii. 2 positions are based in Armidale, NSW iv. 5 positions are based in metropolitan area – 4 positions based in in Penrith and 1 position in Parramatta.
	Windale Public Housing	
14	<p>14. On 9 March 2020 Lake Macquarie City Council rezoned 151 LAHC residential properties from low density (R2) to medium density (R3) following a Windale master plan created for Department of Housing:</p> <p>(a) Will the Minister guarantee that residents currently living in public housing in Windale will be offered suitable housing within the same suburb if they are required to move because of residential re-development of their homes ?</p> <p>(b) Will the Minister guarantee that any funds raised through the sale of public housing stock in Windale will be re-invested within the same suburb?</p>	<p>a) If the site is redeveloped, LAHC will work with DCJ to support any residents who wish to remain in the suburb during redevelopment or return to the site once redevelopment is completed, provided there is available accommodation suitable for their needs.</p> <p>b) Proceeds of sales are invested to deliver new construction and capital upgrades across the LAHC portfolio.</p>
	LAHC Housing Stock in the Electorate of Charlestown	

<p>15</p>	<p>15. How many dwellings does LAHC own in each of the following suburbs at 1st March 2020:</p> <p>(a) Adamstown? (b) Adamstown Heights? (c) Belmont North? (d) Bennetts Green? (e) Cardiff? (f) Cardiff Heights? (g) Charlestown? (h) Dudley? (i) Eleebana? (j) Floraville? (k) Garden Suburb? (l) Gateshead? (m) Highfields? (n) Hillsborough? (o) Jewells? (p) Kahibah? (q) Kotara? (r) Kotara South? (s) Merewether? (t) Mount Hutton? (u) New Lambton? (v) New Lambton Heights? (w) Redhead? (x) Tingira Heights? (y) Warners Bay? (z) Whitebridge? (aa) Windale?</p>	<p>(a) - (aa)</p> <p>Adamstown 119 Adamstown Heights 2 Belmont North 82 Bennetts Green 0 Cardiff 22 Cardiff Heights 1 Charlestown 59 Dudley 24 Eleebana 1 Floraville 4 Garden Suburb 0 Gateshead 358 Highfields 0 Hillsborough 0 Jewells 3 Kahibah 27 Kotara 15 Kotara South 39 Merewether 303 Mount Hutton 52 New Lambton 141 New Lambton Heights 1 Redhead 18 Tingira Heights 22 Warners Bay 51 Whitebridge 13 Windale 957</p>
<p>16</p>	<p>16. How has the LAHC housing stock changed over the last five years, as follows:</p> <p>(a) In 2015:</p> <p>i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many dwellings were added to the housing stock? • How many houses were removed from the housing stock? <p>ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many dwellings were added to the housing stock? • How many houses were removed from the housing stock? <p>iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many dwellings were added to the housing stock? • How many houses were removed from the housing stock? <p>iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many dwellings were added to the housing stock? • How many houses were removed from the housing stock? 	<p>See Appendix 10</p>

- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

(b) In 2016:

i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- (c) In 2017:
- i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

(d) In 2018:

i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- (e) In 2019:
 - i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
 - v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

(f) In 2020:

i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many dwellings were added to the housing stock? • How many houses were removed from the housing stock? 	
17	<p>17. How many maintenance requests have been received by Land and Housing Corporation as follows:</p> <p>(a) In 2015 for:</p> <p>i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of maintenance requests? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days? • Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable? <p>ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of maintenance requests? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days? • Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable? <p>iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of maintenance requests? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days? • Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days? • Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable? <p>iv. Dwellings owned in Bennetts Green:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of maintenance requests? 	See Appendix 11

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Mereweather:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?

- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- (b) In 2016 for:
 - i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - iv. Dwellings owned in Bennetts Green:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead
 - Total number of maintenance requests?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Mereweather:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?

- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- (c) In 2017 for:
 - i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - iv. Dwellings owned in Bennetts Green:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Mereweather:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
 - xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- (d) In 2018 for:

- i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- iv. Dwellings owned in Bennetts Green:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?

- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?

- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Mereweather:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- (e) In 2019 for:
 - i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- iv. Dwellings owned in Bennetts Green:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?

- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Mereweather:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- (f) In 2020 for:
 - i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- iv. Dwellings owned in Bennetts Green:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

- Total number of maintenance requests?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
- Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?

- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xix. Dwellings owned in Mereweather:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?

- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?

- Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
- Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - Total number of maintenance requests?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
 - Number of requests satisfactorily completed within 90 days?
 - Number of dwellings deemed uninhabitable?

Whole of government cleaning contract

18	18. Does Property NSW Government administer the whole-of-government cleaning contract? (a) If yes, what companies are on the panel? (b) What is the value of each contract? (c) What are the contracts duration? (d) What sites are they required to clean?"	No.
19	19. When did the Minister first learn that Broadspectrum were directing their staff from cleaning NSW Schools to cleaning the 'Diamond Princess', the quarantined shipped moored at Japan for Coronavirus suffers?	The Minister for Education has responded on this topic.
20	20. Are Broadspectrum required to notify the Department of these circumstances?	The contract is silent on these specific circumstances. However, Broadspectrum briefed PWA and Education NSW on these particular works for their other clients.
21	21. Are there any restrictions provided for in the contract on recruiting cleaners on Government sites to undertake private work?	Since 1994 all cleaners on Whole of Government Contracts have been employees of private sector employers; Private employment is a matter for these cleaners' respective employers
22	22. Do you have any figures on how many Government contracted cleaners were recruited to clean the Diamond Princess ship?	PWA was advised by Broadspectrum that five (5) cleaners who work on the Whole of Government contract expressed interest in this project and four (4) cleaners proceeded with the works
23	23. Are there any investigations underway regarding this case?	• No investigations are underway by PWA;
Backlog Sewerage Charges		
24	24. Was a Development Servicing Plan (DSP) done for property(ies) in North Rothbury? (a) How many properties were included in each DSP? (b) Were the DSPs publicly exhibited? i. All? A few? None? ii. Where? – Which local papers?	No.

25	<p>25. NSW Government social policy objectives relating to the provision of backlog sewerage services:</p> <p>(a) How much funding has been provided since 2006?</p> <p>(b) What communities have benefitted from this?</p> <p>i. How many properties has this benefitted?</p>	<p>Hunter Water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarence Town Sewerage (420 properties, \$12.98m total cost, \$5.82m Government funded) - Wyee Sewer Scheme (400 properties, \$36m total cost, \$2.4m Government funded) - Kitchener, Fern Bay, Lochinvar, Millfield and Ellalong Priority Sewerage Scheme (1400 properties, \$34m total cost, \$4.2m Government funded) <p>Sydney Water:</p> <p>(a) Total funds of \$644m. Estimated \$36.2m is NSW Government funding (subsidy).</p> <p>(b) Twenty-five communities: Mulgoa, Wallacia, Silverdale, Brooklyn, Dangar Island, Upper Blue Mountains (Blackheath, Medlow Bath and Mt Victoria), Mt Kuring-gai Industrial Estate, Three Towns (Freemans Reach, Glossodia, Wilberforce), Agnes Banks and Londonderry, Hawkesbury Heights and Yellow Rock, Appin, Cowan, West Hoxton, Bargo, Buxton, Douglas Park, Wilton, Galston and Glenorie.</p> <p>(b) (i) 9,050 properties.</p>
26	<p>26. In IPART's 2015 review of Sydney Water's operating licence, the following recommendation was made:</p> <p>'That the Government undertake a comprehensive review examining firefighting water capacity requirements within NSW. This review should identify any 'regulatory gaps' or necessary improvements to regulatory arrangements. It should also examine water distribution network solutions and other options to enhance water availability for firefighting.'</p> <p>(a) Has this review been done?</p> <p>i. When was it completed?</p> <p>ii. What were the findings?</p>	<p>(a) (i) In 2016, Sydney Water and Fire and Rescue NSW (FRNSW) entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to develop a joint work program to address issues of common interest. The work program included an assessment of the capability of our water network to support firefighting. Preliminary results of this modelling were shared with FRNSW in 2018 and helped set the direction for further action and timing.</p> <p>(ii) Early results indicate the vast majority of locations comply with current FRNSW design standards.</p> <p>Sydney Water is currently undertaking a comprehensive network review and has identified very few non-compliant sites. It will continue to work with FRNSW and other key stakeholders to consider the most cost effective and efficient solutions to meet the current design standards.</p>
Outstanding Water Resource Plans		
27	<p>27. What is the progress of the 20 outstanding Water Resource Plans which Minister Pavey advised would be delivered mid-way through the year?</p>	<p>The 20 water resource plans have been drafted.</p> <p>The Minister has committed to providing 11 groundwater water resource plans before 30 April 2020.</p>

	(a) How many will be delivered by the 30 April 2020 deadline?	
28	28. Has New South Wales received any of the withheld Federal funding that Minister Littleproud refused to approve in January 2020?	No.
29	29. Have any of the Water Resource Plans been placed on display for communities? (a) If yes, at what physical locations could they be viewed (ie not just online)?	Yes (a) The water resource plans were placed on display at the 54 public consultation sessions held in 39 locations
30	30. Will finalisation of Water Resource Plans only progress if/when they have had an Audit and if not, which Resource Plans are potentially going to be finalised without an Audit?	Water Resource Plans are not Water Sharing Plans.
31	31. How many Water Sharing Plan audits have now been concluded?	Audits of water sharing plans that were due to be completed to date under s44 of the <i>Water Management Act 2000</i> have all been completed. The Department completed and published 37 audits between 2009 and 2012. The Department completed 8 audits that were endorsed by the Audit Panel but not published between 2013 and 2014.
32	32. How many of the outstanding Water Sharing Plan audits have now become the responsibility of the Natural Resources Commission?	As of 2018, all new water sharing plan audits are now the responsibility of the NRC.
	Lifting of Floodplain Harvesting Embargo	
33	33. How many property owners contacted DPIE prior to 10 Feb 2020 seeking to have the floodplain harvest embargo lifted?	DPIE Water received representations from peak groups in Gwydir, Namoi, Border Rivers, and Barwon Darling, as well as one individual. These groups represented all areas of FPH covered by the restriction.
34	34. How many of these same properties owners (as per above Q) had property interests that were included in the limited and geographically specific lifted embargo during the Approval Period 10/2/20-13/2/20?	The one individual who made a representation to the department has a property in an area covered by the brief lift of the restriction.
35	35. Was DPIE contacted by other property owners not included in the limited and geographically specific lifted embargo prior to 10 Feb 2020? (a) How many?	No (a) NA (b) NA

	(b) Why were their concerns rejected/ignored?	
36	36. When was Minister Pavey and/or her staff made aware that lifting the embargo was being considered? (a) Was Minister Pavey and/or her staff advised of the exact locations being included?	A Ministerial staff member was advised after the decision was made on 9 February and a brief was provided to the Minister on 10th February. (a) The water sources and/or floodplains were included in the brief
37	37. When were Minister Pavey and/or her staff made aware the lifting of the embargo decision had been made?	A Ministerial staff member was advised after the decision was made on 9 February and a brief was provided to the Minister on 10th February.
38	38. What specific types of infrastructure can be built on a floodplain?	Various types of floodworks can be built on a floodplain subject to approval. Further information on flood works can be found at https://www.waternsw.com.au/customer-service/water-licensing/approvals/flood-work-approvals . The assessment and approval of floodworks is guided by Floodplain Management Plans developed under the <i>WMA 2000</i> .
39	39. What specific types of infrastructure that had been built on a floodplain were reportedly “at risk” of damage as a result of water moving naturally across the floodplain?	Private irrigation infrastructure (pump sites, levees, supply channel and irrigation fields) as well as public and private roads.
40	40. Reference has been made to rain during February 6, 7 & 8 of 250mm which ultimately was part of the rationale used for the lifting of embargoes. Where did, specifically, these 250mm rain events occur and what Bureau of Meteorology sites were used to verify these volumes? (a) What other sources were used to verify these rain volumes? (b) Were any private entity measurements used in clarifying the suggested 250mm volumes of rain and if so where and which specific private sites were used and were these sites accessed at the request of Water NSW and/or DPIE Water, or were these volumes volunteered by the private landholders? (c) Why, in subsequent days after the lifting of the embargoes, would the Minister fail to endorse and re-affirm the 250mm volumes of rain	There was a series of intense, localised storm events over the lower Gwydir and Namoi. There are only scattered official rain gauges in these areas and results vary widely, reflecting the localised nature of these events. The highest rainfall total at the nearest official gauge is 175mm at Bellata gauge. The reports of infrastructure damage were accompanied by photos showing localised flooding, and the figure of 260mm was provided by a peak group, along with photos of localised flooding. (a) None - the response to infrastructure damage was made noting the localised intense nature of the rainfall, and that these may not be necessarily picked up at any particular gauge. (b) A total amount of 260mm was volunteered by a peak group, along with photos of localised flooding. (c) Details on the source of the 250mm figure were not included in the brief prepared for the Minister

	when asked in public media interviews?	
41	41. Has there been any instances of damage infrastructure being verified and proven and if so how were the damaged infrastructure claims verified? (a) In person? (b) Aerial view? (c) Taken on trust?	Yes - via Aerial view.
42	42. Were measurements taken of the water storage before and after the lifting of the embargo to enable an accurate assessment of the volume of water retained by properties who benefited from the lifting of the embargo?	Measurement requirements for floodplain harvesting will be imposed by the new licensing requirements that are expected to commence for the Northern Basin on 1 July 2021. Estimates of water in on farm storages, both prior to and since these restrictions, are being made using remote sensing. The Department is collaborating with the MDBA and Geoscience Australia to undertake this assessment. Results will be published.
43	43. Is it true that technology exists that can not only measure the surface area of water storages, but also the depth? (a) Is this technology in use to assess, detect and/or validate water storage capacity and variations such that volumes of water can be measured? (b) If such technology exists and is not in use, why not?	LiDAR and photogrammetry surveys have been used to accurately quantify the capacity of on farm storages. (a) The technology will be employed as part of the floodplain harvesting measurement policy that will take effect in the Northern Basin once licences commence - 1 July 2021. (b) Remote satellite imagery sensing is routinely used by the Department to assess water take and to inform our models.
	Embargos on Floodplain Harvesting and Lifting Embargos	

44	<p>44. Did the Minister sign off on, or directly authorise, the 7th February 2020 gazettal in Government Gazette No 30, pages 550-555 Temporary Water Restriction (Northern Basin) (Floodplain Harvesting) Order 2020?</p> <p>(a) Is it this gazetted instrument that gave authority to a Director level within Department to potentially lift the very same embargo that was gazetted on this February 7th date?</p>	<p>No. (a) Yes</p>
45	<p>45. The gazetted instrument, in that 7th February publication, states in Schedule 1 (2) that the Director could approve floodplain harvesting if "...there is, or is forecasted to be, water available for take by the person because there is, or is forecasted to be, sufficient water available for higher priority needs..." In this context, what are the "priority needs" and are they consistent with the various Water Act's and the Murray Darling Basin Plan?</p>	<p>Priority needs include, basic human needs, town water supplies and critical environmental needs. These are consistent with the Commonwealth's Basin Plan and the priorities under the <i>NSW Water Management Act 2000</i>.</p>
46	<p>46. Does the language of this gazetted instrument allow the Director to make a decision based on possible "infrastructure damage" when the word infrastructure is not used at all in the Order?</p>	<p>As outlined in the reasons for decision, the interim downstream triggers had been met or were forecast to be met. Accordingly, it was open to the decision maker to temporarily lift the embargo, acknowledging that this lift could mitigate the reported damage to property.</p>
47	<p>47. Was there any consultation with the Minister or the Minister's office prior to the floodplain harvesting embargo being lifted to "prevent infrastructure damage"? (a) Are you able to identify what type of infrastructure may be built on a floodplain that might be damaged by water flow?</p>	<p>No - the Minister was briefed afterwards. (a) All infrastructure can be damaged during floods. This is particularly the case for irrigation infrastructure that has to date been built to capture not preclude or pass flood flows.</p>
48	<p>48. Did the Minister directly and personally speak to any external stakeholders about the need to lift the floodplain harvesting embargo, prior to them being lifted on 10th February? (a) Did the Minister hold any internal office meetings or have any internal office conversations with Ministerial staff and/or Departmental staff about the lifting of these embargoes?</p>	<p>The Minister was briefed on updates from the lifting which began on the 9th of February, which was highlighted during the hearing.</p>

49	49. Minister did you give any direct or implied direction to the Director and/or Department to have the embargos lifted on the 10th February?	No.
Trigger Points		
50	Minister Pavey said on 7 February 2020 :‘If we get to the point where we’re satisfied.....that we’ve hit those trigger points, the water can get down the system to the South Australian border in a healthy way, then we will look at lifting (the restrictions).’ 50. What are the trigger points referred to? (a) Where can this information be located? (b) When were the trigger points decided? (c) Which departments were consulted in deciding the trigger points?	Trigger points (or targets) were set with flow targets determined at gauge sites along the rivers - these were the minimum flow levels required to meet critical human and environmental needs, as well as town water supply. The trigger volumes were based on flow rates in the Long Term Environmental Water Plans to provide minimums for critical refugia. These were also deemed sufficient for critical human needs. (a) The information on the targets used during the s324 restriction was not published. This was done to avoid any misinterpretation on their use. However, the targets are based on science, and are sourced from long term watering plans published on the DPIE EES website. (b) The targets were agreed to on 6th February (c) DPIE Water, WaterNSW, DPI Fisheries, DPIE EES
Ministerial Diaries		
51	51. Minister Pavey has advised that her meeting with irrigators, as reported by Harriet Alexander in the Sydney Morning Herald on 20 February 2020, was nothing more than an informal invitation to dinner, as such: (a) Will the dinner based meeting and those in attendance at the dinner based meeting be recorded and published in the ministerial diary? (b) How many organisations were represented? (c) How many individuals were represented? (d) Were any third-party lobbying firms in attendance? (e) Since becoming Minister how many formal or informal meetings has the Minister had with each of those listed in b, c and d?	a) Meetings will published in the ministerial diary as required. b) Four c) Zero d) No e) The Minister’s diary is publicly available.
52	52. Were any of the attendee’s owners of properties who benefitted from the lifting of the floodplain harvesting embargo on 10 February to 13 February?	The attendees were there as representatives of their organisations.
Fish Deaths		

53	<p>53. What sites have experienced large scale fish deaths, caused by environmental conditions, since August 1, 2019?</p> <p>(a) What is the estimated number of fish collectively killed as a result of these events?</p> <p>(b) Have species, other than fish, also experienced large scale deaths along NSW estuaries as a result of environmental conditions since August 1, 2019?</p>	This is a matter for the Minister for Agriculture and Western NSW
Dungowan Dam		
54	<p>54. What is the current cost estimate of the Dungowan Dam project?</p> <p>(a) How much of this is to be spent on the pipeline between Chaffey Dam and Dungowan Dam?</p> <p>i. Will this pipeline be capable of flows both into, and out of, the Dungowan Dam?</p> <p>(b) How much of this is to be spent on the pipeline between Dungowan Dam and Tamworth town supply?</p> <p>(c) How much of this is to be spent on the dam wall and water storage facility itself?</p> <p>(d) How much of this is to be spent on ancillary infrastructures around the dam, things like roads, pumps, parks, fencing, etc?</p> <p>(e) Are there any other expected costs for infrastructure?</p>	<p>The Dungowan Dam project is currently estimated to cost \$480 million comprising \$380 million for the new dam and \$100 million for the new pipeline. Costs for the dam, pipeline and ancillary infrastructure will be determined once a detailed concept design is completed as part of the Final Business Case, due mid-2021.</p> <p>54(a)(i) No.</p>

55	<p>55. Is the Dungowan Dam going to be co-funded by different levels of Government?</p> <p>(a) How much funding will the Federal Government contribute?</p> <p>i. Is any of this funding to be interpreted as a “loan” with an expectation to be repaid by the State or Local Government and if so, how much funding is on loan and what are the terms of repayment?</p> <p>(b) How much funding will the State Government contribute?</p> <p>i. Is any of this funding to be interpreted as a “loan” with an expectation to be repaid by the Federal or Local Government and if so, how much funding is on loan and what are the terms of repayment?</p> <p>(c) How much funding will the Local Government contribute?</p> <p>i. Is any of this funding to be interpreted as a “loan” with an expectation to be repaid by the Federal or State Government and if so, how much funding is on loan and what are the terms of repayment?</p>	<p>Dungowan Dam will be co-funded by the State and Commonwealth Governments. An agreement on the final form of the funding contribution is yet to be finalised.</p>
56	56. What is the projected timeline for the Dungowan Dam?	<p>Details of the projected Dungowan Dam project timeline are available on the WaterNSW website and include:</p> <p>Oct 2019 Commenced project planning Jan 2020 Initiated environmental assessment Mar 2020 Commence detailed investigations and design Oct 2020 Commence early works Jun 2021 Complete final business case Oct 2021 Commence construction</p>
57	57. When is it expected that a decision on future ownership of the dam will be made?	This will be part of the final business case.
58	58. Once built, with Dam capacity rising from 6GL to 23GL, for what purpose will the additional water be used?	The principle objective of the project is to improve the long term water security for Tamworth City and Peel Valley water users.

59	<p>59. Will any of the additional water be made available for purchase by irrigators?</p> <p>(a) For water held currently in the Dungowan Dam and available to irrigators, what classification does this water have?</p> <p>(b) For water held currently in the Chaffey Dam and available to irrigators, what classification does this water have?</p>	<p>Its purpose is for town water supply security.</p> <p>a) It is a town water supply dam.</p> <p>b) Irrigators can use general security allocations and/or high security allocations held in Chaffey Dam. Allocations for general security licences in 2019/20 remain at zero. Allocations for high security licences are at 50% of licensed entitlement.</p>
60	60. Will any of the additional water be made available for environmental flows?	Environmental water releases from a new dam will have to be established.
61	61. Was a business case used as a platform through which to seek Federal Government funding and financial support?	The Commonwealth Government initially provided funding in 2016 for a feasibility study into a new Dungowan dam. This study was completed in 2017 and provided to the Commonwealth Government.
62	62. Have there been any previous instances of application being made for Federal government funding for a Dungowan Dam project where those previous applications have been refused or denied and if so, on how many occasions, on what dates and for what reason were they refused?	No.
63	63. What is the average annual inflow volumes for the existing Dungowan Dam and what is the normal average outflow volumes?	<p>Annual average inflow volumes for the existing Dungowan Dam are 9.2GL/year (based on recorded data 2004-2019) and 11.9GL/year (based on model 1911-2018).</p> <p>Since the existing Dungowan Dam is very small, average annual outflows are same as average annual inflows.</p>
64	64. Is there a long term average for water that is moved from the Chaffey Dam across to the Dungowan Dam and if so, what is the average volume moved?	Water is not moved from Chaffey Dam to Dungowan Dam.
65	65. What is the projected average annual inflow volumes expected into the proposed new Dungowan Dam and based on these projections how many years is it expected to take to fill the Dungowan Dam assuming normal average annual outflows as well?	The modelling to define projected average annual inflow volumes will be part of the Final Business Case due mid-2021

66	66. Has any cost recovery modelling for Dungowan Dam, and if so, what was the time frame, or what did the modelling show?	This will be considered as part of the Final Business Case due mid-2021.
67	67. Has there been any initial discussions with IPART about Dungowan Dam cost recovery and if so what advice was received/what was revealed etc?	Pricing determinations for Dungowan Dam have not yet begun.
Wyangala Dam Upgrade		
68	68. What is the current cost estimate of the Wyangala Dam project?	\$650m
69	69. Is the Wyangala Dam going to be co-funded by different levels of Government? (a) How much funding will the Federal Government contribute? i. Is any of this funding to be interpreted as a "loan" with an expectation to be repaid by the State or Local Government and if so, how much funding is on loan and what are the terms of repayment? (b) How much funding will the State Government contribute? i. Is any of this funding to be interpreted as a "loan" with an expectation to be repaid by the Federal or Local Government and if so, how much funding is on loan and what are the terms of repayment? (c) How much funding will the Local Government contribute? i. Is any of this funding to be interpreted as a "loan" with an expectation to be repaid by the Federal or State Government and if so, how much funding is on loan and what are the terms of repayment?	Wyangala Dam will be co-funded by the State and Commonwealth Governments. An agreement on the final form of the funding contribution is yet to be finalised.

70	70. What is the projected timeline for the Wyangala Dam upgrade?	<p>Details of the projected Wyangala Dam upgrade timeline are available on the WaterNSW website and include:</p> <p>Field investigations commence – March 2020 Inundation mapping reports – September 2020 “Shovels in the ground” ancillary works commence – October 2020 Construction works commence - October 2021</p>
71	71. Once built, with Dam capacity rising, for what purpose will the additional water be used? (a) Will any of the additional water be made available for purchase by irrigators?	Modelling predicts an additional 21.05GL per annum estimated yield for general security licence use. The project driver is water security and reliability for existing customers/users.
72	72. For water held currently in the Wyangala Dam and available to irrigators, what classification does this water have?	Irrigators in the Lachlan River hold a range of water licences including High Security and General Security Licences. Other types of water held in the dam include stock and domestic licences and town water supply.
73	73. Will any of the additional water be made available for environmental flows?	The project driver is water security and reliability for existing customers/users.
74	74. Was a business case used as a platform through which to seek Federal Government funding and financial support?	Lachlan Valley Priority Catchment Water Security – Preliminary Business Case" was prepared by WaterNSW for the NSW Government in 2018, which submitted it to the Federal Government.

75	75. Have there been any previous instances of application being made for Federal government funding for a Wyangala Dam project where those previous applications have been refused or denied and if so, on how many occasions, on what dates and for what reason were they refused?	No.
76	76. What is the average annual inflow volumes for the existing Wyangala Dam and what is the normal average outflow volumes?	Average annual inflows to Wyangala between 1898 and 2018 was 719 GL/Yr. Annual releases from the storage vary depending upon the storage conditions (drought and floods).
77	77. Based on average annual inflow volumes into Wyangala Dam, how many years is it expected to take to fill the upgraded Wyangala Dam assuming normal average annual outflows as well?	The modelling to define this will be part of the Final Business Case due mid-2021.
78	78. When will mapping be available to show the expected waterline of a full Wyangala Dam, post upgrades and why is this mapping taking so long?	Information on inundation model timelines is available on the WaterNSW website: https://www.waternsw.com.au/projects/new-dams-for-nsw/wyangala-dam
79	79. What is the timeline for community consultation for this project?	A timeline on community consultation is available on the WaterNSW website: https://www.waternsw.com.au/projects/new-dams-for-nsw/wyangala-dam
80	80. Will the NSW Government, within its funding envelope for this project, be building replacement infrastructure above the projected new high water line, to replace existing infrastructure owned by Federal, State, Local, Community or Private entities that will be below the new water line once the project is complete and the upgraded dam full?	Yes.
Barmah Choke and Flows Along the Murray		

81	<p>81. Transcripts show that at Budget Estimates in September 2019 the Minister confirmed that the Barmah Choke once had capacity to pass some 12Gigalitres (GL) per day through this water flow bottleneck, but that it had reduced to 9GL as at that time. Is there an agreed volume of water that the Barmah Choke can now pass each day that may be even less than 9GL?</p>	<p>'Choke full' is measured as 2.6 metres on the river gauge at Picnic Point just upstream of the river narrowing, therefore river operators target about 2.50 - 2.55 metres as the maximum within-channel choke capacity.</p> <p>Flow rate would need to be measured on any particular day because it is variable. At 2.6 metres it is likely to be less than 10,000ML/day, could be less 9,000ML/day but unlikely to be less than 8,000 ML/day.</p>
82	<p>82. Is the current flow rate of the Barmah Choke sufficient to deliver the necessary volumes of water downstream to irrigators within NSW and to satisfy the MDBP volume that needs to cross the SA border?</p> <p>(a) To achieve higher downriver flows than the Barmah choke can handle, what other methods are used and what volumes do they pass downriver?</p>	<p>The Murray is operated as a whole system to efficiently and effectively meet water delivery obligations under the Murray Darling Basin Agreement.</p> <p>Therefore it is likely at any time that delivery of volumes can be met from lake, tributary and weir pool sources downstream of the choke.</p> <p>In a worst-case scenario of high downstream demand (hot summer) and little/no downstream inflows/resources, a delivery shortfall situation can arise because there is insufficient physical channel capacity to meet required delivery rates from upstream storage alone.</p> <p>There is a Basin wide review being led by the Ministerial Council. Consultation with impacted communities will be absolutely critical. NSW has made it clear our communities are bearing the brunt of these problems, and will be involved in exploring options.</p> <p>(a) A project team is currently exploring delivery capacity risks, potential system capacity augmentation (increased flows around the choke), potential rule changes and equitable sharing of delivery capacity in the event of a shortfall. In addition, WaterNSW has an agreement with Murray Irrigation Limited to use its infrastructure to deliver an additional volume of water around the choke.</p>
83	<p>83. By flooding the Barmah Forest adjacent to the Barmah Choke how much additional downstream flow is gained and how much water is lost from downstream flow?</p>	<p>This depends largely on the antecedent conditions at the time and is highly variable. For example, if there is rainfall across the forest shortly before or during a watering, the return flows downstream can be more than the flows diverted into the forest.</p>

84	<p>84. What work is being undertaken by Water NSW with regard to the collapsing river banks that are falling in along the Murray River because the water is being pushed downstream so hard?</p> <p>(a) Are the trees that have fallen into the river as a result of bank collapse having any impact on water flow volumes, and hence impacts on water volume deliverability, and what is the nature of this impact and what are the proposed solutions?</p>	<p>WaterNSW is working with the Murray Darling Basin Authority (MDBA) regarding the management of Barmah Choke. MDBA are taking the lead in these works as the approach needs to be joint government, as the impacts and benefits of any remediation works will apply to NSW, Victoria and SA.</p> <p>The factors impacting the choke capacity are currently being determined. The increase in woody debris due to bank collapse, would in principle be contributing to reduced capacity, but there are other factors such as sedimentation, and reduced bank height also contributing. It is however difficult to quantify the contribution of each element impacting channel capacity.</p>
85	<p>85. Has the Minister visited the Murray River and travelled along the river to see the scale of damage of collapsing banks and trees falling into the river and if so, on what dates did this occur?</p>	<p>I Spent time with local forresters, landholders, farmers, recreational fishermen, and departmental officials from DPIE-WATER, WaterNSW and EES visiting affected areas. In addition I met with the Member for Albury to discuss these matters while I was down there. My diary is publicly available.</p>
86	<p>86. Is water turbidity, as a result of pushing Murray Rover flow volumes so hard, and having a detrimental impact on that water system?</p> <p>(a) What is the nature of this impact on flora and fauna?</p> <p>(b) What is the nature of this impact on tourism?</p> <p>(c) What is the nature of this impact on economic opportunity for river side communities?</p>	<p>Large volumes of water are frequently delivered down the Murray River to provide water to the lower Murray and to South Australia. High flows can cause bank erosion and increase turbidity.</p> <p>(a) High turbidity can show large amounts of suspended material and cause low oxygen levels which can impact fish and aquatic animals and may cause death.</p> <p>(b)Monitoring of turbidity over the last three months shows it is within the acceptable range for ecosystems in this region.</p> <p>(c) Monitoring of turbidity over the last three months shows it is within the acceptable range for ecosystems in this region.</p>
87	<p>87. In the past 12 months, how many meetings have been held with the Environment Minister to discuss issues of water flow, water quality and environmental impacts along the Murray River?</p>	<p>Cluster Ministers meet regularly to discuss a variety of issues.</p>
88	<p>88. Are there any other option currently being considered to increase the flow of water downstream to satisfy NSW based water customer demand and the SA water delivery requirements?</p>	<p>A project team is currently exploring delivery capacity risks, potential system capacity augmentation (increased flows around the choke), potential rule changes and equitable sharing of delivery capacity in the event of a shortfall. The project team is being supported by an Independent Panel chaired by Jane Doolan.</p>
<p>Barwon Darling Flows and Future Flows</p>		

89	<p>89. To ensure future connectivity in the Lower-Darling River for a period of 12 months, and assuming no further rain or inflows, how much water does the Menindee Lakes need to hold to ensure ongoing connectivity of the lower Barwon-Darling all the way to Wentworth?</p> <p>(a) What steps are you taking to ensure this?</p>	<p>Longevity of Menindee supplies is a combination of many variables, including future weather conditions. Therefore there is no fixed volume for a particular forecast period.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the department is confident of between 390,000 ML and 420,000 ML flowing into the Menindee system will provide at least 12 months of connectivity to the Murray even without any future upstream rainfall and runoff.</p> <p>(a) When there is a forecast risk that normal river operations are likely to be disrupted by water shortages, water managers begin introducing increasingly stringent water savings measures to stretch the longevity of remaining supplies for as long as possible to meet critical needs. Water use is restricted and prioritised, and emergency infrastructure measures implemented, to provide security for critical human needs as the highest priority.</p>
90	<p>90. According to the best scientific advice available on the range of flow volumes required below the Menindee Lakes to maintain the health of fish, shellfish, plant and estuary health, what flow volumes are required as a minimum and what flow volumes are required as an ideal?</p> <p>(a) Will you ensure that these flows are available by storing at least this volume of water in the Menindee Lakes?</p>	<p>This is a matter for the Minister for Energy and Environment.</p> <p>(a) The Menindee Lakes Project will need to strike a balance between a desire to maximise water savings, with a need to protect the significant ecological, cultural heritage and socio-economic values that exist in the Menindee Lakes and Lower Darling. The Department is collaborating with the community around the Menindee Lakes and Lower Darling to develop options for future configuration and management of the system.</p>
91	<p>91. What is the status of plans to decommission the Menindee Lakes as a water savings measures and water efficiency measure?</p>	<p>Decommissioning the Menindee Lakes System is not under consideration by the NSW Government.</p> <p>The proposal to upgrade and improve the operation of the Menindee Lakes System is currently a pre-feasibility concept proposal only. Work is currently underway to progress a community based options development and assessment process for the project to inform a preferred option and detailed business case to drive government investment decisions.</p>
<p>Finalising Water Resource Plan for Barwon Darling without having a Meeting in Menindee, Broken Hill or Wentworth</p>		

92	<p>92. Once established, how long will a Water Resource Plan be “locked in” for?</p> <p>(a) For how many years will it be largely un-changeable?</p>	<p>Water resource plans do not have a set period in which they are in place.</p> <p>(a) They are amended when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Basin Plan is amended and a change in the water resource plans is required, or • a state makes a material change to an item that is part of the accredited WRP
93	<p>93. Are there any key “stakeholders” in the Broken Hill, Menindee and Wentworth areas that would be considered important enough to consult with, prior to finalising Water Resource Plans, given that the Stakeholder Advisory Panels (SAP’s) that will be consulted are seen as a minimum level of community consultation, not a maximum limit to community consultation?</p> <p>(a) Who made the decision on the venues at which the SAP’s would be held?</p> <p>(b) Did the Minister have any input or involvement in the selection of these sites for the SAP meetings?</p> <p>(c) Why was a SAP meeting not designated to the Broken Hill, Menindee and/or Wentworth communities?</p> <p>(d) Will changes be made to ensure a SAP meeting is held in either of these 3 communities prior to the finalisation of the Water Resource Plans?</p> <p>(e) Is Menindee considered to be part of the Lower Darling system or the Barwon Darling system?</p>	<p>All stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the water resource plans during public consultation for all the water resource plans. For the Barwon Darling Water Resource Plan, public consultation occurred between 26 September 2019 to 29 October 2019. The following public information sessions were held:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Walgett, 15 October 2019 - Bourke, 16 October 2019 - Wilcannia, 17 October 2019 - Menindee, 18 October 2019 <p>Consultation on the Murray - Lower Darling water resource plan was undertaken from 4 September to 13 October 2019. Public information sessions were held at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Corowa, 17 September 2019 - Deniliquin, 18 September 2019 - Barham, 18 September 2019 - Dareton, 19 September 2019 - Menindee, 18 October 2019 <p>In response to the direct questions</p> <p>(a) DPIE - Water</p> <p>(b) No</p> <p>(c) The Barwon Darling SAP meetings have always been held in Bourke. It is geographically more central for all water users along the Barwon Darling. The Murray Lower Darling SAP meetings have been held in Deniliquin, Dareton and Albury</p> <p>(d) No. All future SAP meetings will now be held by video or teleconference to reduce the public health risks associated with COVID-19.</p> <p>(e) Menindee Lakes are part of the Lower Darling Regulated Water Source</p>

<p>94</p>	<p>94. Are you aware of the Murray-Lower Darling Water Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Panel has been trying to coordinate a joint meeting with the Barwon Darling Water Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Panel since 2014?</p> <p>(a) Do you agree that a joint meeting of these 2 SAP's to consider whole-of-river issues would be a good thing?</p> <p>(b) Will you intervene and insist that a joint meeting take place as part of finalising the Water Resource Plans?</p> <p>(c) Why has your Department, which sits on these SAP's, not previously intervened to ensure a joint meeting?</p> <p>(d) As Minister, have you ever intervened to prevent a joint meeting of these 2 SAP's?</p>	<p>Officers of DPIE - Water are aware that there has been a request for a joint meeting since 2017. 'All SAP' meetings have previously taken place on 11-12 December 2017 and 5-6 June 2018. SAP members from both these groups participated in a workshop that discussed connectivity</p> <p>(a) An all-SAP was held in Sydney on 5 & 6 June 2018 where a connectivity workshop was held</p> <p>(b) A proposal for a joint meeting was presented to the Barwon Darling SAP meeting No. 5 on 10 April 2018. There was general agreement about the need for discussion about connectivity, however it was suggested that discussion needed to be a whole Northern basin discussion.</p> <p>(c) 'All SAP' meetings have previously taken place on 11-12 December 2017 and 5-6 June 2018. SAP members from both these groups participated in a workshop that discussed connectivity across the Northern Basin and with the Lower Darling</p> <p>(d) No.</p>
<p>95</p>	<p>95. Does a Mr Ian Cole sit on the Barwon Darling Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Panel?</p> <p>(a) Is this the same Mr Ian Cole that you met with during a dinner at a Japanese restaurant, in Sydney, on 4th February, 2020?</p> <p>(b) Is this the same Mr Ian Cole that is reported to have continued to lobby former Water Minister Katrina Hodgkinson about the 2012 Barwon-Darling Water Sharing Plan and by all reports had terrific success with is lobbying?</p> <p>(c) Does this same Mr Ian Cole have your personal phone number?</p> <p>(d) Does every member of the various SAP's have your personal phone number?</p> <p>i. If not, what steps have you taken to ensure that each of the stakeholders and SAP participants has fair and equal access to you?</p>	<p>Mr Cole is a member of that panel.</p> <p>(a) There was no meeting on the 4th of February.</p> <p>(b) This is a question for the Minister of the time.</p> <p>(c) I do not believe so.</p> <p>(d)SAP members can contact myself or my office at any time.</p>
<p>Desalination – Newcastle</p>		

96	96. Given that Hunter Water customer have paid enough in their water bills over recent years, for the Government to take out a \$100M dividend to NSW Treasury in 2018/19 financial year, why is the NSW Government not paying for the desalination plant (or part of) and why would the NSW Government consider asking HW customers to pay another \$100M as part of the funding required for the proposed desalination plant?	Hunter Water is progressing with planning approvals and designs for a Drought Response Desalination Plant at Belmont, which would only be constructed if Hunter Water's total storages fell below 45% in a severe drought.
97	97. Mr Cleary referred to the proposed Hunter Desalination plant as “a drought response plant” during Budget Estimates (p25 of transcript). What does that term mean for the purpose of construction, funding, depreciation and ongoing operations and maintenance?	See response to question 96.
98	98. How many Hunter Water customers’ still don’t have sewer connection?	Approximately 2,500 residential lots across the Lower Hunter presently do not have access to reticulated sewers. These properties are typically serviced by onsite systems such as septic tanks.
99	Who will operate that proposed Hunter desalination plant?	If it was required to be constructed during an unprecedented severe drought, it is proposed that the Belmont Drought Response Desalination Plant would be owned and operated by Hunter Water, either directly or under contract.

100	Why has Hunter Water not appointed a permanent CEO?	<p>Hunter Water's former Managing Director, Dr Jim Bentley, commenced a secondment to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment on 1 July 2019. Dr Bentley was subsequently appointed to this role in March 2020, and resigned from Hunter Water.</p> <p>Hunter Water's Board of Directors is currently finalising a comprehensive international recruitment process.</p> <p>Mr Darren Cleary has the full delegations of the Managing Director while serving as Acting Chief Executive Officer.</p>
101	Does the planning approval for the Hunter Water Desalination plant have planning approval that assumes renewable energy?	<p>The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment is currently considering a State Significant Infrastructure application from Hunter Water for the Belmont Drought Response Desalination Plant.</p> <p>The application is currently under assessment in accordance with the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>. At the time of writing, no planning approval has been issued.</p>
Bathurst Water		
102	Have you formally met with the Member for Bathurst, Paul Toole to discuss the water crisis facing the Bathurst community and the challenges that the Bathurst Council is having in getting the necessary approvals for their proposed water security works? (a) If so, on how many occasions, when was the first occasion and as a result of those meetings has any instruction been issued to formally assist Bathurst Council in their endeavours?"	I have been speaking with Minister Toole regularly about the situation in Bathurst. I have provided Bathurst Council with \$12m to date, and I have also made DPIE-Water available to provide technical assistance to the council, and they have been in frequent contact.

103	In refusing Bathurst Councils request to purchase water from the Oberon Dam in late 2019 what were the critical supply needs for that water that were deemed of higher importance than the proposed town supply at Bathurst?	Maintaining critical water supplies for Oberon, Lithgow and the Blue Mountains as well as water used for the Mount Piper Power Station which is still operational. It was also considered that the losses in transfer were too great.
104	What volume of water is held in Oberon Dam for use by Energy Australia?	The shares in water entitlement available to Energy Australia can be found in the Department of Planning Industry and Environment, Water's report at Appendix 2 .
105	What approvals are currently being sought by Bathurst Council to enact water savings and security projects such as water harvesting and the Winburndale pipeline? (a) What role does Water NSW have in this process? (b) Is there a timetable for approval or denial of the request?	Bathurst is currently experiencing severe drought conditions. Bathurst Regional Council requested the locality for its town water supply scheme be listed in Schedule 1 of the Water Supply (Critical Needs) Act 2019. Bathurst Regional Council is also seeking to have one development listed in Schedule 2 of and authorised under the Act. This development relates to a water extraction and harvesting scheme. (a) WaterNSW does not play any role in this process. (b) Work is progressing to draft the Regulations to list the Bathurst locality and the water extraction and harvesting scheme on Schedules 1 and 2 respectively of the Water Supply (Critical Needs) Act 2019. This is anticipated to be completed within the next few weeks. Following this, Bathurst Regional Council can formally seek authorisation of the development.. However, work is already concurrently underway with Council and relevant agencies to make sure that Council is providing the information needed up front so that this process can proceed as quickly as possible following the making of the regulations.
Northern Tablelands Water		
106	Have you formally met with the Member for Northern Tablelands, Adam Marshall, to discuss the water crisis facing the Armidale and Uralla communities and the challenges that those communities are experiencing in terms of water security and supply? (a) If so, on how many occasions, when was the first occasion and as a result of those meetings has any instruction been issued to formally assist local Councils in their water security endeavours?	Minister Marshall has been in contact with me on numerous occasions. Funding and technical assistance has been provided to council.
Tamworth Water		

107	<p>Have you formally met with the Member for Tamworth, Kevin Anderson, to discuss the water crisis facing the various Tamworth based communities?</p> <p>(a) If so, on how many occasions, when was the first occasion and as a result of those meetings has any instruction been issued to formally assist local Councils in their water security and delivery endeavours?</p>	<p>Minister Anderson has been in contact with me on numerous occasions. Funding and technical assistance has been provided to council.</p>
Upper Hunter Water		
108	<p>Have you formally met with the Member for Upper Hunter, to discuss the water crisis facing the various Upper Hunter communities?</p> <p>(a) If so, on how many occasions, when was the first occasion and as a result of those meetings has any instruction been issued to formally assist Bathurst Council in their endeavours?</p>	<p>Michael Johnson's electorate has been severely impacted by the drought, and he has been a strong advocate for emergency drought infrastructure, and drought legislation in both his electorate and beyond.</p>
109	<p>Have you formally met with the Member for Upper Hunter to discuss and explore additional water storage (dams) for the Upper Hunter?</p> <p>(a) If so, on how many occasions, when was the first occasion and as a result of those meetings has any instruction been issued to formally explore such a concept?</p>	<p>The Member for Upper Hunter has been advocating for a variety of water security measures with me throughout the current drought.</p>
Desalination – Sydney		

110	<p>Why did you make the decision to move to Level 2 water restrictions when Sydney Water storage was still at just over 45% despite the fact that the Sydney Metropolitan Water Plan indicates that Level 2 Restrictions should be applied at 40%, not 45%?</p> <p>(a) Is the 2017 Sydney Metropolitan Water Plan, which indicates Level 2 water restrictions at 40%, signed off and approved by this Government, inadequate?</p>	<p>The Metropolitan Water Plan is an adaptive plan – one that can be modified in response to changing or unforeseen circumstances. During the recent drought dam levels declined at an unprecedented rate, and outside of historical modelling parameters used to inform development of the 2017 Plan. As a precautionary measure, and due to the unprecedented rate of depletion, the NSW government introduced level 2 water restrictions earlier than the guideline trigger level of 40%, to help minimise the potential time and likelihood of Sydney being subject to even more severe restrictions...</p>
111	<p>Why did you not request the “detailed plan” for expansion of Sydney’s desalination plant until water levels were at 43% when the 2017 Sydney Metropolitan Water Plan requires “detailed planning” to start when water levels reach 45%?</p> <p>(a) Is the 2017 Sydney Metropolitan Water Plan, which indicates Detailed Planning for Sydney Desalination Expansion at 45%, signed off and approved by this Government, inadequate?"</p>	<p>The detailed plan was requested as soon as the preliminary plan had been evaluated and approved. The preliminary plan was requested in August 2019 when dam levels were approximately 50%, in line with the guidance contained in the 2017 Metropolitan Water Plan. The Metropolitan Water Plan is an adaptive plan – one that is modified in response to changing or unforeseen circumstances.</p>
112	<p>Minister, is detailed planning still being developed for the expansion of the Sydney Desalination plant continuing?</p> <p>(a) Have they detailed plans and costings been presented to you?</p> <p>(b) Does the Government have a response?</p> <p>(c) Will you go ahead with planning and construction for the expansion (doubling of size) of the Sydney desalination plant?</p> <p>(d) How much is it expected to cost?</p>	<p>Detailed planning for the expansion of the plant has been discontinued until the development of the Greater Sydney Water Strategy or if drought conditions return in Sydney.</p>

113	<p>If the expansion of the Sydney Desalination plant were to proceed, how exactly would it be funded?</p>	<p>IPART will make a price determination to pass through the efficient and prudent cost of the expansion to Sydney Water customers. IPART has commenced its pricing investigation which will continue until late 2020.</p>
114	<p>What plans are in place to co-fund an alternate energy supply for the Sydney Desalination expansion? (a) Specifically, which Ministers had you spoken to about this need for additional energy supply? Will a GIPA testify to this? (b) Is the additional power going to be renewables? (c) Who is going to fund the alternate energy supply? (d) Had the question funding for an alternate energy supply been raised with Treasury?</p>	<p>Energy supply matters for the expansion of the Sydney Desalination Plant will be considered as part of the detailed planning and approval process.</p>
115	<p>What has been the cost, per Sydney Water customer, of running the Sydney Desalination plant over these past 12 months?</p>	<p>As per IPART's 2017 Sydney Desalination Plant (SDP) determination, due to the operation of SDP during the 2019-20 financial year, the estimated additional cost to Sydney Water customers was approximately \$100 per customer, \$15 more than when it was not running.</p>

116	What is the cost, per Sydney Water customer, of NOT running the desalination plant at production levels over a 12 month period?	Per IPART's 2017 Sydney Desalination Plant (SDP) determination, when SDP is not operating, Sydney Water customers have a billing impact of approximately \$85 per customer annually.
117	What is the total cost to have the Desalination plant re-started, after being in hibernation (ie: zero use)?	Under the current IPART price determination the shut down and re-start costs are estimated at \$14 million.
118	What would be the cost, per Sydney Water customer, of running the Desalination plant at 10% p.a. during an otherwise "hibernation" period, to avoid the 8 month delays and high re-start cost of coming out of hibernation?	The operating rules for the plant are set by the Department of Planning Industry and Environment, under the Metropolitan Water Plan. IPART determines the pass-through costs to customers.
119	Does Sydney Water still have the capacity, to take on more debt, to fund the expansion of the Sydney Desalination plant, or is the debt/income ratio geared so highly that borrowing is a problem?	Construction of an expansion to the desalination plant would be funded by the Sydney Desalination Plant (SDP), not Sydney Water. IPART will determine how SDP can recover expansion-related costs in a price determination later this year.
120	With regard to the Minister referring to the possibility of renewable energy for a Sydney desalination plant expansion as energy "that comes (with) a higher price", what did the Minister mean by this? What does the term "higher" refer to with regard to power prices that can be sourced at a lower cost and is this lower cost power available?	As part of the expansion plan, proposals will be put forward consistent with current planning approvals.
121	Is the Sydney Desalination plant an asset in the regulated asset base of Sydney Water?	No.
122	What sites for Desalination expansion were being considered on the northern beaches of Sydney? What capacity was being considered? (a) Will this exploratory work continue now that rain has fallen and dams are re-filling?"	While the short term threat to water supply in Greater Sydney is over, planning for desalination and other climate independent water sources will continue to be progressed to help ensure we are ready if severe drought conditions return to Greater Sydney, and to inform the development of the Greater Sydney Water Strategy.
Yanco Creek Diversion and Re-structuring Water Licences		

123	<p>What are the proposed changes to the Yanco Creek water supply and why are these changes being investigated?</p> <p>(a) What is the proposed benefit of any such changes?</p>	<p>The pre-feasibility concept proposals for Yanco Creek projects were developed to contribute to the Sustainable Diversion Limit Adjustment Mechanism as part of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. Projects under this Mechanism were required to demonstrate that they could deliver equivalent environmental outcomes with less water. The Yanco concept proposals presented ideas on how this could be done. Work is currently underway to progress a community based options development and assessment process for these projects to inform preferred option and detailed business cases to drive government investment decisions.</p>
124	<p>Is Yanco Creek project included in any of the Water Resource Plans that are currently being finalised?</p>	<p>Proposed extraction limits in the Murrumbidgee Water Resource Plan are based on the assumption that the Yanco Creek projects contribute to the Sustainable Diversion Limit Adjustment Mechanism. Should these projects not contribute to the Sustainable Diversion Limit Adjustment Mechanism, it is likely that extraction limits will decrease.</p>
125	<p>If the Yanco Creek project progressed would more water stay in the Murrumbidgee and flow west to places like Darlington Point where it can possibly be picked up by irrigators as “Supplementary Water”?</p>	<p>The Sustainable Diversion Limit Adjustment Mechanism (SDLAM) projects around Yanco Creek are pre-feasibility concept proposals only. Work is currently underway to progress a community based options development and assessment process that will inform preferred options for Yanco projects and detailed business cases to drive government investment decisions. Any additional entitlement created by any SDLAM project will be transferred to the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder for use as part of their environmental water holdings.</p>
126	<p>If the Yanco Creek project progressed would that mean that water is taken away from flows through the Yanco, meaning a reduction in water to be accessible to landowners, community and environment and if so, that are the projected volumes that would be diverted away from the Yanco Creek river system?</p>	<p>Existing SDLAM projects, including Yanco projects, are pre-feasibility concept proposals only. Work is currently underway to progress a community based options development and assessment process that will inform preferred options for Yanco projects and detailed business cases to drive government investment decisions. Options assessment will include identification of third party impacts and mitigation approaches for potential options which will inform government decisions.</p>
127	<p>If the Yanco Creek project progressed would that mean that water is taken away from flows along the Murray River, meaning a reduction in water to be accessible to landowners, community and environment along the Murray and if so, what are the projected volumes that will no longer be</p>	<p>Existing SDLAM projects , including Yanco projects, are pre-feasibility concept proposals only. Work is currently underway to progress a community based options development and assessment process that will inform preferred options for Yanco projects and detailed business cases to drive government investment decisions. Options assessment will include identification of third party impacts</p>

	available as a result of the Yenco Creek diversion?	and mitigation approaches for potential options which will inform government decisions.
128	Is there a view that Yenco Creek currently has access to too much water?	Extractions Limits under the Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Regulated River include the Yanco Creek system and those limits manage the amount of water available to all entitlement holders.
129	What is the frequency during which Supplementary licences around Darlington Point have been activated over the past 20 years?	Supplementary access was available to water users in the Murrumbidgee regulated river water source around Darlington Point on 42 occasions in the last 15 years (since the commencement of Supplementary entitlements under the Water Sharing Plan in 2004), totalling 1003 days of access altogether.
130	Is there any awareness within the Ministerial office, or Department, that properties around Darlington Point have been installing pumps capable of sucking 300ML/day out of the river despite only owning "Supplementary Water" licences?	Applications for such infrastructure are assessed for potential impacts, and determined, with the works being registered on a Works Approval licence for successful applicants.
131	What has been the average selling price of Supplementary Water licences along the Murrumbidgee, close to Darlington Point, each year for the past 5 years?	<p>Water prices are a function of market supply and demand, with prices negotiated between willing buyers and sellers with no government involvement. Darlington Point is within the supplementary water access zone named in the WSP as "that part of the water source downstream of Gogeldrie Weir". Average price for temporary (71T) and permanent (71Q) trade of supplementary water in that zone is shown below. This excludes trades of less than \$5 value.</p> <p>2014-15 water year - 71T average price per ML = \$29 - 71Q average price per share = \$290</p> <p>2015-16 water year - 71T average price per ML = \$36 - 71Q average price per share = \$375</p> <p>2016-17 water year - 71T average price per ML = \$41 - 71Q average price per share = \$536</p> <p>2017-18 water year - 71T average price per ML = \$26 - 71Q average price per share = \$607</p> <p>2018-19 water year - 71T average price per ML = \$30</p>

		<p>- 71Q average price per share = \$795</p> <p>2019-20 water year</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = -</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$840</p> <p>Average over above period</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = \$34</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$617</p>
132	<p>What has been the average selling price for High Security Water Licences along the Murrumbidgee, close to Darlington Point, each year for the past 5 years?</p>	<p>Water prices are a function of market supply and demand, with prices negotiated between willing buyers and sellers with no government involvement. High security licences are not differentiated by location along the Murrumbidgee river. The average price for temporary (71T) and permanent (71Q) trade of high security water in the Murrumbidgee generally is shown below. This excludes trades of less than \$5 value.</p> <p>2014-15 water year</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = \$110</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$2,121</p> <p>2015-16 water year</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = \$205</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$3,308</p> <p>2016-17 water year</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = \$95</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$3,550</p> <p>2017-18 water year</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = \$137</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$3,911</p> <p>2018-19 water year</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = \$398</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$5,453</p> <p>2019-20 water year</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = \$613</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$7,547</p> <p>Average over above period</p> <p>- 71T average price per ML = \$300</p> <p>- 71Q average price per share = \$4,669</p>

133	<p>What is the current water volume capacity of the Murrumbidgee River when running at high volume?</p> <p>(a) Are there any recent or current works underway to increase the carrying capacity of the Murrumbidgee River and if so, what is the nature of those works, at what cost and who paid?</p>	<p>The Murrumbidgee Water Sharing Plan refers to the following capacities at the commencement of this Plan have been assessed as:</p> <p>(a) 9,000 ML/day in the Tumut River at Oddys Bridge, (b) 9,300 ML/day in the Tumut River at Tumut, (c) 32,000 ML/day in the Murrumbidgee River at Gundagai, (d) 1,400 ML/day in Yanco Creek at the Offtake.</p>
134	<p>Minister, can you provide a dollar value (taxpayer dollars) on the work being done around Wagga Wagga to raise bank levees so that more water can be pushed harder along the Murrumbidgee River?</p> <p>(a) Are there any other funds being invested in this project from other sources and if so, how much is being contributed by whom?</p>	<p>The Murrumbidgee Constraints relaxation project is investigating the impacts of delivering environmental water at higher flows than currently allowed downstream of Gundagai. Early preliminary investigations indicated that some of the higher flows being considered may have an impact low lying Wagga Wagga City Council infrastructure e.g. storm water management infrastructure. Subject to the impact of COVID-19, the Project will soon commence community consultation, including with Wagga Wagga City Council, on possible benefits and impacts of these flows and the project will work through an options process with community and potentially impacted landholders to determine the preferred outcome for this project.</p> <p>There is \$21 million budgeted for Stage 1 of the Murrumbidgee Constraints relaxation project. This is 100% funded by the Commonwealth.</p> <p>No work is currently being done in the Wagga Wagga City Council area to allow higher environmental water flows to be delivered.</p>
135	<p>Minister have you ever met with a company or persons that own and/or are purchasing Supplementary Water Licences around Darlington Point to discuss the opportunity for additional Supplementary Water flows along the Murrumbidgee River and/or the Yanco Creek project?</p>	<p>The Minister's diary is publically available.</p>

136	Are water access trades within the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Water Access Licence (WAL) accessible and transparent to NSW Water and/or DPIE?	No.
Applications to drill bores		
137	How many applications to drill bores have been received from farmers and rural businesses since 1 October 2019? (a) How many have been approved? i. Of these, how many were approved on the basis of prioritising bores for drinking water and jobs? (b) How many have been rejected? i. Of these, how many were rejected on the basis of they were not prioritising bores for drinking water and jobs?	Since October 2019: 2724 bore applications were received. 2432 Basic Landholder Right (BLR) bores were granted. 50 non-BLR bores were granted. 17 BLR bores are in progress. 223 non-BLR bores are in progress. 2 BLR bores were refused. 0 non-BLR bores were refused. WaterNSW did not approve or reject bore applications due to prioritisation for drinking water and jobs. The prioritisation framework is about managing workflow.
WaterNSW Portfolio Delivery Management Partner		
138	After pre-registrations for the Expressions of Interest closed, how many suitably qualified organisations: (a) Submitted Expressions of Interest? then (b) Were invited to submit Tenders? (c) Actually submitted Tenders?	In total 10 organisations lodged an Expression of Interest (made up from 20 entities due to either a joint venture being formed or a subcontractor arrangement); Three were invited to tender; and Three have indicated that they will submit a tender (tenders close on 7 April 2020).
Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Israel signed 4 November 2019		
139	The estimated cost of the 11 day trip which included the signing of the MOU with Israel was \$94,988: (a) Who paid for the trip? (b) What was breakdown of the contribution of each contributor and/or department?"	Information on expenses incurred on this trip have been published on the Department of Premier and Cabinet's website.

140	<p>Are you concerned that Mekorot Water Company Ltd., Israel's national water company, has been listed on the United Nations Human Rights Office Database of Business Enterprises involved in illegal settlement activities which was released on 12 February 2020?</p> <p>(a) Can you confirm if Mekorot Water Company Ltd or any of the other 111 business enterprises listed are involved in the MOU or arrangements under the MOU?</p> <p>i. If yes, what steps have you taken to ensure that New South Wales, by signing the MOU with Israel, will not be in violation of international law?"</p>	<p>(a) The MOU is between the State of New South Wales and the Ministry of Energy of the State of Israel on Water Resources Management and Development Cooperation. This is a Government Department and not a business enterprise. Arrangements under the MOU are in their preliminary stages and do not at this stage involve business enterprise.</p>
141	<p>Is a copy of the MOU publically available?</p> <p>(a) Where can it be located?</p> <p>(b) If not publically available, can a copy be provided?</p>	<p>The MOU is available online at: https://www.industry.nsw.gov.au/water/what-we-do/legislation-policies/intergovernmental-agreements</p>
142	<p>On what basis did you as NSW Water Minister, and by default the NSW Government, choose to engage with Israel to share water research and development?</p>	<p>Israel has advanced water efficiency, desalination and recycling technology and expertise, and the NSW Legislative Council inquiry into "Augmentation of water supply for rural and regional New South Wales" recommended in 2018 that "That the NSW Government immediately commence a dialogue with Israel to study its innovative water management practices with a view to making recommendations to the Council of Australian Governments regarding the adoption of such practices in New South Wales and Australia.</p> <p>Knowledge-sharing and collaboration in water resource management has been realised to be of mutual benefit for Israel and the New South Wales Government for some time, particularly during the severe and extended drought in NSW.</p> <p>This MOU builds on earlier dialog between NSW and Israel, including a 2013 study tour of Israel consisting of MPs from across Parliament, and a 2016 MOU between the NSW Government and the State of Israel for Bilateral Cooperation in Research and Development, and Technology Innovation that underpinned a subsequent grants program. Water technology was identified in that agreement as a priority sector for the program.</p>
Sydney Water – Leakage		

143

What is the current rate, percentage, of water lost throughout the Sydney Water network as a result of leakage?
(a) What has been the rate of this problem for each year, over the past 10 years?

In 2018-19, Sydney Water's leakage loss was 8.4%. This rates among the best major water utilities in Australia. By world standards measured against the World Bank's Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) and adopted by the International Water Association (IWA), Sydney Water is placed in the top band for managing leak losses for a water supply company.

Sydney Water currently manages more than 23,000km of water mains which is the second largest network in Australia, servicing the greatest number of properties nationally.

QUESTION

(a)

2018-19: 8.4% *
2017-18: 7.9% *
2016-17: 7.5%
2015-16: 7.2%
2014-15: 7.0%
2013-14: 7.4%
2012-13: 8.3%
2011-12: 8.6%
2010-11: 7.7%
2009-10: 7.0%

*Drought years – The drought has resulted in a reduction in soil moisture, which leads to ground movement and associated movement of buried assets. This increases the number of leaks and breaks on the pipe network, along with the fittings and services connected to the pipes.

<p>144</p>	<p>What is the current rate, volume, of water lost throughout the Sydney Water network as a result of leakage? (a) What has been the volume rate of this problem for each year, over the past 10 years?</p>	<p>In 2018-19, 47.8GL was lost due to leakage.</p> <p>(a) What has been the volume rate of this problem for each year, over the past 10 years?</p> <p>2018-19: 47.8 GL * 2017-18: 47.1 GL * 2016-17: 41.9 GL 2015-16: 37.5 GL 2014-15: 36.2 GL 2013-14: 39.0 GL 2012-13: 41.7 GL 2011-12: 41.8 GL 2010-11: 38.3 GL 2009-10: 35.1 GL</p> <p>Current leakage volume is substantially reduced from a peak of around 68.6GL in 2002-03.</p> <p>*Drought years – The drought has resulted in a reduction in soil moisture, which leads to ground movement and associated movement of buried assets. This increases the number of leaks and breaks on the pipe network, along with the fittings and services connected to the pipes.</p>
<p>145</p>	<p>How much funding will be invested into addressing the problem of leakage this year? (a) What has been the rate of investment for each year, over the past 10 years?</p>	<p>The forecast spending for critical and reticulation watermain renewals for 2019-20 is \$49.3M.</p> <p>(a) Capital programs are underway to replace water mains not performing at the required standard, as part of Sydney Water’s efforts to reduce leakage. The length of mains replaced and renewed and the total cost over the last 10 years, are summarised in the table in Appendix 1.</p> <p>The costs in the above table only relate to money invested in watermain renewals. Additional investment has been made in the Active Leak Detection program and planned and reactive maintenance.</p> <p>In addition, \$27.1 million was spent in 2018-19 to address performance issues created by drought, such as weather-related repairs and maintenance.</p>

146

Does Sydney Water have a target for the volume or percentage of water lost through leakage that it is working towards and if so what is that target?

"Sydney Water's Operating Licence requires it to target an Economic Level of Leakage (ELL) using the Economic Level of Water Conservation. The ELL is a balance between the cost of reducing leakage and the current value of water. Sydney Water uses the ELL approach set by the International Water Association.

The ELL is based on the value of water and is affected by dam levels and the use of water produced by the Sydney Desalination Plant. With the current dam storages around 82%, the current target ELL is 105 megalitres a day with an upper limit of 121."

147

Does Sydney Water have employees directly charged with responsibility to detect and repair/replace parts of the network that have leakage and if so what is the number of FTE's dedicated to this task?

(a) How many FTE's employees of Sydney Water have been dedicated to this task in each year for the past 10 years?

Sydney Water's budgeted full-time equivalent staff and contractor numbers for civil maintenance are currently higher than they have been in the last five years. This is in response to the drought which has resulted in a reduction in soil moisture, leading to ground movement and associated movement of buried assets. This increases the number of leaks and breaks on the pipe network, along with the fittings and services connected to the pipes.

In 2018-19, there were 641 full-time equivalent staff and in 2019-20 there are 669 people dedicated to civil maintenance.

We have increased our expenditure on maintenance, expanding the number of crews and frontline maintenance staff by 30% since 2017.

(a)

2019-20: 669 FTE
2018-19: 641
2017-18: 623
2016-17: 593
2015-16: 603
2014-15: 613
2013-14: 624
2012-13: 630
2011-12: 628
2010-11: 654

148	<p>Does Sydney Water engage external contractors specifically for the purpose of charging these contractors with responsibility to detect and repair/replace parts of the network that have leakage and if so what is the budget allocated for tis purpose in this financial year? (a) What is the value of contractors engaged by Sydney Water for the purpose of detection and repair of leaking infrastructure throughout the network in each year for the past 10 years?</p>	<p>Sydney Water’s workforce is supplemented with contract partners to assist internal staff, particularly during periods of high demand such as extended drought periods.</p> <p>There has been an investment of \$30 million in additional work crews with active leak detection increasing by 66%. The allocated budget for active leak detection for 2019-20 is \$1.8 million.</p> <p>(a) Active Leak Detection Contract costs:</p> <p>2019-20: \$1.80m 2018-19: \$1.46m 2017-18: \$1.02m 2016-17: \$0.97m 2015-16: \$1.05m 2014-15: \$1.30m 2013-14: \$1.55m 2012-13: \$1.84m 2011-12: \$1.85m"</p>
149	<p>How much was spent as redress payments for water outages in each year for the past 10 years?</p>	<p>2018-19: \$2,659,163 2017-18: \$3,170,151 2016-17: \$2,971,796 2015-16: \$3,185,456 2014-15: \$2,131,655 2013-14: \$2,506,864 2012-13: \$2,657,256 2011-12: \$3,121,374 2010-11: \$1,691,402 2009-10: \$3,753,178</p>
Toorale Station		
150	<p>What is the maximum volume of water, per annum, that will be licenced to be diverted from the Warrego River into the Toorale National Park? (a) How will these volumes me measured and monitored?</p>	<p>There is currently 8,106 unregulated river licenced shares and 9,720 unregulated river licenced (special additional high flow) shares owned by the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder.</p> <p>There are WaterNSW gauges upstream at Fords Bridge and down-stream at Dicks Dam. There is also telemetered weir pool height measurement in the Boera storage.</p>

151	<p>Which NSW Government department would that diverted water, into Toorale National Park, be licenced to?</p> <p>(a) Will any of this water be held in storage for future or later release by the authorised NSW Government department and if so, what would the projected volume of this water holding?</p>	<p>The water licences are held by the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder. This matter was discussed in the 2008 Project Proposal made by the 2008 Department of Water and Energy. It states "Licensed entitlement holders, such as at Toorale, would typically pump water when able to, into on-farm storage, for subsequent diversion for irrigation. The volume able to be diverted is limited in three ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Cap management arrangements that provide for volumes to be credited to accounts. A licensed entitlement holder cannot divert more water than is available in their respective accounts ii. The capacity of the pumps to divert water iii. The on-farm storage capacity. If on-farm storages are full, there is little capacity to divert any more water into these. <p>Questions regarding the use of this water should be directed to the Minister for Energy and Environment.</p>
152	<p>Is it correct that the Toorale property had 6 significant dam structures and that of those six only one single dam has been dismantled for the purpose of allowing water to flow further down into the Barwon-Darling river system?</p> <p>(a) Do each of the dams have individual names and if so what are the names of each and specifically which is the one that has been dismantled to allow water to flow?</p> <p>(b) If so, what is proposed for the remaining 5 dams and what volume of water could they potentially hold just as a result of floodplain harvesting (putting aside river diversions)?</p>	<p>The water licences are held by the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder. The proposed Boera Dam structure is being developed to enable a more flexible approach to delivering water to either the Western Floodplain and/or the Warrego River/Darling Rivers. The projected maximum capacity of this structure is 1,650GL.</p>
153	<p>In purchasing the Toorale Station in 2008, what was the total volume of water purchased and what portion of that water was intended for return to natural river flows and what portion of that water was always intended to be held into the future for environmental purposes?</p>	<p>According to a 2008 NSW Government report, 'Proposal to enable environmental water entitlements acquired in the Darling River at Toorale Station, to be diverted downstream of the Menindee Lakes', the entitlements associated with Toorale in 2008 were 8,106ML on the Warrego, as well as 7,672ML of the Cap Share on the Darling River. This same report states "<i>Since the purchase of Toorale, it has been the Commonwealth Government's intention that water, that would have otherwise been diverted from the Darling River or retained in storage on the property, be allowed to flow</i></p>

		<i>past the property and provide additional flows in the Darling River.”</i>
154	Under what conditions, if any, could the water that has been repurposed from storage on Toorale back to river flows become part of the consolidated water account and as such potentially be available for irrigator access?	Toorale and its associated licences are required to follow the same rules for how water is used that irrigators are required to follow.
155	How does the Intersecting Streams Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2011 Water Sharing Plan account for the water from Toorale and does the recent revelation that water could continue to be diverted onto the Toorale National Park instead of flowing naturally change the nature of that Water Sharing Plan in any way? (a) If so, will a review of that Water Sharing Plan be brought forward?	The Intersecting Streams Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2011 Water Sharing Plan accounts for unregulated access licences in the water source. The use of water at Toorale does not change the nature of the water sharing plan (a) The water sharing plan is scheduled to be reviewed by the Natural Resources Commission (NRC) in 2021/22 as the plan will have been in place for 10 years. At this time the NRC will seek public submissions on the effectiveness of the water sharing plan.
156	Which Government department is responsible for the water diversion and water holding works on Toorale and what is the quantum of funds available for these projects?	National Parks and Wildlife Services (NPWS) manages the Toorale site and its associated works.
Budget Income Expenses		

What were the actual Department of Primary Industry and Environment – Water (DPIE – Water) figures during financial years 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 for

- (a) Salaries and Wages
- (b) Workers Compensation Premiums to Treasury Managed Fund
- (c) Redundancy or Restructuring Expenses
- (d) Materials to Produce Goods
- (e) Consultant Expenses
- (f) Contractor Expenses
- (g) Advertising Expenses
- (h) Printing Expenses
- (i) Training and Development Expenses
- (j) Other Operating Expenses (Cash)
- (k) Recurrent Grant Expense – Murray Darling Basin Authority
- (l) Recurrent Subsidies and Contributions – Other
- (m) Cluster Grant to Agencies – Recurrent
- (n) Capital Grants to Agencies – Other than Cluster Grants
- (o) Capital Grant Expenses – Other
- (p) Capital Grant Expense – Land (Non-cash)
- (q) Cluster Grants to Agencies – Capital
- (r) Depreciation – Buildings and Improvements – Other than Dwellings
- (s) Depreciation – Plant and Equipment – Other than Transport Equipment
- (t) Depreciation – Infrastructure – Water, Dams, Sewerage and Drainage
- (u) Sale of Goods – Other
- (v) Personnel Services Revenue
- (w) Fees for Services – Other
- (x) Water Operations Fee Revenue
- (y) Recoup of Administration Costs – Government Agencies
- (z) Sale of Other Services Revenue
- (aa) Recurrent Grants from Government Agencies
- (bb) Capital Grants from Government Agencies
- (cc) Capital Grants and Subsidies – Other

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment is established under the Administrative Arrangements (Administrative Change – Public Service Agencies) Order 2019 effective 1 July 2019. The Planning, Industry and Environment cluster combines the functions and agencies of the former Planning and Environment cluster and the former Industry cluster with specific functions from the former Finance, Services and Innovation cluster, the former Family and Community Services cluster and the Premier and Cabinet cluster. DPIE Water Group came into existence on 1 July 2019, as such the historical expenses incurred that formed part of these historical organisations and it is not possible to provide the items as outlined.

	(dd) Capital Donations and Contributions – Other (Non-cash) (ee) Revenue – General (ff) Proceeds of Sale – Land (gg) Written Down Value of Plant and Equipment – Sold	
--	--	--

What is the projected budget for the following items under DPIE – Water for financial year 2019-20:

- (a) Salaries and Wages
- (b) Workers Compensation Premiums to Treasury Managed Fund
- (c) Redundancy or Restructuring Expenses
- (d) Materials to Produce Goods
- (e) Consultant Expenses
- (f) Contractor Expenses
- (g) Advertising Expenses
- (h) Printing Expenses
- (i) Training and Development Expenses
- (j) Other Operating Expenses (Cash)
- (k) Recurrent Grant Expense – Murray Darling Basin Authority
- (l) Recurrent Subsidies and Contributions – Other
- (m) Cluster Grant to Agencies – Recurrent
- (n) Capital Grants to Agencies – Other than Cluster Grants
- (o) Capital Grant Expenses – Other
- (p) Capital Grant Expense – Land (Non-cash)
- (q) Cluster Grants to Agencies – Capital
- (r) Depreciation – Buildings and Improvements – Other than Dwellings
- (s) Depreciation – Plant and Equipment – Other than Transport Equipment
- (t) Depreciation – Infrastructure – Water, Dams, Sewerage and Drainage
- (u) Sale of Goods – Other
- (v) Personnel Services Revenue
- (w) Fees for Services – Other
- (x) Water Operations Fee Revenue
- (y) Recoup of Administration Costs – Government Agencies
- (z) Sale of Other Services Revenue
- (aa) Recurrent Grants from Government Agencies
- (bb) Capital Grants from Government Agencies
- (cc) Capital Grants and Subsidies – Other
- (dd) Capital Donations and Contributions – Other (Non-cash)
- (ee) Revenue – General

The budget for the DPIE Water Group is contained in Budget Paper 3 to the NSW Government Budget Papers within the State Outcome, “Sustainable and secure water resources” for both Recurrent and Capital Expenditure. The various businesses within the Planning, Industry & Environment Cluster are responsible for allocating their operational budgets as they see appropriate given the objectives and outcomes, fiscal constraints of the NSW Government.

	(ff) Proceeds of Sale – Land (gg) Written Down Value of Plant and Equipment – Sold	
	Budget Estimates Testimony Questions	
159	<p>With regard to the independent assessment panel (p2) that is going to be convened to investigate the process around the lifting of floodplain harvesting embargoes, why is the Natural Resources Commissioner (NRC) not being used?</p> <p>(a) Who made the decision to not use the NRC?</p> <p>(b) On what date were the NRC notified that they would not be the investigating body?</p> <p>(c) Does the scope of this independent assessment fall outside of the current scope of work for the NRC in a unique way, or more broadly does this suggest that the scope of the NRC itself is not fit for purpose?</p>	<p>The Department's decision, in the first instance, was that Dr Wendy Craik and Mr Greg Claydon constitute an independent assessment panel given their collective extensive experience in water resource management, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the operation of the Murray-Darling Basin and the Murray-Darling Basin Plan; Dr Craik's previous role as the independent reviewer of the Murray-Darling Basin Compliance Compact; and Mr Claydon's previous role as an independent reviewer of implementation of the NSW Floodplain Harvesting Policy. <p>The decision to engage these reviewers was made following Minister Pavey's budget estimates hearing</p> <p>(a) The department</p> <p>(b) There was no obligation to refer this assessment to the NRC. The NRC was not notified as there was no requirement for the department to do so.</p> <p>(c) No.</p>

160	<p>With regard to the contact between DPIE and the Ministers policy officer (p6) referred to by Executive Director O'Keefe, on what dates and on how many occasions on each date was there contact between DPIE and the relevant Policy adviser and on each occasion who instigated the contact?</p> <p>(a) With regard to the term used "he was passing on representations" what does this mean in this context and does it include information being provided to the Minister?</p>	<p>On 8 and 9 Feb the Policy advisor informed the Department by telephone that stakeholders had advised that there was significant rain in parts of the north-west of the state. The Department contacted the Policy advisor by email to advise of the response. The Policy advisor also asked for updated forecasts.</p> <p>On 10 February the Policy advisor asked for a summary of the embargoes in place and lifted. This was provided by email. The policy officer was advised of the decision to lift after the decision had been made.</p> <p>(a) In this context, the Minister's policy advisor was passing on representations received (direct to the Minister's office) from stakeholders. The Department did not provide information directly to the Minister.</p>
161	<p>With regards the "public interest test" being met, as per evidence provided by Ms O'Keefe, are these measures of public interest determined on a catchment by catchment basis?</p> <p>(a) If so, does the public interest test need to be measured and met in each catchment?</p> <p>(b) If the public interest test is being measured and tested in one catchment, at what point, under what trigger, does it become a requirement for that public interest test to stretch beyond that single catchment area?</p> <p>(c) Ordinarily, at a time when an embargo is not in place, is the public interest test implemented for the purpose of making decisions about allowing pumping and if so, is there a requirement to make any consideration of the downstream effects of that pumping occurring in that ne catchment?</p> <p>(d) If the public interest test is extended beyond a single catchment, who makes the decision that water might/might not get further downstream and is the Minister of the Ministerial office a part of that decision making process?</p>	<p>(a) The order under s324 of the <i>Water Management Act 2000</i> was issued because it was in the public interest to temporarily restrict extraction so that water could be provided for critical town water, basic landholder and stock needs, and critical environmental needs, across the Northern Basin due to the drought. Flow targets were developed in each valley, and the Barwon-Darling, to guide when restrictions could be lifted on the basis that the objectives of the s324 order had been (or were forecast to be) met.</p> <p>(b) The triggers to guide when restrictions could be lifted extended to several catchments. In determining whether to lift restrictions, the department assessed the flow against the flow targets and allowed access to upstream water users under normal rules once the nearest downstream triggers are met or forecast to be met and there was an assessment that this event would not meaningfully contribute to meeting any downstream critical needs.</p> <p>(c) The public interest test is a specific mechanism within Section 324 orders.</p> <p>(d) This decision is based on flow forecasts used to determine whether the next downstream trigger will be met or not. The decisions are made by DPIE Water following consultation with DPI Fisheries and WaterNSW. The Minister is not involved in the decision-making process.</p>

162	<p>With regard evidence given by Mr Harris regarding block banks (p7) is there a specific volume of water that is required to satisfy the criteria for 12 months of supply to the lower darling and if so, what is that volume?</p> <p>(a) Is there a figure for the volume of water required for 18 months' supply?</p> <p>(b) What would be the decision on the block banks if the water being held guaranteed supply for somewhere between 12-18 months?</p>	<p>The specific volume of water estimated to supply 12 & 18 months varies with each month of the year (due high evaporation rates at Menindee).</p> <p>a) 200GL is currently being targeted to supply 12 to 18 months of supply to the lower Darling.</p> <p>b) The block banks are being removed as there will be 12-18 months of supply.</p>
163	<p>With regard to Mr Harris testimony about construction of future dams (p11) he makes reference to Mole Dam. Is Mole Dam going ahead?</p> <p>(a) What is the estimated cost of Mole Dam?</p> <p>(b) What is the timeline for construction?</p> <p>(c) What is the benefit to cost ratio for Mole Dam?</p> <p>(d) Which customer base will be charged for the construction and future depreciation of Mole Dam?</p> <p>(e) How much water is Mole Dam expected to hold and how will this be treated under Sustainable Diversion Limits on that waterway and who will lose access in the short term due to the water required to fill Mole Dam being held back?</p>	<p>The Commonwealth and State Government's have committed \$24 million for detailed investigations and the completion of a business case for a new Dam at Mole River.</p> <p>a) The total construction cost is estimated in preliminary studies at \$355m, however this is subject to change following detailed investigations.</p> <p>b) An indicative timeline is: - 2020 Community engagement commences - Year One Concept Design & Environmental Assessment - End of Year Two Project Determination - Year Three Detailed Design and Pre-Construction enabling work - From Year Four Dam construction Construction is expected to take 2-4 years, dependent on design.</p> <p>c) This will be assessed through the preparation of a final business case for the projects.</p> <p>d) A funding model is yet to be determined. This could include a mix of Government funding and customer charging.</p> <p>e) Initial studies suggested that storage capacity would be optimised at around 100gL, however this, and related impacts, will be further assessed in the final business case.</p>

With regard to water recycling projects (p16) are there any current plans in place for a specific volume of water that is projected to become part of the recycling network of water in the Sydney Water network and if so, what is that volume?

(a) What new estates, like Rouse Hill, within the Sydney Water network, have been developed with a requirement to have water recycling measures installed?

i. What are the names of these estates?

ii. What is the housing capacity of each of these estates?

iii. What is the current progress against that total housing capacity for each of these estates?"

Water recycling makes up approximately 7-8 per cent of Sydney's water supply. The Government supports cost effective water recycling where it provides social, environmental and economic benefits to the community. The role of, and measures to promote recycling will be considered as part of the Greater Sydney Water Strategy development.

(a) In 2018-2019, Sydney Water supplied 44 billion litres of recycled water across 23 schemes saving 12 billion litres of drinking water.

Sydney Water's Rouse Hill Water Recycling Scheme is the largest residential water recycling scheme in Australia. This scheme services 32,000 properties in Rouse Hill, Stanhope Gardens, Glenwood, Kellyville, Kellyville Ridge, Parklea, Acacia Gardens, Beaumont Hills, Quakers Hill, The Ponds and Castle Hill.

Several recycled water schemes are being planned and delivered in Western Sydney to Colebee; Ropes Crossing; Hoxton Park; and Oran Park and Turner Road. These schemes will all be operational by the end of 2022.

The Hoxton Park Recycled Water scheme is currently used to supply drinking water as there is insufficient demand for recycled water. Sydney Water is currently planning to recommission this plant to supply recycled water to the new Western Sydney Airport for construction purposes.

Sydney Water is also assessing if it can expand or develop new schemes to supply local government and agricultural customers with recycled water in the West Camden and Richmond areas, as well as the South West Growth Area and the Western Sydney Aerotropolis.

(i) In 2019-20, Sydney Water is continuing to plan and implement recycled water schemes in:

- Colebee
- Oran Park
- Turner Road
- Ropes Crossing

(ii) The capacity of these schemes are as follows:

- Colebee: around 185 dwellings

- Oran Park: around 600 dwellings
- Turner Road: around 300 dwellings
- Ropes Crossing: around 2,315 dwellings

Hoxton Park Recycled Water Scheme requires 6,500 connections to be operational, which is expected to be reached in late 2022, by which time water is no longer expected to be needed for airport construction.

(iii) Sydney Water is working towards having the Colebee, Oran Park, Turner Road, Ropes Crossing and Hoxton Park schemes all operational by the end of 2022.

Sydney Water is also actively working with local councils and developer partners in exploring sustainable and integrated water solutions to support growth.

<p>165</p>	<p>With regard to the Greater Sydney water strategy referred to by Dr Bentley (p17) how will that be different from the Sydney Metropolitan Water Plan 2017?</p> <p>(a) Why was the work now proposed by Dr Bentley not done during the development of the 2017 Metropolitan Plan</p> <p>(b) Why does the 2017 Metropolitan Plan refer to future timelines including 10 years and 50 years, as does the proposed Greater Sydney water strategy? Is this not duplication?</p> <p>(c) Why did a document, as recent as 2017, not include plans and options for recycled water in any great detail?</p>	<p>The Greater Sydney Water Strategy will replace the Metropolitan Water Plan (MWP). It will be broader in scope than the MWP and will look at how all water sources (including dams, desalination, recycled water and stormwater) can contribute to the Government's vision of a productive, liveable and sustainable city. The Greater Sydney Water Strategy will take on board learnings from the recent drought, how climate change will impact on water supply and consumption, and examine a range of future scenarios that could impact on growth and water consumption. It will consider the contribution of water conservation, but also identify and prioritise the major infrastructure initiatives that are needed to ensure that our water supply is safe, affordable and resilient as the population continues to grow.</p>
<p>166</p>	<p>With regard to water sharing plan audits referred to by Dr Betley (p21), how many audits have now been completed and how many audits are still outstanding?</p> <p>(a) What is the due date for any still outstanding water audits?</p> <p>(b) What was the original due date for the water audits? i. How many extensions to the due date have been sought and granted?</p> <p>(c) Does each water sharing plan receive an audit?</p> <p>(d) Who are the water audits submitted to and for what purpose?</p> <p>(e) Can a water audit be refused to be recognised because of concerns about reliability, accuracy, etc?</p>	<p>All 25 outstanding audits have now been completed.</p> <p>(a) There are no outstanding audits of water sharing plans to be completed.</p> <p>(b) The backlog of 25 outstanding audits were due at various times between 2015 to 2018. There is no mechanism for seeking extensions.</p> <p>(c) Section 44 of the Water Management Act 2000 requires that The Minister is to ensure that a management plan is audited, within the first 5 years of the plan..."</p> <p>(d) Audits under s44 of the Act are submitted to the Minister "for the purpose of ascertaining whether its provisions are being given effect to."</p> <p>(e) There are no statutory provisions relating to rejecting an audit</p>

167

With regard to the Barwon-Darling Water Sharing Plan (WSP) referred to on p22, is it the case that the Barwon Darling WSP is going to be completely remade, as opposed to being amended?

(a) What is the timeline for this remake of the Barwon-Darling WSP?

(b) Once a WSP is made, or in this instance remade, how long is it in effect for?

(c) Will the NSW Government be exposed to any possible compensation payments as a result of this remaking of the WSP before it comes to the end of its natural term?

(d) Is the Government exposed to compensation for a remade, or amended plan, even if that WSP has reached its end date?

(e) Are there currently any other WSP's that are being reviewed with a view to be completely remade, as opposed to simply being amended and if so which WSP's are they?"

The Water Sharing Plan for the Barwon Darling River is being amended

(a) The plan will be remade in 2022

(b) Generally 10 years, although the Water Management Act 2000 enables plans to be amended or remade in that period, or its duration extended in certain circumstances.

(c) N/A

(d) The provisions concerning compensation relating to access licences are specified in Division 9 of Part 2 of Chapter 3 of the *Water Management Act 2000*.

(e) Yes, as part of the development of the water resource plans 17 plans are being remade and 11 other plans are being amended.

With regard to the Water Resource Plans that are going to be taken to Stakeholder Advisory Panels (SAP) referred to on pages 22 & 23, is the purpose of these gatherings to seek further feedback for possible further amendment, or is it simply to show/reveal what the final version looks like?

(a) Will each SAP have a role to play by way of final vote of acceptance or to perhaps move some type of Motion of approval to formalise the Water Resource Plan under consideration?

(b) Why is there a commitment to hold 2 sessions for the Namoi Water Resource Plan, at both Narrabri and Tamworth, just 170km apart?

i. Will both of these meetings for the Namoi involve the same people at the two different venues?

ii. Why is the logic being applied to the Namoi SAP, to hold 2 meetings, not being applied to either the Murray Lower Darling Sap or the Barwon Darling SAP which have distances of more than 500km from end to end and between major communities?

iii. Does the SAP for the Barwon Darling include community representatives or is it only comprised of relevant government agencies?

iv. Are SAP's deemed to be the only form of community consultation in finalising Water Resource Plans, or are SAP's considered the minimum standard in finalising Water Resource Plans with capacity to go outside of and beyond the existing SAP's?

v. Do each of the SAP's have representation of Aboriginal communities?

vi. Have each of the Water Resource Plans been developed with wider engagement, outside of SAP's, of community water interest groups and if so, what are the names of these groups in each of the Water Resource Plans?

vii. Is there any plan to invite other persons, non-SAP members, to

The purpose of the SAP meetings is to explain the changes resulting from the full public consultation and government agency assessment last year, and to seek comment and feedback on the final drafts. All SAP meetings are currently being undertaken through remote technology due to the ongoing COVID-19 emergency.

(a) No - the SAPs are an advisory panel

(b) There are separate water sharing plans for the regulated Peel River (Tamworth) and regulated Upper and Lower Namoi (Narrabri). Separate meetings have been held on two occasions over the last two years. Usually the SAP discusses both water sharing plans during a meeting

i) Different external stakeholders but an invitation to each meeting goes to all SAP members

ii) See answer to (b). The Murray and Lower Darling are covered under one water sharing plan

iii) The SAP includes aboriginal, community, water user, environmental and local government representatives

iv) All stakeholders (not just SAP members) were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the various water resource plans during the public consultation period for each plan

v) Aboriginal representatives have been invited to each SAP through the Murray Lower Darling Indigenous Nations and Northern Basin Aboriginal Nations organisations

vi) Yes, all stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the various water resource plans during the public consultation period for each plan

vii) No.

	attend any of the SAP meetings that are listed for March-April 2020 to deal with the finalisation of Water Resource Plans, and if so, who are these persons and which meetings will they attend?"	
169	With regard to references made to Mr Jock Laurie during the recent Budget Estimates hearing, as an employee of NSW, which Government department has been responsible for Mr Laurie's wage, salary, etc?	Mr Laurie's wage/salary etc were administered by the Department of Industry prior to the April 2019 Machinery of Government (MOG) changes. Post MOG, the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment were responsible for these administrative actions.
170	With regard to a possible Royal Commission into the Murray Darling Basin Plan in Budget Estimates testimony (p35) what are the next steps in realising this outcome? (a) Is Legislation required to be enacted through NSW Parliament? (b) What is the timeline for the Minister in pursuing a Royal Commission?	(a) Legislation is not required in NSW for the Federal Government to conduct a Royal Commission into the Murray-Darling Basin Plan (b) This is a Federal matter and the relevant Commonwealth Minister is aware.

171	<p>With regard to the reference made by the Minister about water being released from Wyangala Dam by the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder (p35) is the Minister aware of any water being released from Wyangala Dam that had been held by the NSW Environmental Water Holder and if so, on what dates did these releases occur and what was the volume of water released by the NSW Environmental water holder? (a) Is the Minister typically advised of the release of NSW Environmental Water prior to the event or after the event?"</p>	<p>Environmental water customers place orders as per normal customer requirements. WaterNSW will schedule releases based on their order. The Minister is not typically advised of the placement of water orders or what releases are made. WaterNSW produces a weekly regional water availability report which references current operations including environmental releases, but this report does not necessarily cover all environmental releases. This report is made publicly available on the WaterNSW website.</p>
172	<p>With regard to the media reports of the Minister attending a dinner with water irrigators at a Japanese restaurant on February 4, 2020, addressed during the recent Budget Estimates (p36), did the Minister attend the irrigation council meeting held at Parliament House earlier in the day? (a) Was the Minister formally invited to attend the irrigators meeting at Parliament House earlier in the day? (b) Approximately how long did the Minister spend with the irrigators at the restaurant in the evening? (c) Was Tom Chesson the policy adviser with the Minister on that evening?"</p>	<p>a. The meeting was on the 5th of February, and this question was answered during the hearing – please refer to page 36 of the transcriptb. Around half an hour c. Tom Chesson was in attendance.</p>

173	<p>With regard to the term “drought of record” used repeatedly by Ms O’Keefe (p37), does this term refer to the worst, most severe, drought on record known?</p> <p>(a) If so, has the recent drought (2016-20) exceeded the known drought on record?</p> <p>(b) Despite the fact that the current drought has not ended will, at the very least, the known details of the current drought be used from this point forward to inform Water Sharing Plans and Water Resource Plans and take the place of drought of record for the purpose of water decisions?</p> <p>(c) Do the current Water Resource Plans that have been drafted and are soon to be finalised use the current drought conditions as the drought of record?</p>	<p>It will, for a specified period.</p> <p>a) In a number of valleys the 2 year cumulative inflows in this drought have been less (worse drought) than those observed at any other time in over 100 years of records.</p> <p>b) In particular, Regional Water Strategies, which are synthesising extended data sets and calibrating them to paleo data in order to better inform and manage climate extremes will guide water sharing instruments and plans.</p> <p>c) The water resource plans use the climate period 1895 - 2009 as prescribed by the Basin Plan.</p>
174	<p>With regard to the \$250M referred to by the Minister to ensure that towns stay in water (p39), on what exact projects has this money been spent and what quantum of money has been spent on each of these projects/initiatives?</p> <p>(a) Has this \$250M been sourced from Consolidated Revenue?</p> <p>(b) Has this \$250M been sourced from Restart or Rebuilding NSW?</p> <p>(c) Has this \$250M been sourced from the Snowy Hydro fund?</p> <p>(d) Has this \$250M been sourced from some other fund and if so, what is the name of that fund and what is the source of the cash injection into that fund?</p>	See Appendix 4 for response.
175	<p>With regard to the \$204M spent on rehabilitation infrastructure referred to by the Minister (p41) for the Great Artesian Basin, what is the break-down of that expenditure, on what programs or projects and in which years has that money been spent?</p>	<p>Since the early 1990’s there have been five Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiatives co funded by the Commonwealth and delivered by NSW through a dollar matching agreement. Individual Landholders have also contributed to part funding arrangements. The projects within these five programs relate to capping and piping bores that have uncontrolled flows. This work delivers water efficiency by reducing evaporation of the GAB resource. Evaporation in uncontrolled flowing bores is approximately 85%.</p> <p>1993 - 1998 \$22.846M 1999 - 2004 \$52.328M 2005 - 2009 \$66.054M 2010 - 2014 \$20.225M 2015 - 2019 \$10.311M</p>

		<p>These figures are the total expenditure including the dollar matched portion by the Commonwealth. There is also yearly funding by NSW to the value of \$1.538M which brings the total expenditure to \$204M. This residual funding enables continuity in bore survey and data collection work within a dedicated team.</p> <p>The next and sixth round of funding is called the Great Artesian Basin Drought Resilience program. NSW is committing up to \$13M toward this program. Projects will again be dollar matched by the Commonwealth. The project agreement has been signed by the Commonwealth and was countersigned by Minister Pavey on the 10th March 2020.</p>
176	<p>With regard to the embargo and the ability to pump water referred to by Ms O'Keefe (p52), is it possible for landholders to pump such enormous volumes of water that they can overcome a condition described as a "flood" (twice on p39)?</p> <p>(a) What consideration was given to the concept of overcoming flood waters, by using pumps, in the decision to lift embargoes?</p> <p>(b) Is DPIE-Water aware of any instance where the pumping of "flood" water was successful in prevent infrastructure damage?"</p>	<p>The temporary lifting of the embargo was not to stop flooding, it was about mitigating alleged damage to private and public infrastructure and for public safety.</p> <p>(a) The decision to temporarily lift these orders was not based on the premise that allowing access to this water would stop or overcome widespread flooding, but rather that property owners could move water around their property to mitigate the risk to infrastructure damage of that floodwater.</p> <p>(b) Movement of water using pumps and infrastructure is frequently used around the world to mitigate risk to infrastructure from floodwater. No direct reports of success of this method were received, nor were any sought.</p>
Water Dividends		
177	<p>Does Water NSW make an annual dividend payment to the NSW Treasury?</p> <p>(a) If so, what has been the annual dividend paid each year for the past 10 financial years?"</p>	<p>This is a matter for the shareholder Ministers – The Treasurer and the Minister for Finance and Small Business.</p>

178	<p>Over each of the past 8 financial years, Annual Report financial statements show that Sydney Water made the following dividend payments to Treasury: 11/12 \$242M, 12/13 \$291M, 13/14 \$252M, 14/15 \$664M, 15/16 \$389M, 16/17 \$291M, 17/18 \$546M, 18/19 \$915M; are these figures correct?</p> <p>(a) What is the projected dividend for 19/20?</p> <p>(b) Why has the annual dividend risen so sharply, on average, over the past 5 years?</p> <p>(c) How has the take of these higher dividends in recent years affected the debt ratio of the business?"</p>	<p>This is a matter for the shareholder Ministers – The Treasurer and the Minister for Finance and Small Business.</p>
179	<p>Over each of the past 8 financial years, Annual Report financial statements show that Hunter Water made the following dividend payments to Treasury: 11/12 \$20.82M, 12/13 \$15.6M, 13/14 \$36.3M, 14/15 \$21.3M, 15/16 \$37.3M, 16/17 \$41.6M, 17/18 \$43.2M, 18/19 \$144.4M; are these figures correct?</p> <p>(a) What is the projected dividend for 19/20?</p> <p>(b) Why has the annual dividend risen so sharply, on average, over the past 5 years?</p> <p>(c) How has the take of these higher dividends in recent years affected the debt ratio of the business?"</p>	<p>This is a matter for the shareholder Ministers – The Treasurer and the Minister for Finance and Small Business.</p>
180	<p>Over each of the past 8 financial years the NSW Budget has indicated that the following dividend payments were made from Water entities to Treasury: 11/12 \$337M, 12/13 \$357M, 13/14 \$337M, 14/15 \$720M, 15/16 \$718M, 16/17 \$576M, 17/18 \$937M, 18/19 \$1,282M; are these figures correct?</p> <p>(a) Payments from what Water sources/entities comprise these dividend payments?</p> <p>(b) Why has the annual dividend risen so sharply, on average, over the past 5 years?</p> <p>(c) Given that future projection of dividends from water sources/entities, as shown in the Budget, is expected to drop to</p>	<p>This is a matter for the shareholder Ministers – The Treasurer and the Minister for Finance and Small Business.</p>

	\$467M in 21/22 and \$435M in 22/23, what is the cause of the proposed sudden drops in dividends?	
	Water for Fodder	
181	<p>Under the federal Governments “water for fodder” scheme, how many farmers along the West Courougan Irrigation District were successful in being balloted for this scheme?</p> <p>(a) What volume of water has been allocated to each of these farmers for the purpose of growing fodder?</p> <p>(b) Will conveyance water be required to deliver that water for fodder?</p> <p>(c) What is the Minister and department doing to ensure that arrangements are in place for conveyancing of that water for fodder allocation?</p> <p>(d) Have the successfully balloted farmers paid for their allocation of water for fodder?</p>	<p>The NSW Government provided a 3,000 ML Special Purpose Access Licence to West Corougan to cover the conveyance water to deliver stock and domestic water earlier this water year.</p> <p>I note only 1% of the 400GL released over the Barrages from September to November this water year, would have been enough to provide water to deliver stock and domestic water to West Corougan.</p> <p>21 properties within West Corougan Private Irrigation District were successful in their bids for the 50 megalitre parcels.</p> <p>(a) Applicants could apply to purchase up to two parcels each.</p> <p>(b) The Commonwealth scheme offers no conveyance water to ensure delivery of the purchased water.</p> <p>(c) The Minister and department are advocating to the Commonwealth on behalf of water users to make the program more flexible and ensure that participants and communities can obtain maximum benefit.</p> <p>(d) It is understood that most have accepted and committed to their offers but a small number have declined and withdrawn from the program.</p>
	Hunter Water	

182	Will the Minister support Newcastle Racecourse's plan to use recycled treated water from the Burwood Waste Water Treatment Plant for irrigation purposes at the racecourse, Merewether Golf Course and local parks and gardens?	The Government supports increased water recycling in the Hunter. I am advised that technical investigations are currently underway and will inform a business case for this proposal.
183	What is the expected total cost of this project?	The preliminary cost estimate for the project is \$15 million.
184	I refer to your response to LA QON 0931 which stated "Hunter Water is progressing investigations on a range of new recycling projects for non- potable uses (such as industrial, municipal including parks and sporting fields, and agricultural) including recycling opportunities in Newcastle", what new recycled water projects are being considered?	<p>Hunter Water is investigating a range of potential recycled water schemes as part of the Lower Hunter Water Security Plan review and wastewater management studies, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • working with all 6 of its local councils to increase the use of recycled water for irrigation of sporting fields and public open spaces • expanding the use of recycled water in industrial processes, and identifying new supply options for commercial customers who use large amounts of water • exploring opportunities to supply high quality recycled water to homes for non-drinking purposes. • exploring opportunities to supply recycled water for agricultural irrigation. <p>As part of the Lower Hunter Water Security Plan, Hunter Water is exploring community attitudes to indirect potable reuse, which is the addition of highly purified recycled water to existing water supplies such as dams or groundwater.</p>
185	How much of the \$145 million dividend being paid by Hunter Water to the NSW Government will be invested in recycled water projects?	This was previously addressed in LA QON 931 - https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/la/paper/s/pages/qanda-tracking-details.aspx?pk=242569
	NSW Government Property Sales in Newcastle	
186	How many government properties have been sold in the Newcastle electorate since FY2011-12 to date?	543 (a)\$197,971,115.00

	(a) What is the total value of these sales?"	
187	Can the Minister provide the addresses of all properties in the Newcastle electorate sold since FY2011-12 to date?	Specific locations of these properties are unable to be provided as there may be overriding confidentiality, Government policy or other concerns that would require specific investigation before this information is published.
	Crown Lands	
188	Can the Minister please provide the details of all crown land within the Newcastle electorate? (a) Please include address, DP and Lot number and reserve management details.	<p>As at March 2020 in the State electorate of Newcastle there is some 900 hectares of Crown land, comprising approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 hectare under licence, • 10 hectares under lease, • 360 hectares reserved, • 100 hectares of other Crown parcels, • 20 hectares of Crown road, and • 420 hectares of Crown waterway. <p>Background:</p> <p>The detail requested in this question is not able to be prepared within the allocated timeframe for budget estimates responses to be submitted. This kind of list will take significant time to prepare. A detailed list of specific Crown land by lot, Deposited Plan (DP) and reserve management details can be provided to the Committee separately, noting this is very extensive and includes technical and tenure classifications.</p>
	Land and Housing Corporation Properties in Newcastle	
189	What is the current social housing maintenance backlog for properties in the Newcastle electorate? (a) What was the total maintenance backlog for social housing properties in 2015?	Maintenance demands change continually, and LAHC does not categorise maintenance as "back logged". In FY 2019 – 2020 as at 1 March 2020, LAHC spent on average \$2443 per DCJ managed dwelling. This is on top of what CHP's spend on the social housing dwellings they manage.
190	How many social housing properties located in the Newcastle electorate are affected by mould for each of the following years; (a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018;	<p>LAHC's system does not currently capture information on all properties specifically affected by mould.</p> <p>Surface mould is the responsibility of the tenant unless there is a substantiated link to a maintenance issue, which would then be the responsibility of LAHC. Commonly, if a Contractor Contact Centre received a call and the tenant stated mould as the maintenance issue, the Criticality Repairs Matrix would refer the responsibility back to the tenant. If it were related to water ingress</p>

	(i) 2019; and (j) 2020?"	then the mould would be removed as part of those works for rectification.																																				
191	How many social housing properties have been sold in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years: (a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020? i. How much was each property sold for?	See Appendix 5.																																				
192	How many new social housing properties were constructed in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years: (a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020? i. What are the addresses of these properties?"	How many new social housing properties were constructed in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY</th> <th>Grand Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a</td> <td>2010-11</td> <td>312</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>2011-12</td> <td>108</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c</td> <td>2012-13</td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d</td> <td>2013-14</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e</td> <td>2014-15</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>f</td> <td>2015-16</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>g</td> <td>2016-17</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>h</td> <td>2017-18</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>i</td> <td>2018-19</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>j</td> <td>2019-20 (YTD Feb 20)</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Total</td> <td>576</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> k Address information is not disclosed for privacy reasons		FY	Grand Total	a	2010-11	312	b	2011-12	108	c	2012-13	73	d	2013-14	8	e	2014-15	14	f	2015-16	1	g	2016-17	1	h	2017-18	13	i	2018-19	40	j	2019-20 (YTD Feb 20)	6		Total	576
	FY	Grand Total																																				
a	2010-11	312																																				
b	2011-12	108																																				
c	2012-13	73																																				
d	2013-14	8																																				
e	2014-15	14																																				
f	2015-16	1																																				
g	2016-17	1																																				
h	2017-18	13																																				
i	2018-19	40																																				
j	2019-20 (YTD Feb 20)	6																																				
	Total	576																																				

193	<p>How much was spent on the construction of new social housing properties in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years:</p> <p>(a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?</p>	<p>193. How much was spent on the construction of new social housing properties in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years:</p> <table data-bbox="807 264 1423 701"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY</th> <th>Grand Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a</td> <td>2010-11</td> <td>\$68,216,917</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b</td> <td>2011-12</td> <td>\$12,940,148</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c</td> <td>2012-13</td> <td>\$4,710,720</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d</td> <td>2013-14</td> <td>\$4,996,314</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e</td> <td>2014-15</td> <td>\$2,428,207</td> </tr> <tr> <td>f</td> <td>2015-16</td> <td>\$581,985</td> </tr> <tr> <td>g</td> <td>2016-17</td> <td>\$1,229,980</td> </tr> <tr> <td>h</td> <td>2017-18</td> <td>\$6,455,327</td> </tr> <tr> <td>i</td> <td>2018-19</td> <td>\$13,349,167</td> </tr> <tr> <td>j</td> <td>2019-20 (YTD Feb 20)</td> <td>\$2,495,378</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Total</td> <td>\$117,404,143</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY	Grand Total	a	2010-11	\$68,216,917	b	2011-12	\$12,940,148	c	2012-13	\$4,710,720	d	2013-14	\$4,996,314	e	2014-15	\$2,428,207	f	2015-16	\$581,985	g	2016-17	\$1,229,980	h	2017-18	\$6,455,327	i	2018-19	\$13,349,167	j	2019-20 (YTD Feb 20)	\$2,495,378		Total	\$117,404,143
	FY	Grand Total																																				
a	2010-11	\$68,216,917																																				
b	2011-12	\$12,940,148																																				
c	2012-13	\$4,710,720																																				
d	2013-14	\$4,996,314																																				
e	2014-15	\$2,428,207																																				
f	2015-16	\$581,985																																				
g	2016-17	\$1,229,980																																				
h	2017-18	\$6,455,327																																				
i	2018-19	\$13,349,167																																				
j	2019-20 (YTD Feb 20)	\$2,495,378																																				
	Total	\$117,404,143																																				
194	<p>How many maintenance requests were made in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years:2011; (a) 2012; (b) 2013; (c) 2014; (d) 2015; (e) 2016; (f) 2017; (g) 2018; (h) 2019; and (i) 2020?</p>	Refer to Appendix 6.																																				
195	<p>How many maintenance requests were actioned in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years: (a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?"</p>	Refer to Appendix 7.																																				

196	<p>What was the average wait time from when a maintenance request was made to when it is actioned in NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years:</p> <p>(a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?"</p>	Refer to Appendix 8.
197	<p>How many maintenance requests in NN07 Newcastle zone were not actioned in the appropriate timeframe for each of the following years?</p> <p>(a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?"</p>	Refer to Appendix 9.
198	<p>What was the total value of Land and Housing Corporation assets in the NN07 Newcastle zone:</p> <p>(a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?"</p>	<p>(a) 2011: Information not available (b) 2012: \$782.1m (c) 2013: \$797.3m (d) 2014: \$800m (e) 2015: \$817.1m (f) 2016: \$905m (g) 2017: \$1,003.5m (h) 2018: \$1,119.8m (i) 2019: \$1,186.6m (j) 2020: Not available until release of the audited 2019-20 financial statements.</p>
199	<p>How much money was spent on maintenance in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years:</p> <p>(a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; and (i) 2019; (j) 2020?"</p>	<p>Money spent on maintenance in the Newcastle LGA in the respective years is as follows:</p> <p>a) 2011/12 - \$9,749,607 b) 2012/13 - \$9,788,269 c) 2013/14 - \$9,708,040 d) 2014/15 - \$19,436,686 e) 2015/16 - \$27,118,654 f) 2016/17 - \$13,107,801 g) 2017/18 - \$23,290,166 h) 2018/19 - \$14,148,571 i) 2019/20 (up until 1 March 2020) - \$9,009,102</p>

200	How many properties do Land and Housing Corporation own in the NN07 Newcastle zone?	4674, including 5 commercial, 7 community purpose, 103 land and 4559 residential properties.
201	How many times was Land and Housing Corporation taken to the NSW Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) regarding maintenance issues in each of the following years: (a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?	As LAHC is not a tenancy manager, it is not summonsed to appear at NCAT. DCJ is responsible for NCAT matters.
202	How many orders were made against Land and Housing Corporation by NCAT regarding maintenance issues in each of the following years: (a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?	As LAHC is not a tenancy manager, it is not summonsed to appear at NCAT. DCJ is responsible for NCAT matters.
203	How many times did Land and Housing breach NCAT orders relating to maintenance issues in each of the following years: (a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?	NCAT matters are the responsibility of the Department of Communities and Justice

204	<p>How much compensation has been paid to tenants as a result of NCAT orders regarding maintenance issues in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years?</p> <p>(a) 2011; (b) 2012; (c) 2013; (d) 2014; (e) 2015; (f) 2016; (g) 2017; (h) 2018; (i) 2019; and (j) 2020?</p>	LAHC does not have oversight of compensation payments awarded for tenant.
Illawarra Desalination Plant		
205	What site has been identified by the Government for the Illawarra desalination plant?	No site has been chosen yet..
206	<p>When will the strategic business case for the Illawarra desalination plant be submitted to the Government for endorsement?</p> <p>(a) How much money has the Government allocated to complete the strategic business case?</p>	<p>WaterNSW will submit a Strategic Business Case to the Government in the second half of 2020.</p> <p>a) None. WaterNSW is funding the Business Case.</p>
207	<p>When will the environmental impact statement (EIS) be commenced for the Illawarra desalination plant?</p> <p>(a) How much money has the Government allocated to complete the EIS?</p>	<p>WaterNSW has commenced some investigations that will inform an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for the Illawarra Desalination Plant.</p> <p>a) None. WaterNSW would fund the relevant EIS.</p>
208	What other potential sites were considered for the Illawarra desalination plant?	WaterNSW is currently investigating the feasibility of a number of industrial sites in Port Kembla.
209	<p>Will there be further community consultation regarding the Illawarra desalination plant?</p> <p>(a) When will this occur?</p>	Further community consultation will take place in coming months.
Floodplain harvesting review		
210	<p>210. Regarding the independent review of flood plain harvesting will the Minister:</p> <p>(a) provide the terms of reference for this committee, and (b) provide the names and qualification of all panel members?</p>	<p>(a) They will be published on the department's website. The terms of reference are currently being confirmed by the independent assessment panel.</p> <p>(b) The Panel members are Dr Wendy Craik AM and Greg Claydon PSM.</p> <p>Dr Craik has a Phd in zoology. She is Chair of the Climate Change Authority and a board member of the Reserve Bank of Australia and</p>

Australian Farm Institute. She has over 25 years' experience in senior roles in public policy, including as Commissioner of the Productivity Commission, Chief Executive of the Murry-Darling Basin Commission, President of the National Competition Council, Chair of the Australian Fisheries Management Authority and Australian Rural Leadership Foundation, Executive Director of the National Farmers' Federation and Executive Officer of the Great Barrier Marine Park Authority.

Mr Claydon has tertiary qualifications in agricultural engineering and has worked throughout Australia and has also worked in New Zealand, Canada, the USA, the Caribbean, Japan, Singapore, Turkey and China. He has extensive water industry and natural resources management knowledge, experience and achievements, built on his roles as a senior executive with Queensland and Western Australia state government water, environment and natural resources agencies. He is recognised at state, national and international levels for his work in water and natural resources reforms. He was an independent reviewer of implementation of the NSW floodplain harvesting policy and the Murray–darling Basin joint governance arrangements.

	Legal advice regarding floodplain harvesting	
211	211. Has the Minister received legal advice on the regulation made on 7 February 2020 to bring 1912 Water Act flood works licences under the Water Management Act 2000?	The Minister regularly receives legal advice on a range of matters which are subject to legal professional privilege.
212	212. Does this advice express doubt over the legality of a Water Management Act 2000 section 324 embargo given the 1912 Water Act has no floodplain Water Sharing Plans or indeed any Water Sharing Plans and the Section 324 relates to Water Sharing Plans ?	The Minister regularly receives legal advice on a range of matters which are subject to legal professional privilege.
	Director discretion in the NSW Government Gazette	
213	213. The Section 324 embargo published in the NSW Government Gazette no. 30 dated 7 February 2020 allows discretion to Director level officials to allow partial lifting of the embargo. Can you confirm the restrictions on this discretion?	Yes, this power can be exercised by specified Executive Director and Director roles. Any decisions made must be consistent with the Water Management Act and the embargo.

214	214. Does the discretion include partial lifting of the embargo to protect infrastructure?	As outlined in the reasons for decision, the interim downstream triggers had been met or were forecast to be met. Accordingly, it was open to the decision maker to temporarily lift the embargo, acknowledging that this lift could mitigate the reported damage to property.
Infrastructure damage		
215	215. Will the Minister publish the internal review of whether there is evidence that infrastructure was being damaged?	An external, independent review into the management of the Northern Basin 'first flush' event has been announced by Minister Pavey. Terms of reference for this review are in the process of being finalised and will shortly be published.
2012 Barwon Darling Water Sharing Plan		
216	216. Does the 2012 Barwon Darling Water Sharing Plan have an accredited 'CAP' model (a) When was the last Murray-Darling Basin Authority (MDBA) CAP audit on this plan? (b) Has the MDBA expressed any concern regarding the CAP audit and accreditation of this plan?	This model is currently being developed by the department. (a) The MDBA does not audit the water sharing plan. The MDBA discontinued the accreditation of the CAP model in December 2015. (b) The MDBA proposed model upgrades and it was agreed that NSW focus on building a new model. The MDBA currently supports the NSW approach to focus on building a new Barwon-Darling model in the Source software platform consistent with the National Hydrological Modelling Strategy. This model is due for completion mid-2020.
Intergovernmental Agreement on Implementing Water Reform on the Murray Darling Basin		
217	217. When did this Intergovernmental Agreement lapse?	This Intergovernmental agreement has not lapsed and remains in force.
218	218. Has a draft for a new agreement been circulated to NSW?	Not applicable. The current intergovernmental agreement remains in force.
219	219. Does the current timeframe for delivery of Water Sharing Plans for accreditation meet the Commonwealth's approval?	The water resource plans will be submitted to the Commonwealth before 30 June 2020.
220	220. Has there been any delay to payments to NSW under this National Partnership Agreement relating to the Intergovernmental Agreement in the last three years? (a) If so in which year ends and how much?	The payment of \$9.4M for the 16/17 reporting period was not received in FY 2017 / 2018. The 19/20 payment of \$9.4M for the 18/19 reporting period has not yet been received and discussions with the Commonwealth Government are ongoing.
The proposed Dungowan Dam		
221	221. Will the Minister confirm the capacity of the proposed new storage is 22 gegalitres or close to that?	Current storage capacity is projected to be 22.5GL. Final confirmation will form part of the Final Business Case.

222	222. What does the water modelling say the long-term increased water diversion at this site will be?	The modelling has not been undertaken and cannot until the dam design has been completed
223	223. What increase in long term diversion will this be over the current Dungowan dam?	Under the Murray Darling Basin Plan an increase in diversions above the sustainable diversion limit is not allowed. Diversions must remain below the Basin Plan sustainable diversion limit.
224	224. How will the increased diversion be accounted for under the current Peel / Namoi Sustainable Diversion Limits (SDLs)?	The diversions will be accounted for within the current state and Basin Plan accounting frameworks. This means that any growth in use of water due to an improved availability from an enlarged Dungowan Dam will be accounted for annually. Any growth in use will be managed so that overall take in the Peel Valley remains within the extraction limit.
225	225. Will the Namoi SDLs be reduced to allow an SDL increase in the Dungowan Peel system?	No.
226	226. Given the new dam and associated pipeline will cost at least \$480 million; is this the most expensive water storage project in Australia's history?	No.
227	227. If the pipeline is not included in the cost is this the most expensive water storage project in Australia's history?	No.
228	228. How will the expenditure be recovered from Tamworth ratepayers as beneficiaries?	The Final Funding Strategy will be determined as part of the Final Business Case.
229	229. Will support be offered to Tamworth ratepayers for this cost recovery?	The Final Funding Strategy will be determined as part of the Final Business Case.
230	230. How will the Namoi water users be informed of further SDLs reductions?	Any change in the sustainable diversion limit (SDL) is the responsibility of the MDBA. It is the responsibility of the MDBA to inform water users of that change.
Flows into Menindee Lakes		
231	231. What are the predicted environmental and social impacts of the first flows dislodging sludge and debris which has built up along the dried river bed of the darling river throughout the course of the drought?	<p>The flows have been large enough such that water quality impacts can be minimised.</p> <p>There were some fish kills in Lake Wetherell, initially, as the flows moved in. The poor water quality was, fortunately, short-lived.</p> <p>Social impacts have been minimal when considering the towns along the Barwon Darling River system have certainty for their water supply and their weir pools are filling. The Minister has received letters from Mayors of Bourke, Brewarrina and Wentworth Shire Councils to acknowledge the positive</p>

		impact these flows have had on their communities.
232	232. Will the government consider longer embargoes and restrictions to ensure the menindee lakes fully recharge as quickly as possible?	There will be sufficient supply in Menindee Lakes to meet a minimum of 12-18 months supply to the lower Darling. No further restrictions are anticipated in the near future.
233	233. What is the department's prediction for how long the Menindee Lakes will take to fully recharge?	The forecast flows into Menindee are for 295,000ML to 360,000ML of inflows as of 25th March. It will take several more weeks until this volume is realised. Without significant additional rainfall, further inflow up to full capacity, some 1,730,000 ML, is highly unlikely.
Regional Desalination Plants		
234	234. Has the department conducted any modelling on the impact of regional towns increasingly relying on bore water?	<p>Throughout much of regional NSW groundwater is relied upon by water utilities for all or part of community water supplies.</p> <p>The NSW Government encourages local government water utilities to plan for the delivery of reliable water supplies to customers. This includes the during periods of drought.</p> <p>During drought periods, water utilities use a range of actions such as water restrictions, water carting or use of alternate water supplies in times of drought.</p> <p>The carting of water is not always a practical option, especially for larger towns and communities, that is one reason that towns may have alternate supplies such as groundwater bores.</p> <p>Many of the State's groundwater resources are highly committed so it is important that these resources are managed judiciously. Urban and other domestic supplies are given priority but this extraction needs to be efficient, and we need to keep monitoring the resources to ensure their use is sustainable.</p> <p>The Government has extensive monitoring bore networks, concentrated in the groundwater areas that are highly used."</p>
235	235. What regional towns are currently relying on bore water as their primary water supply?	The following water utilities source more than 50% of water supplied from groundwater: Bega Valley Kempsey Nambucca Moree Plains Narrabri

		<p>Gunnedah Bellingen Liverpool Plains Narromine Narrandera Coonamble Gwydir Gilgandra Murrumbidgee Carrathool Riverina County Council Goldenfields County Council</p>
236	<p>236. What is the status of the construction of desalination plants for Bourke and Walgett? (a) When are these plants expected to go online? (b) How much water will they provide per day for Bourke and Walgett respectively? (c) Will the plants be adequate to provide water for the entire population of Bourke and Walgett respectively? (d) Will the government provide desalination plants to other towns relying on bore water to deal with high levels of salinity?</p>	<p>The desalination plants for Bourke and Walgett are currently being assembled by Osmoflo in South Australia. On site works in Bourke and Walgett are also underway.</p> <p>(a) The desalination plants for Bourke and Walgett will be installed and commissioned by 17 April 2020. This is currently on track but may be impacted by COVID-19 and closure of state borders.</p> <p>(b) The desalination plants for Bourke and Walgett are designed to work in conjunction with the existing water treatment plants in Bourke and Walgett to provide drinking water that meets the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines. The desalination plants in Bourke and Walgett will provide 1.1ML/day and 0.7ML/day respectively. The desalinated water will be mixed with conventionally treated water to meet the town demand of 2.5 ML/day and 1.5 ML/day respectively.</p> <p>(c) The desalination plants in Bourke and Walgett are designed to provide adequate drinking water supplies for the entire population of the two communities. Note that these communities are provided dual water services to each household - a raw water supply primarily for outdoor usage and a drinking water supply. The desalination plants in Bourke and Walgett will be connected to the drinking water supply only.</p> <p>(d) Local water utilities in regional NSW are responsible for the delivery of safe water services to the community. The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and NSW Health oversee the delivery of safe water supplies to communities in regional NSW. Agencies will continue to monitor the situation and may choose to implement water quality improvements such as desalination (reverse osmosis) in the future to respond to water quality risks or the needs of the community.</p>

Lake Cathie		
237	237. What action has the department taken to rectify the degradation of the Lake Cathie / Lake Innes Estuary System?	<p>Intermittently Closed and Open Lakes and Lagoons (ICCOLs) such as Lake Cathie / Lake Innes are complex naturally occurring systems that support a large range of fauna and flora, as well as providing recreational opportunities for the public.</p> <p>Under NSW planning legislation and the coastal management framework, local governments are responsible for managing estuaries and ICOLLs. Under the framework, Councils prepare site specific entrance opening management plans, detailing the process, trigger levels and procedure for opening an ICOLL to mitigate flood or other risks. These plans are prepared with input from state agencies, including the Department, community groups and stakeholders and provide an agreed and evidence based strategy for managing ICOLL entrances. Councils are responsible for reviewing and updating these plans, with input from stakeholders and agencies, as required.</p>
238	238. Has the department investigated the impact of the construction of Kenwood drive bridge on the estuary system?	Local governments are responsible for managing estuaries and ICOLLs.
239	239. Has the department investigated the presence of acid sulphates in the soil around the estuary system as identified in the Lake Cathie and Lake Innes Acid Sulfate and Soil Risk Assessment?	Local governments are responsible for managing estuaries and ICOLLs.
240	240. What investigations have been undertaken or commissioned by the department into the status of wildlife within the estuary system within the past 2 years?	Local governments are responsible for managing estuaries and ICOLLs.
241	241. Has the department investigated the potential to open the estuary system to the ocean to try and rehabilitate the system?	Port Macquarie-Hastings Council has applied for a licence to dredge the entrance of Lake Cathie to open it to the ocean to flush and replenish the water. As part of the application process, Council is also required to complete an environmental impact assessment which is yet to be submitted to Crown Lands. Crown Lands will expedite the application once the assessment has been received from Council.
Water Infrastructure		

242	242. How many litres of water does Sydney water lose from leaky and poorly maintained infrastructure annually?	<p>In 2018-19, 47.8GL was lost due to leakage from the 570.6 GL produced. This loss occurred during the drought period, which included prolonged dry spells that cause soil movement leading to an increase in the number of water main breaks and leaks, an issue confronted by water utilities around the world.</p> <p>Sydney Water manages a large and complex water network of about 23,000 kilometres of pipework. It proactively renews its pipes and has an active leak detection program.</p>
243	<p>243. Has Sydney water identified aging and decaying infrastructure that will require replacing in the immediate future to next five years?</p> <p>(a) Has Sydney Water projected the costs involved in replacing this infrastructure?</p> <p>(b) Does Sydney water have a proactive plan to replace Sydney's aging water infrastructure?</p> <p>(c) How much is currently spent repairing Sydney water's infrastructure?</p>	<p>Sydney Water continually reviews asset performance and deterioration, which is underpinned by robust risk analysis.</p> <p>Most renewal programs are prioritised by assessing the criticality of assets in their locations, and their condition.</p> <p>243 (a) Sydney Water's program includes significant expenditure to renew existing assets. The forecast for water network renewal expenditure is \$570 million to meet existing mandatory standards for 2020–24.</p> <p>This investment is to renew or remediate deteriorated water mains, valves, water pumping stations, reservoirs and water filtration plants. This is based on a combination of condition assessments and analysis which predicts the life left in assets.</p> <p>In developing the forecast, Sydney Water's review process factored a range of efficiency reductions including program-specific efficiency savings; identifying how to meet multiple needs with lower cost integrated planning solutions; and factoring low growth forecasts to ensure customers are not funding investments which may be deferred.</p> <p>243 (b) Sydney Water develops short and long-term capital investment programs for each asset class from water mains, reservoirs and pumping stations through to network expansion, to meet growth needs.</p>

These capital investment programs are developed based on asset conditions and their risk profiles. Sydney Water has various asset renewal decision frameworks and associated standard operating procedures to guide the execution of the renewal of aging water infrastructure.

From 2019–20, Sydney Water is planning to increase the delivery of water conservation activities, particularly water efficiency initiatives. Likely projects include continuing and expanding WaterFix programs (strata, residential, commercial); reintroducing business water efficiency programs; optimising recycled water schemes and seeking out new opportunities where economically viable; and enhancing leak management.

In periods of drought, further activity would be required beyond our proposed baseline program.

243 (c) Sydney Water spends about \$110 million on operation and maintenance of water mains, water pumping stations and reservoirs annually.

For the 2016-2020 period, Sydney Water will have invested \$467 million in inspecting and assessing water network assets; and renewing and refurbishing water mains, reservoirs, water pumping stations and water filtration plants.

244

244. What is Sydney Water's protocol for the replacement of aging infrastructure that is near the end of its life when local councils inform Sydney Water of imminent repavement works? Does Sydney water attempt to replace aging infrastructure before such works occur?

Sydney Water has asset renewal decision frameworks and associated standard operating procedures to guide the execution of replacement of aging infrastructure.

High risk assets such as critical water mains have a risk-based approach and low-risk assets such as reticulation water mains are based on their condition and performance.

Sydney Water proactively works with local councils, state governments and other utilities to share information about current and upcoming works through the iWORCS web-based GIS tool. This tool helps optimise renewal of aging water mains prior to councils' imminent re-pavement works to save significant restoration costs.

245	245. Does Sydney water install infrastructure in anticipation of the planned scale of new developments or install infrastructure on an ad-hoc basis as the development is completed?	<p>Sydney Water's Growth Servicing Plan provides a longer-term planning outlook for water and wastewater infrastructure. This plan provides Sydney Water and Government with visibility on planning processes and programs for the next 15 years to show available trunk water-related infrastructure in major greenfield and infill areas.</p> <p>The plan supports the NSW Government's vision of three sustainable, productive and liveable cities – the Western Parkland City, the Central River City and the Eastern Harbour City – and incorporates the coastline city in the Illawarra region.</p> <p>New water infrastructure for growth areas is typically planned and funded in two ways. The first option occurs when Sydney Water plans and funds the infrastructure which is aligned to Government priorities. The second option is when water infrastructure development is prioritised/accelerated by a developer who funds the costs.</p>
Recreational Swimming		
246	246. Is the department working to establish water quality targets for bacterial levels for swimming in freshwater rivers?	This is a matter for the Minister for Energy and Environment
247	247. Does the department keep records of e.coli and other bacteria levels at popular freshwater swimming locations?	This is a matter for the Minister for Energy and Environment
248	248. How and when has the government notified swimmers when e coli and other bacteria levels in the nepean river and other popular freshwater swimming locations were unsafe for swimming?	This is a matter for the Minister for Energy and Environment
Water recycling		

249	<p>249. In November the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment to investigate recycling blackwater from toilets for public spaces, backyards and gardens</p> <p>(a) What has been the result of this investigation thus far?</p> <p>(b) What plans have the department developed to implement these water recycling measures?</p>	<p>The Greater Sydney Water Strategy is investigating the mix of rain dependant and rain independent water sources, including increasing recycled water for future water supplies. Supply options will be analysed in the GSWS. The draft will be complete end of 2020 with the Strategy to be finalised mid 2021.</p>
250	<p>250. Is the department investigating water recycling for potable use?</p>	<p>All options for meeting Sydney's water needs are being investigated for the Greater Sydney Water Strategy. This includes the option of increasing water recycling and using purified recycled water to supplement the drinking water supply. The Department, Sydney Water and WaterNSW will jointly lead a public engagement program for all options including rainfall-independent sources of water such as desalination and purified recycled water recycling for drinking the engagement will inform the options presented in the GSWS.</p>
Memorandum of Understanding with Israel		
251	<p>251. What are the parameters of the memorandum of understanding signed with Israel on water management including scope, timeframe, participants, duration and outcomes?</p>	<p>A copy of the MOU can be found at: https://www.industry.nsw.gov.au/water/what-we-do/legislation-policies/intergovernmental-agreements</p>
252	<p>252. What funding and /or trade benefits will accrue to Israel as part of this MOU?</p>	<p>While arrangements under the MOU are in their preliminary stages, the MOU is intended to facilitate activities such as the exchange of experts, study tours, productive collaboration through commercial growth opportunities, cooperation in the technology sphere and their respective academic institutions, and research collaboration.</p> <p>This is intended to help both parties in securing water resources for future generations.</p>
253	<p>253. What funding and /or trade benefits will accrue to NSW as part of this MOU?</p>	<p>While arrangements under the MOU are in their preliminary stages, the MOU is intended to facilitate activities such as the exchange of experts, study tours, productive collaboration through commercial growth opportunities, cooperation in the technology sphere and their respective academic institutions, and research collaboration.</p>

		This is intended to help both parties in securing water resources for future generations.
254	254. What expertise in water management did the NSW government seek to obtain by entering into this MOU?	While arrangements under the MOU are in their preliminary stages, the MOU is intended to include techniques in the efficient use of water resources, recycling/re-use of wastewater, desalination, aquifer recharge and in-situ water conservation techniques, and water resource management.
255	255. What expertise in water management did the Israeli government seek to obtain by entering into this MOU with NSW?	While arrangements under the MOU are in their preliminary stages, the MOU is intended to include techniques in the efficient use of water resources, recycling/re-use of wastewater, desalination, aquifer recharge and in-situ water conservation techniques, and water resource management.
256	256. What NSW bodies or companies will participate in or profit from this MOU?	"Arrangements under the MOU are in their preliminary stages and do not at this stage involve business enterprise. However, it is anticipated that the MOU will benefit both parties through commercial growth opportunities, cooperation in the technology sphere and their respective academic institutions, and research collaboration."
257	257. What Israeli bodies or companies will participate in or profit from this MOU?	Arrangements under the MOU are in their preliminary stages and do not at this stage involve business enterprise. However, it is anticipated that the MOU will benefit both parties through commercial growth opportunities, cooperation in the technology sphere and their respective academic institutions, and research collaboration.
	Public Housing Maintenance following February 9th Storms	
258	258. After the storms on 9 February 2020 what increased was there in the number of maintenance call outs for flooding, leaking, ceiling collapse and storm related damage to NSW public housing?	In January 2020, there was a total of 27,182 responsive maintenance orders raised while in February 2020, it increased by 30% to a total of 35,471.
259	259. What is the cost of the damage following the February 9th storms and how will this impact the public housing maintenance waiting list?	LAHC's systems do not routinely capture reports of water damage, flooding or storm damage. Any maintenance calls are assessed in accordance with the asset maintenance repairs matrix. All maintenance work is typically delivered within the established timeframes set out in the matrix.
260	260. What is being done to ensure that damage to public housing major works as a result of flooding and water damage are repaired	LAHC's systems do not routinely capture reports of water damage, flooding or storm damage. Any maintenance calls are assessed in accordance with the asset maintenance

	before further damage is caused by other weather events?	repairs matrix. All maintenance work is typically delivered within the established timeframes set out in the matrix.
261	261. If there was an increase in public housing maintenance calls following the February 9th storms, how will this affect the current waitlist for emergency and planned works?	All works are or have been undertaken in line with the CRM as outlined in the answer to Question 259.
262	262. Public housing at 55 Young Street Redfern has had significant leaks from gaps between the window panes and the windows for over 8 years which had been reported several times. Was there a plan in place prior to the recent flooding in the February 9th storms to complete major works required?	55 Young Street, Redfern is a multi-unit, high rise building comprising 61 units. There is not an extended history of water leaks relating to the windows at this building. During the extreme weather event experienced in February 2020, seven tenants reported concerns about water ingress into their homes, some relating to water penetration via the existing window frames. The issue was isolated to one side of the building and is believed to have only occurred due to the extremely 1 in 100 year storm event. Following the weather event staff have visited affected residents and any immediate works required were arranged.
263	263. Can public housing tenants access compensation for damage to personal items and furniture as a result of leaking or flooding from storms/heavy rain? (a) If so, how?	In the event of damage to personal items and furniture as a result of leaking or flooding from storm/heavy rain, tenants can lodge a claim for compensation through DCJ. Tenants can get the forms through their local DCJ office or through contact with their Community Housing Provider (if applicable). Each claim is assessed on its merits.
	Public Housing Maintenance and accessibility issues	
264	264. What is the policy relating to alterations to Land and Housing Corporation properties based on accessibility requirements?	LAHC's Disability Modification's Policy complies with all relevant standards. The policy enables clients to request modifications to their home as required so that they can continue to live independently. The policy and relevant application form can be found at: www.facs.nsw.gov.au/housing/policies/disability-modifications-policy .
265	265. Can a tenant's NDIS package be used to finance required alterations to a property?	Yes, tenants can use the NDIS package to finance required alterations.
266	266. Many tenants are forced to wait for several years in an unsuitable property for a transfer due to accessibility requirements as LAHC refuses certain alterations. What is being done to reduce the risk of injury or ensure tenants are safe during these long waiting periods?	The Department of Communities and Justice is responsible for tenant services including relocation requests. The question should be referred to the Department of Communities and Justice.
	Waterloo Redevelopment	

267	267. What is the status of the 2019 LAHC preferred masterplan for the Waterloo public housing redevelopment.?	<p>LAHC released a preferred masterplan for Waterloo in January 2019. LAHC has worked with the City of Sydney from August through to December 2019 in alignment discussion on the LAHC preferred masterplan. In November 2019, the rezoning planning pathway for Waterloo changed from a State Significant Precinct process led by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment to a Planning Proposal process led by the City of Sydney.</p> <p>LAHC has received a Planning Proposal letter from the City of Sydney and is in the process of preparing a Planning Proposal for lodgement.</p>
268	268. What is the role of the City of Sydney in relation to the design and implementation of a masterplan for the Waterloo estate?	The City of Sydney is the planning authority for the rezoning.
269	269. Is LAHC progressing the Waterloo Redevelopment Human Services Plan - if not why not?	LAHC continues to work with the Department of Communities and Justice on a Human Services Framework for the tenants of Waterloo.
270	270. Has the timeframe changed for all or any stages of the Waterloo Redevelopment?	The timeframes will be reviewed when the Planning Proposal is finalised by the City of Sydney.
271	271. Will the redevelopment necessitate the relocation of any existing tenants off the site?	Offsite relocations have not been determined at this stage. The Waterloo Estate project is expected to be staged over the next 20 years to enable a coordinated renewal approach that minimises disruption for existing tenants and allows for the up-front delivery of key public domain elements such as public open space.
272	<p>272. What Aboriginal organisations were consulted in 2018 and in 2019 regarding Aboriginal housing in the Waterloo redevelopment?</p> <p>(a) What engagement or consultation is planned?</p>	<p>(a)</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with Aboriginal Consultation Requirements. Since 2017, an Aboriginal Liaison Officer has been engaging with the Aboriginal community in Waterloo, funded by LAHC.</p> <p>In 2018, Waterloo Masterplan Options Testing consultation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with Waterloo Aboriginal community members • Consultation with Waterloo service providers (including organisations; WEAVE and Metro Local Aboriginal Land Council) <p>In 2019, PricewaterhouseCoopers Indigenous Consulting (PIC) has been engaged to undertake a series of community consultations to inform the development of an Aboriginal Housing and Cultural Strategy. LAHC will continue to engage with the local Aboriginal community as part of the</p>

		community consultation for the Planning Proposal
273	273. What percentage of public housing will be specifically affordable Aboriginal housing in the Waterloo redevelopment?	Not determined at this stage.
274	274. What specific affordable housing projects for Aboriginal people are planned for the inner city and inner west areas of Sydney?	The AHO is currently progressing 3 small-scale redevelopment projects of existing AHO properties within inner city suburbs of Sydney. These project will deliver 2 x 2-bed units in Newtown, 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed homes in Waterloo, and 1 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed units in Glebe. A number of these new dwellings are likely to be designated for affordable housing use although this will be determined in due course following consultation with the properties' managing Aboriginal Community Housing Provider
275	275. What specific affordable housing projects for Aboriginal people are planned for regional areas and for smaller communities in NSW?	The AHO is delivering a number of new supply projects across regional and remote areas in NSW however these primarily focus on addressing high levels of social housing demand. The developments will deliver a broad range of dwelling types, from large family homes to smaller homes dedicated for seniors and small families. Over recent years the AHO has established a small portfolio of affordable housing spread across a number of regional centres. At this time the only project dedicated to affordable housing in regional areas is the development of 5 townhouses in Tweed Heads scheduled for completion in late FY21. The designation of other projects in the AHO's new supply pipeline for affordable housing will be determined in consultation with the relevant managing ACHPs.
	Social Housing Infrastructure	
276	276. What Shared Equity Schemes are currently operating in NSW with government support to facilitate partial and joint home ownership?	Over past decades there have been a range of housing assistance schemes. LHC has participated in shared equity arrangements on an adhoc basis with charities, Community Housing Providers, non-government organisations, councils and other community groups.

277	<p>277. There are currently 51,014 people on the social housing waitlist as of 30 June 2019. This only accounts for people who have applied for social housing as tenants, not their family members. 45% of public housing households have at least 1 person with disability. Will the NSW Government be committing additional funding to the Communities Plus and Social and Affordable Housing Fund to increase public housing supply? (a) If so, how much?</p>	<p>LAHC is committed to delivering new social housing, and does so within the budget agreed with the Minister for Housing.</p>
278	<p>278. How much does the Government intend to invest in the rejuvenation/restoration of aging stock under the Communities Plus Program? (a) Is there a target for accessible housing within this?</p>	<p>LAHC ensures that its properties satisfy the Residential and Tenancies Act 2010 in terms of 'Clean, safe and habitable'. Investment in capital maintenance is based on demand and priority, and where properties are at the end of their useful life LAHC considers if appropriate to redevelop or sell and invest elsewhere. LAHC aims to achieve 50% of its annual program to a gold standard in accordance with the Liveable Housing Guidelines.</p>
279	<p>279. There is a shortage of accommodation in the private market for accessible housing. The NDIS will only cover a proportion of people with disability under the Specialist Disability Accommodation (SDA), and only a small proportion of NDIS recipients will be eligible for SDA in any event. As of March 2019, there was a shortfall in terms of SDA in NSW of 2,658 properties. How will the NSW Government have to address this housing shortfall?</p>	<p>This is a matter for the Minister for Families, Communities and Disability Services.</p>
Audits of water sharing plans under Section 44 of the Water Management Act 2000		
280	<p>280. Will the recently published independent audits by Alluvium and Vista Advisory into water sharing plans from 2015-18 feed into the water resource plan development process where significant changes to water sharing plans are proposed? (a) If so, how? (b) If so, what processes are in place to feed into plans which have already been publicly exhibited or are on public exhibition?</p>	<p>Audits under s44 of the Water Management Act 2000 are conducted to "ascertaining whether its provisions are being given effect to", rather than to inform how effective the plans are and whether they should be improved. Relevant audit findings are being addressed through improvements to water sharing plans to more clearly identify responsibilities for implementing particular rules and simplify the language so that the rules will be easier to understand and enforce. (a) n/a (b) n/a</p>

281. What is the Government's response to findings in the water sharing plan audits by Alluvium and Vista Advisory, listing separately any changes being proposed and/or any responses to findings in each of the following audited water sharing plans:

- (a) Barwon-Darling Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012
- (b) Bega and Brogo Rivers Area Regulated, Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2011
- (c) Belubula Regulated River Water Sources 2012
- (d) Castlereagh River Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2011
- (e) Greater Metropolitan Region Groundwater Sources 2011
- (f) Greater Metropolitan Region Unregulated River Water Sources 2011
- (g) Gwydir Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012
- (h) Intersecting Streams Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2011
- (i) Lachlan Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012
- (j) Lower Murray Shallow Groundwater Source 2012
- (k) Lower Murray-Darling Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2011
- (l) Macquarie Bogan Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012
- (m) Murrumbidgee Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2010
- (n) Murray Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2011
- (o) Murrumbidgee Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012
- (p) Namoi Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012
- (q) North Western Unregulated and Fractured Rock Water Sources 2011
- (r) NSW Border Rivers Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2012
- (s) NSW Great Artesian Basin Shallow Groundwater Sources 2011
- (t) NSW Murray Darling Basin Fractured Rock Groundwater Sources 2011
- (u) NSW Murray Darling Basin Porous Rock Groundwater

See [Appendix 3](#) for a summary of key findings of audits of water sharing plans under section 44 of the Water Management Act 2000 completed in December 2019 and action being taken.

	<p>Sources 2011 (v) Peel Valley, Regulated, Unregulated, Alluvium and Fractured Rock Water Sources 2010 (w) Richmond River Area Unregulated, Regulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2010 (x) Towamba River Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2010 (y) Tweed River Area Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources 2010</p>	
Drought of record		
282	<p>282. What is the 'drought of record' or 'worst drought' for each of the following water sharing plans: (a) Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Border Rivers Regulated River Water Source 2009 (b) Water Sharing Plan for the Gwydir Regulated River Water Source 2016 (c) Water Sharing Plan for the Macquarie and Cudgegong Regulated Rivers Water Source 2016 (d) Water Sharing Plan for the New South Wales Murray and Lower Darling Regulated Rivers Water Sources 2016 (e) Water Sharing Plan for the Lachlan Regulated River Water Source 2016</p>	<p>The drought of record for each plan is the driest inflow to the headwater storages known at the commencement of each plan and is given below (worst plan inflow).</p> <p>The current drought in the north is a new worst case drought - worse than the inflow sequences used in the current water sharing plans.</p> <p>The current drought in the south - that is the Murray and Murrumbidgee, is not yet as severe as the Millennium drought. However, these plans commenced in 2004, so the worst drought inflow sequence used in these plans also pre-dates the Millennium drought.</p> <p>The critical drought duration can vary between water sources but is typically between 12 and 24 months.</p> <p>(a) For the Border Rivers, the worst plan inflow sequence into Pindari Dam across the inflow data period 1890 to 2009, commenced in December 1979 for 18 months duration.</p>

		<p>(b) For the Gwydir River, the worst plan inflow to Copeton Dam within the 1890 to 2002 inflow data period was for 18 months starting in December 1918.</p> <p>(c) For the Macquarie Cudgegong River, the worst plan inflow to Burrendong Dam within the 1890 to 2003 inflow data period was 24 months starting in July 1937.</p> <p>(d) For the Murray River, the worst plan inflow to Hume, Dartmouth Dams within the 1891 to 2005 inflow data period was for 12 months starting in June 1914.</p> <p>(e) For the Lachlan River, the worst plan inflow to Wyangala Dam within the 1898 to 2003 inflow data period was for 24 months starting in July 1979.</p>
	Natural Resource Commission review	
283	<p>283. How many of the water sharing plans in NSW are having the cease date contained with the plan extended as a result of the water resource plan development process?</p> <p>(a) Please list each of these water sharing plans with the corresponding new cease date.</p>	<p>Nineteen</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Regulated River - 2030 2. Water Sharing Plan for the Murray and Lower Darling Regulated River - 2030 3. Water Sharing Plan for the Upper and Lower Namoi Regulated River - 2030 4. Water Sharing Plan for the Gwydir Regulated River - 2030 5. Water Sharing Plan for the Lachlan Regulated River - 2030 6. Water Sharing Plan for the Macquarie and Cudgegong Regulated Rivers - 2030 7. Water Sharing Plan for the Lachlan Alluvium Water Sources - 2030 8. Water Sharing Plan for the Upper & Lower Namoi Alluvium Water Sources - 2030 9. Water Sharing Plan for the NSW MDB Fractured Rock Water Sources - 2030 10. Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Alluvium Water Sources - 2030 11. Water Sharing Plan for the Murray Alluvium Water Sources - 2030 12. Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Border Rivers Regulated Water Sources - 2030 13. Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Border Rivers Alluvium Water Sources - 2030 14. Water Sharing Plan for the NSW GAB Shallow Water Sources - 2030 15. Water Sharing Plan for the NSW MDB Porous Rock Water Sources - 2030 16. Water Sharing Plan for the Gwydir Alluvium Water Sources - 2030 17. Water Sharing Plan for the Macquarie Castlereagh Alluvium - 2030 18. The Water Sharing Plan for the Darling Alluvium Water Sources will commence in 2020 as a result of brining groundwater resources currently under the Barwon Darling and Unregulated Lower Darling and Alluvium

		water sharing plans under one water sharing plan - 2030 19. Water Sharing Plan for the Peel River Regulated Water Sources – 2030.
	Barwon Darling Water Sharing Plan	
284	284. In regards to a 'draft letter' sent by Minister Pavey to the Natural Resources Commissioner, Dr John Keniry, referred to in the Sydney Morning Herald article 'Water fight: minister attacks river scientists', dated August 26 2019: (a) Was the draft letter prepared by the Minister's office or the Department staff? (b) What date and time was the draft letter sent? (c) Why was the draft letter not provided to the Legislative Council in response to the SO52 Call for Paper order under the passage of private members' business item No. 364? (d) Will you provide the draft letter to the Committee or the Legislative Council? If so, when?	A) It was drafted by an advisor. B) It was lodged for posting the day it was signed. C) The letter was not requested in the Order. Whether the letter would have fallen within scope of the broader categories in the Order is not clear, however searches did not identify any copy of the letter in the possession of the Minister's Office at the time the Order was made. D) The draft letter was signed and sent to the NRC.
	Floodplain harvesting in the Northern Basin	
285	285. The Temporary Water Restriction (Northern Basin) (Floodplain Harvesting) Order 2020 dated 7 February 2020 refers to 'passive take' as not being subject to the embargo: (a) How much water is estimated to have been taken as 'passive take' over the course of this embargo? (b) Is there any assessment of how much water is used, or can be used, as 'passive take' across the state's water system? (c) Will 'passive take' be licenced under the floodplain harvesting licencing scheme that is to be established in 2021?	(a) Work is being undertaken by DPIE in partnership with Geoscience Australia and the Murray-Darling Basin Authority to quantify, using remote sensing technologies the volume of floodplain harvesting taken during the period of restriction. This work will be published as soon as it is available. (b) At present, there are no measurement requirements for water impounded on floodplains in any valley in NSW. This includes 'active' or 'passive' take. (c) All works that meet the eligibility criteria in the NSW Floodplain Harvesting Policy and collect, impound or extract floodplain harvesting will be licensed. The floodplain harvesting measurement policy is in the final stages of development and will take affect through licences and approvals that are due to commence on 1 July 2021.

286	<p>286. Page 38 of the transcript refers to evidence given by Ms O’Keefe regarding representations made in relation to the floodplain harvesting embargo from “irrigation groups, individual irrigators, north and south, for and against”:</p> <p>(a) Who made representations in regards to the embargo? (b) What were the concerns raised by each of these groups? i. How many related to infrastructure damage from the first flush?</p>	<p>(a) Many representations were made. These include both peak bodies and individuals. Prior to the temporary lifting there were representations made by peaks groups in the north. When restrictions were eased, there were representations from interests in the South. (b) Northern peak groups raised concerns of infrastructure damage, and southern interests raised concerns that allowing access would impact on flows to the South. (i) Each of the peak irrigator groups in the north raised concerns over infrastructure damage.</p>
287	<p>287. Page 39 of the transcript refers to evidence given by Minister Pavey that “the area that the embargo was lifted was around a third of that north-west area where floodplain harvesting occurred”:</p> <p>(a) How many properties did this apply to? (b) How much water take did this apply to? (c) How many floodplain harvesting works did this apply to?</p>	<p>(a) Approximately 200 properties (b) If all pumps had full access to water the max volume that could be taken over the 4 days was 200GL, however preliminary remote sensing analysis indicates that less than 20% of the volume (40GL) was actually taken (c) 415 storages</p>
288	<p>288. Page 42 of the transcript refers to the ‘independent panel’ set up to review the floodplain harvesting embargo:</p> <p>(a) Who is on this panel? (b) What is their relevant expertise? (c) What are the terms of reference? (d) Who decides/has decided who is on this panel? (e) What, if any, power does the panel have to seek documents from the Department or the Minister’s Office? (f) Will this panel produce a final report? If so, will this be made public?</p>	<p>(a) See response to Question 210. (b) See response to Question 210. (c) See response to Question 210. (d) The Secretary of the department. (e) The Panel will be able to seek documents from relevant agencies consistent with the terms of reference. (f) The final report will be published.</p>

289	<p>289. Page 53 of the transcript refers to evidence given by Ms O’Keefe in regards to water taken when the floodplain harvesting embargo for the Northern Basin was lifted:</p> <p>(a) What is meant in the statement the ‘200 is the upper’ in terms of approximated take? What does this refer to exactly and how is this measured?</p> <p>(b) Can you confirm, approximately, the amount of take from the event when the embargo was lifted?</p> <p>i. What river systems did this apply to?</p> <p>ii. How many properties did this apply to?</p> <p>iii. How many storages did this apply to?</p>	<p>(a) “200 is the upper” refers to the potential maximum volume of take. Floodplain harvesting take is not currently metered.</p> <p>(b) Preliminary remote sensing analysis indicates that less than 20% of the potential maximum volume (40 GL) was actually taken</p> <p>(i) the lower Namoi and lower Gwydir river systems</p> <p>(ii) About 200 properties</p> <p>(iii) 415 storages.</p>
Water Management (General) Amendment (Exemptions for Floodplain Harvesting) Regulation 2020		
290	<p>In regards to the Water Management (General) Amendment (Exemptions for Floodplain Harvesting) Regulation 2020 (‘the Regulation’):</p> <p>290. Can you give examples of the water management and water supply works that will now be exempt by the Regulation but which would have required an approval before the introduction of this regulation?</p>	<p>The requirements to hold flood work approvals to construct levees, dams and certain supply channels is unaffected by this exemption. No approvals exist to take and use water from floodplains anywhere in NSW via pumps, pipes, regulators. The exemption allows certain works that are eligible for licensing to continue to be used for floodplain harvesting without a water supply work approval - for these works this is essentially a continuation of the status quo. All other works will require water supply work approvals if they are to be used for floodplain harvesting - for these works this is a change in the status quo.</p>
291	<p>291. Through remote sensing work, is DPIE Water able to determine how many eligible water storages the Regulation applies to?</p> <p>(a) What is the total capacity of these storages?</p>	<p>The total capacity of eligible floodplain harvesting storages will be publicly reported in modelling reports, dates for the release of these reports can be found in the Floodplain Harvesting Action Plan. This information cannot currently be released because it has not yet been finalised or quality checked.</p>
292	<p>292. How many water management and water supply works which were built after the 1993/94 cap on works will this Regulation apply to?</p>	<p>There is no ‘1993/94 cap on works’. The ‘Murray-Darling Basin Cap Agreement’ is a cap on diversions - refer schedule 1 of the Water Act 2007 (Cwth). Levels of development under ‘cap’ and ‘current’ conditions will be publicly reported in valley based modelling reports, dates for the release of these reports can be found in the Floodplain Harvesting Action Plan. This information cannot currently be released</p>

		because it has not yet been finalised or quality checked.
293	293. What is the estimated capacity of the water management and water supply works built after the 1993/94 cap on works that this Regulation will apply to?	There is no '1993/94 cap on works'. The 'Murray-Darling Basin Cap Agreement' is a cap on diversions - refer schedule 1 of the Water Act 2007 (Cwth). Levels of development under 'cap' and 'current' conditions will be publicly reported in modelling reports, dates for the release of these reports can be found in the Floodplain Harvesting Action Plan. This information cannot currently be released because it has not yet been finalised or quality checked.
294	294. Why was the date of 3 July 2008 chosen? (a) Were any other dates considered?	This date coincides with an announcement from the then Minister Rees that no new works would be allowed to undertake floodplain harvesting. This date is used to set licence shares within the legal limit. Legal limits are reflected in NSW Water Sharing Plans and the Basin Plan. These legal limits are set at or below the 'Cap limit' i.e. the long term volume that can be taken under 1993/94 development and management conditions. (a) Yes. Plan limit development conditions were also considered but were discounted because they would result in stranded assets.

Appendix 1 – Supplementary Question 145

Table:

Capital programs are underway to replace water mains not performing at the required standard, as part of Sydney Water's efforts to reduce leakage. The length of mains replaced and renewed and the total cost over the last 10 years, are summarised in the table below.

Year	Reticulation Mains (km)	Trunk Mains (km)	Total Cost (\$M)
2018-19	22.7	2.6	22.1
2017-18	27.3	5.8	37.6
2016-17	29.8	8.6	48.62
2015-16	54.2	13.4	57.02
2014-15	46.2	7.2	56.75
2013-14	33.1	7.4	58.69
2012-13	70	8.3	111.74
2011-12	49	16.5	86.02
2010-11	84.1	6.4	120.29
2009-10	105.7	9.3	110.41

The costs in the above table only relate to money invested in watermain renewals. Additional investment has been made in the Active Leak Detection program and planned and reactive maintenance.

In addition, \$27.1 million was spent in 2018-19 to address performance issues created by drought, such as weather-related repairs and maintenance.

Appendix 2 – Supplementary Question 104

The shares in water entitlement available to Energy Australia can be found in the Department of Planning Industry and Environment, Water's report below

Fish River Water Supply Scheme – review of water sharing arrangements

Table 1 – NSW Office of Water recommended modified Restriction Table (Oberon Dam)

Annual Dam at ML		Level 1 50%	Level 2 40%	Level 3 25%	Level 4 20%	Level 5 15%	Level 6 10%	Level 7 8%	Level 8 5%
		44,762	22,381	17,905	11,191	8,952	6,714	4,476	2,238
Restriction	Delta	20.0%	20.0%	30.0%	40.0%	60.0%	68.0%	98.0%	99.5%
	SCA/LCC	10.0%	20.0%	30.0%	40.0%	60.0%	65.0%	65.0%	100.0% ¹
	Oberon	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	20.0%
	Minor Consumers	10.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Yearly	Shares								
Delta	8,184	6,547	6,547	5,729	4,910	3,274	2,619	164	41
SCA	3,650	3,285	2,920	2,555	2,190	1,460	1,278	1,278	0
Lithgow	1,778	1,600	1,422	1,245	1,067	711	622	622	0
Oberon	1,064	1,064	1,064	1,064	1,064	958	958	958	851
Min Cons	200	180	160	160	160	160	160	100	100
Totals	14,876	12,676	12,114	10,752	9,391	6,562	5,636	3,121	992
Monthly	Shares								
Delta	682	546	546	477	409	273	218	14	3
SCA	304	274	243	213	183	122	106	106	0
Lithgow	148	133	119	104	89	59	52	52	0
Oberon	89	89	89	89	89	80	80	80	71
Min Cons	17	15	13	13	13	13	13	8	8
Totals	1,240	1,056	1,009	896	783	547	470	260	83
Weekly	Shares								
Delta	157	126	126	110	94	63	50	3	1
SCA	70	63	56	49	42	28	25	25	0
Lithgow	34	31	27	24	21	14	12	12	0
Oberon	20	20	20	20	20	18	18	18	16
Min Cons	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
Totals	286	244	233	207	181	126	108	60	19
Daily	Shares								
Delta	22.4	17.9	17.9	15.7	13.4	9.0	7.2	0.4	0.1
SCA	10.0	9.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	0.0
Lithgow	4.9	4.4	3.9	3.4	2.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	0.0
Oberon	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.3
Min Cons	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3
Totals	41	34.7	33.2	29.4	25.7	18.0	15.4	8.5	2.7

Please note that all restrictions described above relate to net storage, that is the volume of water in storage, excluding any water in carry over accounts.

¹ In the event that SCA's Cascade storages are at critical levels (less than 50% storage), and maximum restrictions have been applied to the upper Blue Mountains villages, consideration will be given to allowing SCA to extract up to 3.5 ML/day from Oberon Dam. Simultaneously, a feasibility and comparative assessment will be initiated for emergency augmentation options for both Oberon Shire and the Upper Blue Mountains.

Appendix 3 – Supplementary Question 281

Budget Estimates March 2020 Q281 - Summary of key findings of audits of water sharing plans under section 44 of the *Water Management Act 2000* completed in December 2019 and action being taken

Key findings	WSP that key findings apply to	Response
<i>Governance</i>		
<p>The interrelated roles and responsibilities of DPIE Water, WaterNSW, NRAR and the DPIE EES in implementing water sharing plans are not clear.</p>	<p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Agencies have produced a number of documents about each agency’s role, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The WaterNSW operating licence 2017-22 (publicly available). ○ The Deed of Business Transfer between the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment - Water (DPIE Water) and WaterNSW (internal). ○ The Water Management Instrument of Delegation between DPIE Water and WaterNSW (internal). ○ A brochure, Roles of water management agencies in NSW (June 2018) ● Redrafting of WSPs, particularly regulated river WSPs, to more clearly identify agency responsibilities for implementing particular rules. WSP rules are being simplified as part of the current WSP review processes. ● Reviewing WaterNSW operating licence, which may provide greater clarification of each agency’s role in relation to WSP implementation. ● The department is undertaking a water reform process which will aim to improve clarity on roles and responsibilities across all agencies in the water sector. ● Developing robust WSP implementation plans to accompany new or updated WSPs as part of the roll-out of the Basin Plan 2012 compliant plans.
<i>Implementation</i>		

Gaps in Department procedures to operationalise WSPs	All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regulated river water sharing plans are currently being redrafted to better clarify agency roles in the implementation of particular rules. ● . ● Recent recruitment will service conditioning of water access licences (ie. Ensuring mandatory conditions in water sharing
		<p>plans are in place on licences).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A significant number of WSPs are being amended to meet Basin Plan requirements. ● Development of implementation programs for water sharing plans, and provide regularly reporting.
Environmental release rules were not always given effect to and legislative requirements to suspend environmental release rules were not followed.	Belubula (R) Greater Metropolitan (U) Richmond (U, R, A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There has been considerable work to set base flow rules and rules for the delivery of freshes for ecological outcomes. ● Not suspending the provisions in the Belubula water sharing plan was an anomaly. During the Millennium drought, five regulated river water sharing plans (Murray, Murrumbidgee, Lachlan, Macquarie and Hunter) were suspended when necessary. ● In the 2019 amendment of the draft water sharing plan for the Belubula Regulated River Water Source 2012, the former Minister for Regional Water stated that environmental release rules were not achievable during periods of prolonged drought. ● No further action was required to address the findings regarding the ECA releases from Toonumbar Dam as the allowance was only in force for the first five years of the plan. Clarification of governance arrangements and improvements in water sharing plan implementation strategies as discussed elsewhere in this table will prevent issue recurrence for other plan areas. ● Carcoar Dam has limited leverage to protect these small flows during drought as the capacity of the dam in relation to the annual flow in the Belubula River is very small. The environmental release rules were effective until the Millennium Drought occurred. The interaction of both drought and groundwater extraction impacted flows in the Belubula River below Canowindra. ● DPIE Water and WaterNSW continue to update their models given a changing hydrological record, and to better understand groundwater to surface interactions and eco-hydrological interactions. The nature of the Belubula River system is such that its minimum flows are likely to continue not to be protected during drought periods. ● The implementation plans referred to above will also support addressing this gap.

<p>Water sharing plan system operation rules and water supply work approvals were not followed.</p>	<p>Belubula (R) Greater Metropolitan (U) Richmond River (U, R, A)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The water supply work approval to authorise the use and operation of Carcoar Dam has not been issued as yet. The assessment process is well advanced and the approval is expected to be issued by the end of 2019. When issued, this will enable annual compliance reporting by WaterNSW to NRAR on whether work approval conditions have been met in relation to dam operations.
<p>There were delays in the notification of mandatory conditions in water sharing plans</p>	<p>All except Tweed (U, A)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Department is working to impose mandatory conditions as part of the stronger focus on implementation of the WSPs. The Department is committed to expanding its implementation capacity, and a major task over the next six months is a focus on conversion of WSP clauses to conditions on water access licences. ● There is significant work relevant to all WSPs underway. Steps already being taken to address the timely notification of mandatory conditions to holders of water access licences and water supply works approvals in NSW include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development and implementation of comprehensive protocols for licence conditioning; ○ Increased resources in the Department directed towards drafting mandatory conditions that give effect to new or amended water sharing plans; ○ Clear processes, including quality assurance and approval protocols, to upload mandatory conditions onto water access licences and water supply work approvals in the Water Licensing System (WLS) database and written notification to licence and approval holders; ○ Appropriate access and training in WLS for all staff involved to ensure an adequate pool of expertise and continuity of service to cover staff absences and reassignment; ○ Processes to monitor, measure and record conditioning and notification outcomes against agreed key performance indicators.

<p>Limited evidence of targeted monitoring and no evidence of reporting against the performance indicators specified in the WSPs</p>	<p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A state-wide Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (MER) framework was developed by DPIE Water in 2018 to embed the monitoring, evaluation and reporting of WSPs in ongoing Departmental functions. ● MER plans are being implemented across NSW which will clearly set out the strategies and management actions that will be implemented to enable the Department to assess progress against the WSP objectives. ● All Basin Plan related environmental MER plans have been on public exhibition (including nine surface water plans and one groundwater plan). This approach will be expanded to the coast. ● The initial MER approach focuses on environmental objectives. The economic, social and cultural objectives have been developed using the same approach with MER plans for these objectives in development. These steps will ensure that a rigorous, transparent and ongoing approach will be adopted for plan performance monitoring. ● DPIE Water has undertaken a review of WSP objectives and performance indicators and has undertaken substantial revision of the approach to setting objectives, which now follows best practice. There is an objective settling guideline publicly available on the Department’s website. These objectives and indicators will be changed as part of the water resource plan development process, which involves amending or remaking 33 NSW WSPs, and through the replacement of water sharing plans in non-Basin areas as they expire. ● The revised objectives and performance indicators will be SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time-bound), allowing the effectiveness of each WSP to be better assessed over its term. There will also be clear milestones set for each WSP at which considerations about amendments to the WSP will be made. ● MER rollout will feature in WSP Implementation Plans currently in development. ●
<p>There is limited assessment and monitoring of compliance with the long term average annual extraction limits (LTAAEL) in water sharing plans.</p>	<p>Barwon-Darling (U, A) Bega and Brogo (R, U, A) Belubula (R) NSW Border Rivers (U, A)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A risk-based system was used for compliance with LTAAELs. ● The focus has been on regulated systems and ensuring they are under the Murray-Darling Basin Cap. However LTAAELs are below the Cap. ● Annual cap account in the Basin will provide sufficient indication of the need to undertake an investigation into a potential LTAAEL compliance issue. ● In the unregulated systems, compliance is difficult because there are no numerical models or metering in place to undertake LTAAEL assessment. Take from all unregulated systems in NSW currently accounts for 4 percent of water use. ● The non-urban water metering framework began in December 2018. It is being rolled out over five years and will provide the capacity to report against LTAAELs for unregulated rivers. The largest water users in the State must have accurate,

	<p>Castlereagh (U, A)</p> <p>Greater Metropolitan (GW)</p> <p>Greater Metropolitan (U)</p> <p>Gwydir (U, A)</p> <p>Intersecting Streams (U, A)</p> <p>Lachlan (U, A)</p> <p>Lower Murray-Darling (U, A)</p> <p>Macquarie Bogan (U, A)</p> <p>Murrumbidgee (U, A)</p> <p>Namoi (U, A)</p> <p>Peel Valley (R, U, A & Fr Rock)</p> <p>Towamba River (U, A)</p> <p>Tweed (U, A)</p>	<p>auditable and tamper proof meter installed by 1 December 2020. When fully rolled out, it will ensure 95 per cent of approved water infrastructure will have an accurate, tamper proof meter. This comprises about 22,000 licensed works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In relation to WSPs in the Basin, as of 2020, DPIE Water will be moving to annual reporting on compliance against the Sustainable Diversion Limit (SDL) in each valley. Transitional reporting arrangements are currently in place. ● The Barwon Darling Watercourse will be a priority area for compliance reporting against the SDL and the ability to adjust future AWDs will be enabled when the non-urban water metering framework has been completed. ● DPIE Water is also developing a system to assess access conditions for unregulated rivers that will make it clear where and when water users can and cannot pump water. ● The NSW Government has committed to transitioning from its IQQM models to eWater Source modelling to improve model accuracy. DPIE Water is progressively making this transition, which will be rolled out over the next few years as it is a complex and time consuming task. ● As part of the transition to eWater Source modelling, additional processes have been added into the models and different components of the models have been re-calibrated using new and longer periods of observed data to improve the model accuracy and a set of best practice guidelines have been followed while building the model in a transparent and consistent way across different valleys. ● Source models have been built for NSW Border Rivers and Belubula regulated systems. We are also developing source models for unregulated systems. Source modelling for Namoi and Murrumbidgee is in advanced stages. The modelling is also underway for other major valleys including Macquarie, Gwydir and Lachlan. We are also targeting completion of the Barwon-Darling Source model with an emphasis on improving low flow accuracy. ● Source models are also being completed for a number of regulated and unregulated river systems in the coastal regions of NSW, including Tweed, Richmond, Hastings, McLeay, Bellingen and Tuross catchments.
--	---	---

<p>There was a lack of oversight of compliance with mandatory conditions on water access licences (WALs) and water supply work approvals</p>	<p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NRAR have developed an education strategy to inform the regulated river communities about water access rules. ● NRAR is managing alleged breaches through a system called CiRaM (Compliance Investigation Reporting and Management). ● NRAR has rapidly expanded its investigation and enforcement staff across both coastal and inland regions since its establishment in April 2018. During the year ending 30 June 2019 NRAR has increased its workforce from 69 to 146 staff that are dedicated to water compliance and enforcement activities. ● During this same period the NRAR has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Received 1,285 alleged breach notifications; ○ Finalised 809 investigations; ○ Issued 327 advisory and formal warning letters; ○ Undertaken 324 property inspections; ○ Undertaken 58 audits; ○ Issued 50 penalty infringement notices; ○ Sent out 107 statutory notices; and ○ Commenced 9 prosecutions. ● The NRAR Establishment Plan outlines strategies that NRAR will put in place for monitoring and compliance auditing. ● NRAR will ensure that review of compliance with mandatory conditions is considered in its monitoring and audit program.
--	------------	--

Appendix 4 – Supplementary Question 174

With regard to the \$250M referred to by the Minister to ensure that towns stay in water (p39), on what exact projects has this money been spent and what quantum of money has been spent on each of these projects/initiatives? (a) Has this \$250M been sourced from Consolidated Revenue? (b) Has this \$250M been sourced from Restart or Rebuilding NSW? (c) Has this \$250M been sourced from the Snowy Hydro fund? (d) Has this \$250M been sourced from some other fund and if so, what is the name of that fund and what is the source of the cash injection into that fund?

DPIE WATER RESPONSE (approved by Graham Attenborough):

The following drought initiatives fall under the funding approved by the NSW Government:

- Byrock Drought Funding - Water Carting (\$60,000)
- Coonabarabran Drought funding offer (\$1,717,500)
- Mount Hope Drought funding - Water Carting (\$20,000)
- Menindee Lakes (Broken Hill) funding offer - Block Banks (\$2,850,000)
- Murrurundi Drought funding offer – bores (\$113,710)
- Fifield Drought funding offer - Water Carting (\$50,000)
- Menindee rural Drought funding - Water Carting (\$80,000)
- Pooncarie rural Drought funding - Water Carting (\$240,000)
- Other rural user pre-approval - Water Carting (\$100,000)
- Tibooburra Drought funding offer - Water Carting (\$350,000)
- Bourke Drought funding offer - additional bores (\$2,092,135)
- Oxley Village Drought funding - Water Carting (\$50,000)
- Lower Darling Block Banks (\$1,482,243)
- Carabagal and Bimbi - Water Carting (\$30,000)
- Byrock Drought funding - Water Carting (\$50,000)
- Girilambone and Coolabah Village Water Supply Schemes Drought funding - Water Carting (\$80,000)
- Nymagee Drought funding - Water Carting (\$90,000)
- Mendooran emergency infrastructure (\$214,500)
- Nyngan-Cobar Drought financial assistance – Purchase of water (\$375,000)
- Murrurundi Drought funding Water Carting (\$260,000)
- Guyra Drought funding - Water Carting (\$820,000)
- Tenterfield emergency infrastructure (\$373,000)
- Bribbaree Drought Emergency funding offer - water carting (\$181,500)

- Tamworth Drought Response - Stage1 - Block Banks and Planning & Development for Stage2 (\$5,300,000)
- Groundwater Infrastructure at Dubbo - Drought Stimulus (\$30,000,000)
- Narromine Water Security and Water Quality Project - Drought Stimulus (\$2,000,000)
- Albert Priest Channel (Warren to Nyngan) - Drought Stimulus (\$2,000,000)
- Improve Bore Water Supply at Coonabarabran - Drought Stimulus (\$2,200,000)
- Bottled water supplies & transport to far west NSW communities (\$712,853)
- Regional Development Australia - Water Carting to Packsaddle Community (\$100,000)
- Application fee reimbursement for Lower Darling Temporary Block Banks (\$6,583)
- Euchareena Drought Emergency - Water Carting (\$50,000)
- Alternate Water Supply for Bathurst - Options planning (\$2,000,000)
- Cowra to CTW Emergency Pipeline Project (\$5,500,000)
- Temporary works to raise Warren Weir (\$500,000)
- Burrendong Deep Storage Access (\$7,720,000)
- Construction of temporary weir at Dungowan and pipeline from Chaffey to Dungowan (\$38,466,000)
- Chaffey Deep Storage Access (\$3,320,000)
- Split Rock Deep Storage Access (\$3,500,000)
- Water Quality works (\$3,907,000)
- Cobar and Triton Mine Water security - support to Cobar Mines to develop options (\$100,000)
- Parkes Water Security Stage 1 - Pipeline from Bore#3 to Eugowra PS (\$4,000,000)
- Groundwater sourcing and treatment options (\$4,000,000)
- Tooraweenah additional bore (\$270,000)
- Walcha Stage 1 Short term (emergency) works (\$1,500,000)
- Calala WTP Off-Stream Storage (\$1,450,000)
- Pooncarie Drought Emergency Works (\$658,500)
- Cowra Drought Emergency Works - Billimari and West Cowra Bores (\$100,000)
- Willawarrin water carting (\$84,000)
- Bellbrook water carting (\$77,000)
- Bathurst Stormwater Harvesting (\$5,000,000)
- Winburndale Pipeline (\$5,000,000)
- Nyngan Off-Stream Storage (\$4,000,000)
- Additional bore capacity and pipeline (\$2,000,000)
- Groundwater Augmentation (\$1,000,000)
- Augmentation of Lake Rowlands Dam (\$1,000,000)
- Manning Supply System Drought Response (\$1,000,000)
- Water Carting to Gloucester & Barrington (\$200,000)
- Groundwater Investigation (\$1,000,000)
- Groundwater Supply System (\$500,000)

- Pipeline from Spring Creek Dam to Icely Road WTP (\$2,500,000)
- Blackmans Swamp Creek Stormwater Harvesting Stage 2 (\$2,500,000)
- Nambucca Drought Response (\$2,000,000)
- Bellingen Drought Response (\$1,000,000)
- Kempsey Drought Response (\$4,000,000)
- Planning of the Narromine to Nyngan Pipeline (\$22,000,000)
- Development of feasibility study into a Mid-Macquarie Water Grid (\$3,000,000)
- Pindari deep water access facility (\$500,000)
- DPIE Groundwater Assessments (\$3,000,000)
- Mungindi Drought Emergency -Installation of a cooling tower (\$189,390)
- Expansion of Reverse Osmosis Unit program (\$4,800,000)
- Love Water Programs (\$4,600,000)
- WaterNSW fixed water charges supplement (\$1,000,000)
- Water supply grants for Services NSW (\$4,000,000)
- Condobolin Water Security (\$2,000,000)
- Brogo-Bermagui Water Carting (\$350,000)
- Walgett Drought Emergency Works (\$1,000,000)
- Bonalbo Water Security (\$231,870)
- Werris Creek Water Carting (\$2,026.20)
- WaterNSW licence fee waiver (\$30,000,000)
- Unallocated water carting and emergency infrastructure funding (\$8,543,785)

- a. \$160.98M has been sourced from consolidated revenue.
- b. \$13.50M has been sourced from RestartNSW.
- c. No funds have been sourced from the Snowy Hydro Fund.
- d. \$77.65M is to be self-funded by WaterNSW, \$10.00M has been sourced from the Safe and Secure Water Program (included in consolidated revenue figure).

Appendix 5 – Supplementary Question 191

191. How many social housing properties have been sold in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years:

FY	Grand Total Residential Dwellings
a.2010-11	5
b. 2011-12	7
c. 2012-13	14
d. 2013-14	31
e. 2014-15	5
f. 2015-16	4
g. 2016-17	4
h. 2017-18	9
i. 2018-19	12
j.2019-20 (YTD Feb 20)	4
Total	95

HOMES PRN	Locality	No	Street	Lot	DP No or SP No.	GL Proceeds	Financial Year	Qty
110209	Newcastle	66	Nobbys Rd	17	1151975	592,000	2010-11	1
220319	Newcastle	62	Nobbys Rd	15	1151975	608,000	2010-11	1
110136	Newcastle East	60	Nobbys Rd	14	1151975	600,000	2010-11	1
108582	Wallsend	7	Diana St	45	35225	220,000	2010-11	1
110135	Newcastle	64	Nobbys Rd	16	11511975	595,000	2010-11	1
110137	Newcastle	58	Nobbys Rd	13	1151975	686,000	2011-12	1
110138	Newcastle	56	Nobbys Rd	12	1151975	665,000	2011-12	1
107915	Stockton	13	Griffith Av (aka 13 Barrie Cr)	3	35474	650,000	2011-12	1
110089	Lambton	315	Newcastle Rd	51	36398	251,000	2011-12	1
108608	Wallsend	37	Douglas St	83	35087	252,500	2011-12	1
110125	Bar Beach	5	Nickson St	29	35833	460,000	2011-12	1
314270	Waratah	180	Christo Rd	101	569322	445,000	2011-12	1
108622	Stockton	243	Dunbar St	5	35474	420,000	2012-13	1
110140	Newcastle	52	Nobbys Rd	10	1151975	670,000	2012-13	1
110141	Newcastle East	50	Nobbys Road	9	1151975	680,000	2012-13	1
110769	Stockton	1	Barrie Crescent	5	35474	640,000	2012-13	1

110765	Stockton	2	Stone St	13	35474	415,000	2012-13	1
107896	Lambton	48	Armstrong St	114	36398	304,000	2012-13	1
107858	Wallsend	7	Alexander St	174	35225	262,000	2012-13	1
108316	Wallsend	13	Corindi St	162	35225	281,500	2012-13	1

110085	Lambton	323	Newcastle Rd	55	36398	222,500	2012-13	1
110139	Newcastle	54	Nobbys Rd	11	1151975	730,000	2012-13	1
108256	Waratah	176	Christo Rd	3	21366	475,000	2012-13	1
110764	Wallsend	15	Stapleton St	105	35087	310,000	2012-13	1
110142	Newcastle	48	Nobbys Rd	8	1151975	682,500	2012-13	1
109496	Lambton	12	Johnston St	108	36398	270,000	2012-13	1
108610	Stockton	248	Dunbar St	1	35474	578,000	2013-14	1
110682	Newcastle East	1/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110683	Newcastle East	2/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110684	Newcastle East	3/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110685	Newcastle East	4/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110687	Newcastle East	6/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110688	Newcastle East	7/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110689	Newcastle East	8/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110690	Newcastle East	9/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110691	Newcastle East	10/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110692	Newcastle East	11/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110693	Newcastle East	12/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110694	Newcastle East	13/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110695	Newcastle East	14/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110696	Newcastle East	15/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110697	Newcastle East	16/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110698	Newcastle East	17/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110699	Newcastle East	18/31	Scott St	37	717393	132,353	2013-14	1
110144	Newcastle East	44	Nobbys Rd	6	1151975	690,000	2013-14	1
110126	Bar Beach	7	Nickson St	30	35833	490,000	2013-14	1
107918	Stockton	3	Barrie Cres	4	35474	642,500	2013-14	1
110770	Stockton	21	Stone St	5	758929	655,000	2013-14	1
110489	Stockton	A/12	Newcastle	9&8	32344	122,857	2013-14	1
110490	Stockton	B/12	Newcastle	9&8	32344	122,857	2013-14	1
110491	Stockton	C/12	Newcastle	9&8	32344	122,857	2013-14	1
110108	Stockton	D/14	Newcastle	9&8	32344	122,857	2013-14	1
110109	Stockton	E/14	Newcastle	9&8	32344	122,857	2013-14	1

110110	Stockton	F/14	Newcastle	9&8	32344	122,857	2013-14	1
110111	Stockton	G/14	Newcastle	9&8	32344	122,857	2013-14	1
110766	Stockton	4	Stone St	12	35474	444,000	2013-14	1
110146	Newcastle East	40	Nobbys Rd	4	1151975	752,500	2013-14	1
252906	Hamilton South	123A	Jenner Parade	2	515586	630,000	2014-15	1
110148	Newcastle	36	Nobbys Rd	2	1151975	860,000	2014-15	1

110147	Newcastle	38	Nobbys Rd	3	1151975	835,000	2014-15	1
107940	Waratah	26	Bernice Cres	94	218092	246,000	2014-15	1
321606	Elermore Vale	9	Valerie Court	80	800322	390,000	2014-15	1
110145	Newcastle East	42	Nobbys Rd	5	1151975	920,000	2015-16	1
110421	Stockton	26	Pitt Street	2	32139	600,000	2015-16	1
110143	Newcastle East	46	Nobbys Rd	7	1151975	910,000	2015-16	1
110423	Stockton	14	Pitt Street	8	32139	620,000	2015-16	1
109351	Bar Beach	9	Greenslope St	13	35833	1,525,000	2016-17	1
110420	Stockton	38	Pitt Street	1	89698	850,000	2016-17	1
110767	Stockton	6	Stone Street	11	35474	705,000	2016-17	1
321784	Wallsend	17	Abbott St	88	30039	328,000	2016-17	1
110399	Stockton	64	Pitt St	22	32344	1,250,000	2017-18	1
109561	Waratah	64	Lambton Rd	4	35247	370,000	2017-18	1
111125	Lambton	90	Womboin Rd	13	35214	620,000	2017-18	1
107917	Stockton	13	Booth St	2	35474	1,000,000	2017-18	1
109737	Bar Beach	24	Light St	23	35833	1,150,000	2017-18	1
109730	Bar Beach	8	Light St	15	35833	1,150,000	2017-18	1
110521	Wallsend	25	Raglan St	119	35225	420,000	2017-18	1
317963	Wickham	1/43	Station St	1	131687	470,000	2017-18	1
317964	Wickham	2/43	Station St	1	131687	470,000	2017-18	1
109734	Bar Beach	16	Light St	19	35833	\$1,150,000	2018-19	1
109731	Bar Beach	10	Light St	16	35833	\$1,150,000	2018-19	1
109732	Bar Beach	12	Light St	17	35833	\$1,150,000	2018-19	1
109733	Bar Beach	14	Light St	18	35833	\$1,135,000	2018-19	1
109500	Lambton	2	Johnson St	103	36398	\$463,000	2018-19	1
107901	Lambton	13	Armstrong St	196	36398	\$480,000	2018-19	1
109736	Bar Beach	20	Light St	21	35833	\$1,125,000	2018-19	1
110660	Lambton	43	Rudd St	166	36398	\$415,000	2018-19	1
109738	Bar Beach	26	Light St	24	35833	\$1,350,000	2018-19	1
109354	Kotara	31	Gregory Pde	17	21402	\$460,000	2018-19	1
109562	Waratah	66	Lambton Rd	5	35247	\$380,000	2018-19	1
109506	Lambton	21	Johnson St	136	36398	\$472,000	2018-19	1

109735	Bar Beach	18	Light St	20	35833	\$1,050,000	2019-20	1
110357	New Lambton	22	Penman St	11	35686	\$472,500	2019-20	1
109491	Waratah West	2	Jarrett St	82	218092	\$340,000	2019-20	1
110886	Shortland	28	Tobruk Cres	150	36553	\$300,000	2019-20	1
						47,960,500		95

Appendix 6 – Supplementary Question 194

Note: 2020 Data is only up to 20th March 2020

Year issued	Maintenance type	Count of Maintenance Requests
2011	Non-Responsive	6,665
	Responsive	8,442
	Total	15,107
2012	Non-Responsive	5,383
	Responsive	8,313
	Total	13,696
2013	Non-Responsive	5,201
	Responsive	8,140
	Total	13,341
2014	Non-Responsive	6,024
	Responsive	8,050
	Total	14,074
2015	Non-Responsive	5,004
	Responsive	9,887
	Total	14,891
2016	Non-Responsive	394
	Responsive	4,549
	Total	4,943
2017	Non-Responsive	6,415
	Responsive	11,374
	Total	17,789
2018	Non-Responsive	5,409
	Responsive	12,024
	Total	17,433
2019	Non-Responsive	5,437
	Responsive	11,037
	Total	16,474
2020 (20th March)	Non-Responsive	1,459
	Responsive	2,478
	Total	3,937

Appendix 7 – Supplementary Question 195

Data for NN7 Allocation Zone

Year issued	Maintenance type	Count of Maintenance Requests Actioned
2011	Non-Responsive	6,665
	Responsive	8,442
	Total	15,107
2012	Non-Responsive	5,383
	Responsive	8,313
	Total	13,696
2013	Non-Responsive	5,201
	Responsive	8,140
	Total	13,341
2014	Non-Responsive	6,024
	Responsive	8,050
	Total	14,074
2015	Non-Responsive	5,004
	Responsive	9,887
	Total	14,891
2016	Non-Responsive	394
	Responsive	4,549
	Total	4,943
2017	Non-Responsive	6,415
	Responsive	11,374
	Total	17,789
2018	Non-Responsive	5,409
	Responsive	12,024
	Total	17,433
2019	Non-Responsive	5,437
	Responsive	11,037
	Total	16,474
2020 (as at 20 March 2020)	Non-Responsive	1,459
	Responsive	2,478
	Total	3,937

Source: EDW, Ariba

Note: 2016 is a combination of MRP08 and Ariba data (AMS manual data did not have any of NN7 properties)
2020 data is only up to 20 March 2020

Appendix 8 – Supplementary Question 196

Note: 2020 Data is only up to 20th March 2020

Year issued	Maintenance type	Average wait time for completion of work, days
2011	Non-Responsive	123.3
	Responsive	11.4
	Total	60.7
2012	Non-Responsive	133.2
	Responsive	10.6
	Total	58.8
2013	Non-Responsive	148.5
	Responsive	13.8
	Total	66.3
2014	Non-Responsive	157.4
	Responsive	13.3
	Total	75.0
2015	Non-Responsive	98.5
	Responsive	15.3
	Total	43.2
2016	Non-Responsive	40.2
	Responsive	24.1
	Total	25.4
2017	Non-Responsive	25.7
	Responsive	8.1
	Total	14.4
2018	Non-Responsive	4.3
	Responsive	4.0
	Total	4.1
2019	Non-Responsive	4.0
	Responsive	1.9
	Total	2.6
2020 (up to 20th March)	Non-Responsive	1.6
	Responsive	1.5
	Total	1.5

Appendix 9 – Supplementary Question 197

Note: 2020 Data is only up to 20th March 2020

Year issued	Maintenance type	Count of Maintenance requests not finished on target time
2011	Non-Responsive	3,530
	Responsive	6,600
	Total	10,130
2012	Non-Responsive	2,142
	Responsive	6,338
	Total	8,480
2013	Non-Responsive	2,119
	Responsive	6,451
	Total	8,570
2014	Non-Responsive	2,183
	Responsive	6,134
	Total	8,317
2015	Non-Responsive	2,830
	Responsive	7,628
	Total	10,458
2016	Non-Responsive	207
	Responsive	2,304
	Total	2,511
2017	Non-Responsive	3,558
	Responsive	1,114
	Total	4,672
2018	Non-Responsive	2,004
	Responsive	2,357
	Total	4,361
2019	Non-Responsive	1,686
	Responsive	1,050
	Total	2,736
2020 (20th March)	Non-Responsive	246
	Responsive	173
	Total	419

Appendix 10 – Supplementary Question 16

16. How has the LAHC housing stock changed over the last five years, as follows:

- (a) In 2015:
- i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
 - ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
 - iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
11
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
3
 - iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
 - v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
 - vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

1

xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

1

(b) In 2016:

i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:

· How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

· How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:

· How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

· How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:

· How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

· How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:

· How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

· How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:

· How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

· How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:

· How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

· How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:

· How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- (c) In 2017:
 - i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- 0
- . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- 0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
1
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- 0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- 0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
2
- (d) In 2018:
 - i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
 - ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:

- . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
1
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
1
- (e) In 2019:
 - i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
 - ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

- iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
 - . How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - . How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
18
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
5
- xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
1

xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

- xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
1
- (f) In 2020: (as at 01/03/2020)
- i. Dwellings owned in Adamstown:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- ii. Dwellings owned in Adamstown Heights:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- iii. Dwellings owned in Belmont North:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

- 0
- iv. Dwellings owned Bennetts Green in:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- v. Dwellings owned in Cardiff:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
1
- vi. Dwellings owned in Cardiff Heights:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- vii. Dwellings owned in Charlestown:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
1
- viii. Dwellings owned in Dudley:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- ix. Dwellings owned in Eleebana:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- x. Dwellings owned in Floraville:
- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xi. Dwellings owned in Garden Suburb:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xii. Dwellings owned in Gateshead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xiii. Dwellings owned in Highfields:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xiv. Dwellings owned in Hillsborough:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xv. Dwellings owned in Jewells:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xvi. Dwellings owned in Kahibah:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xvii. Dwellings owned in Kotara:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xviii. Dwellings owned in Kotara South:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

1

xix. Dwellings owned in Merewether:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xx. Dwellings owned in Mount Hutton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

xxi. Dwellings owned in New Lambton:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

1

xxii. Dwellings owned in New Lambton Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxiii. Dwellings owned in Redhead:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxiv. Dwellings owned in Tingira Heights:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?

0

- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?

0

xxv. Dwellings owned in Warners Bay:

- How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
- How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvi. Dwellings owned in Whitebridge:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0
- xxvii. Dwellings owned in Windale:
 - How many dwellings were added to the housing stock?
0
 - How many houses were removed from the housing stock?
0

Appendix 11 – Supplementary Question 17

Year	Suburb name	Within 30 days	Within 60 days	Within 90 days	More than 90 days	Total
2015	Adamstown	158	29	38	90	315
2015	Adamstown Heights	4	0	2	0	6
2015	Belmont North	194	30	16	89	329
2015	Bennetts Green					0
2015	Cardiff	62	7	8	32	109
2015	Cardiff Heights	0	0	0	1	1
2015	Charlestown	90	32	4	51	177
2015	Dudley	42	9	0	54	105
2015	Eleebana					0
2015	Floraville	4	1	0	4	9
2015	Garden Suburb					0
2015	Gateshead	664	123	30	320	1137
2015	Highfields	4	1	0	0	5
2015	Hillsborough	5	0	0	0	5
2015	Jewells	5	0	3	3	11
2015	Kahibah	11	2	2	5	20
2015	Kotara	10	2	0	4	16
2015	Kotara South	73	13	5	38	129
2015	Merewether	380	90	37	192	699
2015	Mount Hutton	96	21	30	75	222
2015	New Lambton	221	20	17	128	386
2015	New Lambton Heights	1	0	0	1	2
2015	Redhead	24	8	1	18	51
2015	Tingira Heights	45	4	1	25	75
2015	Warners Bay	98	16	4	60	178
2015	Whitebridge	17	3	1	12	33

2015	Windale	1847	289	240	903	3279
------	---------	------	-----	-----	-----	------

Year	Suburb name	Within 30 days	Within 60 days	Within 90 days	More than 90 days	Total
2016	Adamstown	354	37	12	25	428
2016	Adamstown Heights	8	0	0	1	9
2016	Belmont North	326	36	14	39	415
2016	Bennetts Green	0	0	0	0	0
2016	Cardiff	93	22	3	8	126
2016	Cardiff Heights	2	0	0	1	3
2016	Charlestown	187	24	6	13	230
2016	Dudley	67	7	6	7	87
2016	Eleebana	0	0	0	0	0
2016	Floraville	16	2	0	4	22
2016	Garden Suburb	0	0	0	0	0
2016	Gateshead	1272	167	68	191	1698
2016	Highfields	4	0	0	0	4
2016	Hillsborough	1	0	0	1	2
2016	Jewells	8	0	1	1	10
2016	Kahibah	10	0	1	4	15
2016	Kotara	25	0	0	4	29
2016	Kotara South	145	5	7	24	181
2016	Merewether	754	86	19	76	935
2016	Mount Hutton	190	17	10	19	236
2016	New Lambton	488	29	7	87	611
2016	New Lambton Heights	0	0	0	1	1
2016	Redhead	71	8	4	6	89
2016	Tingira Heights	60	6	6	9	81
2016	Warners Bay	168	24	11	20	223
2016	Whitebridge	16	2	1	8	27
2016	Windale	3406	421	168	441	4436

Year	Suburb name	Within 30 days	Within 60 days	Within 90 days	More than 90 days	Total
2017	Adamstown	478			0	478
2017	Adamstown Heights	9			0	9
2017	Belmont North	475			0	475
2017	Bennetts Green					0
2017	Cardiff	164			0	164
2017	Cardiff Heights	5			0	5
2017	Charlestown	262			0	262
2017	Dudley	90			0	90
2017	Eleebana					0
2017	Floraville	40			0	40
2017	Garden Suburb					0
2017	Gateshead	1924			0	1924
2017	Highfields	4			0	4
2017	Hillsborough	3			0	3
2017	Jewells	11			0	11
2017	Kahibah	29			0	29
2017	Kotara	32			0	32
2017	Kotara South	176			0	176
2017	Merewether	1088			0	1088
2017	Mount Hutton	291			0	291
2017	New Lambton	632			1	633
2017	New Lambton Heights	1			0	1
2017	Redhead	65			0	65
2017	Tingira Heights	114			0	114
2017	Warners Bay	281			0	281
2017	Whitebridge	63			0	63
2017	Windale	5365			0	5365

Year	Suburb name	Within 30 days	Within 60 days	Within 90 days	More than 90 days	Total
2018	Adamstown	493	5	8	0	506
2018	Adamstown Heights	5	0	0	0	5
2018	Belmont North	420	1	0	0	421
2018	Bennetts Green					0
2018	Cardiff	121	0	0	0	121
2018	Cardiff Heights	6	0	0	0	6
2018	Charlestown	253	1	0	0	254
2018	Dudley	134	2	0	0	136
2018	Eleebana					0
2018	Floraville	12	0	0	0	12
2018	Garden Suburb					0
2018	Gateshead	1642	7	0	0	1649
2018	Highfields	2	0	0	0	2
2018	Hillsborough	6	0	0	0	6
2018	Jewells	13	0	0	0	13
2018	Kahibah	24	0	0	0	24
2018	Kotara	18	0	0	0	18
2018	Kotara South	169	2	1	0	172
2018	Merewether	1039	6	7	4	1056
2018	Mount Hutton	247	0	1	0	248
2018	New Lambton	624	7	2	1	634
2018	New Lambton Heights	2	0	0	0	2
2018	Redhead	57	0	1	0	58
2018	Tingira Heights	104	1	0	0	105
2018	Warners Bay	294	0	0	0	294
2018	Whitebridge	56	0	0	0	56
2018	Windale	4626	14	2	3	4645

Year	Suburb name	Within 30 days	Within 60 days	Within 90 days	More than 90 days	Total
2019	Adamstown	419	0	0	1	420
2019	Adamstown Heights	2	0	0	0	2
2019	Belmont North	491	1	0	1	493
2019	Bennetts Green					0
2019	Cardiff	156	0	0	0	156
2019	Cardiff Heights	10	0	0	0	10
2019	Charlestown	249	0	0	0	249
2019	Dudley	145	0	0	0	145
2019	Eleebana					0
2019	Floraville	25	0	0	0	25
2019	Garden Suburb					0
2019	Gateshead	1660	4	0	0	1664
2019	Highfields	10	0	0	0	10
2019	Hillsborough	3	0	0	0	3
2019	Jewells	16	0	0	0	16
2019	Kahibah	16	0	0	0	16
2019	Kotara	26	0	0	0	26
2019	Kotara South	163	0	1	0	164
2019	Merewether	1026	0	0	1	1027
2019	Mount Hutton	280	0	0	0	280
2019	New Lambton	599	0	0	1	600
2019	New Lambton Heights	4	0	0	0	4
2019	Redhead	81	0	0	0	81
2019	Tingira Heights	95	0	0	0	95
2019	Warners Bay	278	0	0	0	278
2019	Whitebridge	46	0	0	0	46
2019	Windale	4527	7	4	2	4540

Year	Suburb name	Within 30 days	Within 60 days	Within 90 days	More than 90 days	Total
2020	Adamstown	91				91
2020	Adamstown Heights	3				3
2020	Belmont North	95				95
2020	Bennetts Green					0
2020	Cardiff	35				35
2020	Cardiff Heights	2				2
2020	Charlestown	48				48
2020	Dudley	22				22
2020	Eleebana					0
2020	Floraville	5				5
2020	Garden Suburb					0
2020	Gateshead	349				349
2020	Highfields					0
2020	Hillsborough	2				2
2020	Jewells	3				3
2020	Kahibah	6				6
2020	Kotara	2				2
2020	Kotara South	43				43
2020	Merewether	236				236
2020	Mount Hutton	43				43
2020	New Lambton	174				174
2020	New Lambton Heights					
2020	Redhead	10				10
2020	Tingira Heights	36				36
2020	Warners Bay	58				58
2020	Whitebridge	9				9
2020	Windale	925				925

Appendix 12 – Supplementary Question 3

BUDGET ESTIMATE LGA	CLEANSED LGA	TOTAL 2011/12 to Date	
		TOTAL # SOLD	TOTAL SALE VALUE
(b) Armidale Regional Council	Armidale Regional	403	10116505
(c) Ballina Shire	Ballina	133	12258592
(d) Balranald Shire	Balranald	21	1443419
(e) Bathurst	Bathurst Regional	307	18817585
(f) Bayside Council	Bayside	60	69773001
(g) Bega Valley Shire	Bega Valley	180	11001947
(h) Bellingen Shire	Bellingen	107	2160703
(i) Berrigan Shire	Berrigan	24	658058
(j) Blacktown, City of	Blacktown	3307	1521689492
(k) Bland Shire	Bland	113	1749243
(l) Blayney Shire	Blayney	167	1753031
(m) Blue Mountains	Blue Mountains	175	26050789
(n) Bogan Shire	Bogan	145	1417095
(o) Bourke Shire	Bourke	11	730512
(p) Brewarrina Shire	Brewarrina	8	2070591
(q) Broken Hill, City of	Broken Hill	35	3374353
(r) Burwood Council	Burwood	10	9672000
(s) Byron Shire	Byron	175	21170339
(t) Cabonne Shire	Cabonne	330	4527727
(u) Camden Council	Camden	1136	314353356
(v) Campbelltown, City of	Campbelltown	2501	1170879809
(w) Canada Bay, City of	Canada Bay	35	62769002
(x) Canterbury-Bankstown	Canterbury-Bankstown	803	470118343
(y) Carrathool Shire	Carrathool	67	954615

(z) Central Coast Council	Central Coast	460	133594761
(aa) Central Darling Shire	Central Darling	10	228503
(bb) Cessnock	Cessnock	110	9561919
(cc) Clarence Valley Council	Clarence Valley	485	21794185
(dd) Cobar Shire	Cobar	29	2109651
(ee) Coffs Harbour	Coffs Harbour	157	29547694
(ff) Coolamon Shire	Coolamon	75	1458809
(gg) Coonamble Shire	Coonamble	163	3097998
(hh) Cootamundra-Gundagai	Cootamundra-gundagai Regional	188	5787979
(ii) Cowra Shire	Cowra	178	4301805
(jj) Cumberland Council	Cumberland	537	412792317
(kk) Dubbo Regional Council	Dubbo Regional	568	29852804
(ll) Dungog Shire	Dungog	101	42016264
(mm) Edward River Council	Edward River	47	2662547
(nn) Fairfield	Fairfield	370	178235403
(oo) Federation Council	Federation	146	3288979
(pp) Forbes Shire	Forbes	135	2971654
(qq) Georges River Council	Georges River	44	53976935
(rr) Gilgandra Shire	Gilgandra	129	5883076
(ss) Glen Innes Severn Council	Glen Innes Severn	271	3199381
(tt) Goulburn Mulwaree	Goulburn Mulwaree	180	7731212
(uu) Greater Hume Shire	Greater Hume Shire	367	12709548
(vv) Griffith, City of	Griffith	60	7834921
(ww) Gunnedah Shire	Gunnedah	143	4540230
(xx) Gwydir Shire	Gwydir	169	5648009
(yy) Hawkesbury, City of	Hawkesbury	31	8048922
(zz) Hay Shire	Hay	50	778622
(aaa) Hills Shire	The Hills Shire	477	301546220
(bbb) Hilltops Council	Hilltops	319	6206092
(ccc) Hornsby Shire	Hornsby	87	64527959
(ddd) Hunter's Hill	Hunters Hill	3	4110000

(eee) Inner West Council	Inner West	71	74576379
(fff) Inverell Shire	Inverell	191	3388911
(ggg) Junee Shire	Junee	105	2598329
(hhh) Kempsey Shire	Kempsey	204	9873377
(iii) Kiama	Kiama	41	14670682
(jjj) Ku-ring-gai Council	Ku-ring-gai	56	65445421
(kkk) Kyogle Council	Kyogle	89	1396264
(lll) Lachlan Shire	Lachlan	247	1710014
(mmm) Lake Macquarie	Lake Macquarie	433	97426037
(nnn) Lane Cove	Lane Cove	34	72753586
(ooo) Leeton Shire	Leeton	26	1561637
(ppp) Lismore	Lismore	179	10450464
(qqq) Lithgow	Lithgow City	140	4351223
(rrr) Liverpool	Liverpool	1086	512062489
(sss) Liverpool Plains Shire	Liverpool Plains	87	2410353
(ttt) Lockhart Shire	Lockhart	74	995454
(uuu) Maitland, City of	Maitland	189	30050855
(vvv) Mid-Coast Council	Mid-Coast	276	21227163
(www) Mid-Western Regional	Mid-Western Regional	317	5779807
(xxx) Moore Plains Shire	Moree Plains	444	12431154
(yyy) Mosman Council	Mosman	1	2400000
(zzz) Murray River Council	Murray River	78	4119680
(aaa) Muswellbrook Shire	Muswellbrook	108	4269098
(bbb) Nambucca Shire	Nambucca Valley	80	1574868
(ccc) Narrandera Shire	Narrandera	90	3081101
(ddd) Narrabri Shire	Narrabri	256	6058319
(eee) Narromine Shire	Narromine	103	1537002
(fff) Northern Beaches Council	Northern Beaches	136	86367478
(ggg) North Sydney Council	North Sydney	5	9856972
(hhh) Oberon Shire	Oberon	156	2606559
(iii) Orange, City of	Orange	183	26282099

(jjjj) Parkes Shire	Parkes	148	4014837
(kkkk) Parramatta Council	City of Parramatta	1384	1834380876
(llll) Penrith	Penrith	979	401832456
(mmmm) Port Macquarie-Hastings Council	Port Macquarie-Hastings	185	16717479
(nnnn) Port Stephens Council	Port Stephens	367	88204681
(oooo) Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional council	Queanbeyan-palerang Regional	273	36969645
(pppp) Randwick	Randwick	20	48085072
(qqqq) Richmond Valley Council	Richmond Valley	166	4468221
(rrrr) Ryde	Ryde	60	607074800
(ssss) Singleton Council	Singleton	101	4910922
(tttt)Shellharbour	Shellharbour	162	42395115
(uuuu) Shoalhaven	Shoalhaven	153	22374324
(vvvv) Snowy Monaro Regional Council	Snowy Monaro Regional	341	4572535
(wwww) Snowy Valleys Council	Snowy Valleys	242	5773639
(xxxx) Strathfield	Strathfield	23	39178001
(yyyy) Sutherland Shire	Sutherland Shire	87	88282841
(zzzz) Sydney	Sydney	1053	1855932147
(aaaa) Tamworth Regional Council	Tamworth Regional	341	14229326
(bbbb) Temora Shire	Temora	120	1980915
(cccc) Tenterfield Shire	Tenterfield	200	2594588
(dddd) Tweed Shire	Tweed	203	16867139
(eeee) Upper Hunter Shire	Upper Hunter	130	3385263
(ffff) Upper Lachlan Shire	Upper Lachlan Shire	217	4402187
(gggg) Uralla Shire	Uralla	134	2722564
(hhhh) Wagga Wagga	Wagga Wagga	304	19796847
(iiii) Walcha Shire	Walcha	171	3163514
(jjjj) Walgett Shire	Walgett	166	5254345
(kkkk)Warren Shire	Warren	152	2531585

(llll)Warrumbungle Shire	Warrumbungle	247	3567424
(mmmm) Waverley Council	Waverley	10	89994000
(nnnn) Weddin Shire	Weddin	120	1169222
(oooo) Wentworth Shire	Wentworth	78	4620529
(pppp) Willoughby	Willoughby	28	86414621
(qqqq) Wingecarribee Shire	Wingecarribee	663	190537507
(rrrr) Wollondilly Shire	Wollondilly	40	14430165
(ssss) Wollongong	Wollongong	291	153663680
(tttt) Woollahra	Woollahra	5	5733908
(uuuu)Yass Valley Council	Yass Valley	137	5052237
		31328	11940146438

Appendix 13 – Supplementary Question 4

	FY 2011- 2012	FY 2012- 2013	FY 2013- 2014	FY 2014- 2015	FY 2015- 2016	FY 2016- 2017	FY 2017- 2018	FY 2018- 2019	FY 2019- 2020	Grand Total
ALBURY	16	5	18	4	2			2		47
ARMIDALE REGIONAL	10	2	5					2		19
BALLINA				2			1		1	4
BATHURST		2	6	1				1	4	14
BAYSIDE	3	12		2	1	5	2	5	3	33
BEGA VALLEY		4	5				1	1	4	12
BLACKTOWN	125	123	34	10	7	4	10	38	21	372
BLAND	2	2						2	1	7
BLAYNEY	1			1						2
BLUE MOUNTAINS		1	4						2	7
BOGAN			1	1						2
BOURKE			1							1
BREWARRINA			1	1		1	1			4
BROKEN HILL							1			1
BURWOOD							1	5		6
BYRON			2	1		3	1		1	8
CABONNE	2		1			1				4
CAMDEN				2		1			1	4
CAMPBELLTOWN	93	166	91	219	284	308	151	37	53	1402
CANADA BAY		4		1	3		9	5		22
CANTERBURY- BANKSTOWN	62	84	61	10	97	43	70	38	33	498
CENTRAL COAST	49	44	8	1		16	5	24	4	151
CESSNOCK	1	17	1		3		9	3	4	38
CLARENCE VALLEY	4	5	3			1	15	1		29

COBAR	1	1	3	1		1			1	8
COFFS HARBOUR	7	2	2	2		1		1	1	16
COOLAMON				1	3			1		5
COONAMBLE		14	1	1						16
COOTAMUNDRA- GUNDAGAI REGIONAL COUNCIL	1		3							4
COWRA	2	1	3	1						7
CUMBERLAND	12	11	7	1	11	22	21	12	9	106
DUBBO-REGIONAL	28	40	81	66	28	3	15	3	2	266
EDWARD RIVER	1									1
EUROBODALLA		1	2	1		1			1	6
FAIRFIELD	11	28	11	4	10	9	19	83	34	209
FEDERATION			2							2
FORBES	1	1	1		1					4
GEORGES RIVER	1			3	4	15	14	5	1	43
GILGANDRA	1									1
GLEN INNES	2	2	2				2			8
GOULBURN MULWAREE	3	16	3					1		23
GREATER HUME	1	2								3
GREAT LAKES	55	23	5	2	2					87
GRIFFITH	16	2	3	1				2	1	25
GUNNEDAH		3								3
GUYRA	1									1
HAWKESBURY		4	1						4	9
HAY		1	3	1				1		6
HILLTOPS	2	2					3			7
HORNSBY	2		1	1	1	3		2		10
HUNTERS HILL						1		1		2
INNER WEST	3		2		7	2	5	2	3	24
INVERELL	1	1				3		1		6
JUNEE	1		1							2
KEMPSEY	6	4	6	1	1	1	1	2	1	23

KU-RING-GAI		6			1	3	3			13
KYOGLA		1				1				2
LACHLAN	1		2	2						5
LAKE MACQUARIE	110	55	42	29	24	5	4	22	7	298
LANE COVE		4	2		2	7	7	6	1	29
LEETON	2	5	4	1					1	13
LISMORE	5	6	5		1	3	3			23
LITHGOW	5				1		1		1	8
LIVERPOOL	6	12	3	3	5	7	9	13	23	81
LIVERPOOL PLAINS	1	1	1	1			1			5
MAITLAND	23	25	6		1			4	1	60
MID-COAST						1		1	2	4
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	1	1					1			3
MOREE PLAINS		1	6		2	2	1			12
MURRUMBIDGEE			1							1
MUSWELLBROOK	3	3	5	1	2		3	5		22
NAMBUCCA		1						1		2
NARRABRI	1	2	1	1				1		6
NARRANDERA	9	4	3						1	17
NARROMINE		1	2		1	1		1		6
NEWCASTLE	8	14	31	5	5	4	12	12	4	95
NORTH SYDNEY								1		1
NORTHERN BEACHES	1	1		6	1	8	3	3	4	27
OBERON	1		3						1	5
ORANGE	49	34	13	3	3	2	2	2		108
PARKES	1	3	3	2		1	2			12
PARRAMATTA	18	65	38	24	35	12	20	14	18	244
PENRITH	23	24	42	7	1	3	5	5	6	116
PORT MACQUARIE-HASTINGS	8	27		1			1			37
PORT STEPHENS	14	15	29		1	5	2	2	4	72

QUEANBEYAN-PALERANG REGIONAL	16	4	7		1		3	2		33
RANDWICK		1			1	1		1	3	7
RICHMOND VALLEY	1	11	2				4			18
RYDE	1	3			2	3	2			11
SHELLHARBOUR	6	4	3		1	5	3	3	9	34
SHOALHAVEN	11	13	6			1	13	6	3	53
SINGLETON	3		4		1		6	1		15
SNOWY MONARO REGIONAL	4						2			6
SNOWY VALLEYS		3	8				2		3	16
STRATHFIELD	1	2			5	2	3	1	3	17
SUTHERLAND	3	4	6		3	1	7	9		33
SYDNEY CITY	2	23	1	28	109	87	182	108	12	552
TAMWORTH	45	12	6	8	8	18	14	4	3	118
TEMORA	1		1					20	2	24
TENTERFIELD					4					4
THE HILLS					1			1	1	3
TWEED	2	1	1	1		2	1			8
UPPER HUNTER	1									1
UPPER LACHLAN	1					1				2
URALLA								1	1	2
WAGGA WAGGA	23	30	9			1	1	4		68
WALCHA	1									1
WALGETT			3							3
WARREN			2							2
WARRUMBUNGLE	1		1	1	2					5
WILLOUGHBY		1			5					6
WINGECARRIBEE			4							4
WOLLONDILLY									1	1
WOLLONGONG	22	15	53	20	8	16	12	33	13	192
Grand Total	962	1068	744	487	702	648	692	568	315	6186