



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

PORTFOLIO COMMITTEES

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2020-2021 Supplementary Questions

Portfolio Committee No. 4 - Industry

WATER, PROPERTY AND HOUSING

Hearing: Monday 1 March 2021

Answers due by: 25 March 2021

Budget Estimates secretariat

Phone 9230 2898

BudgetEstimates@parliament.nsw.gov.au

WATER, PROPERTY AND HOUSING

Questions from Mr Shoebridge MLC

Questions from the Hon Mark Banasiak MLC

Questions regarding NRAR

12. What level of insight does the Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR) have on Irrigation Infrastructure Operations (IIO) activities?

a) Are you limited in your scope? If so, how?

b) If you are limited, what recommendations would you make to widen your scope so there is full transparency with IIO activities?

Answer

NRAR enforces compliance with water management legislation for all water users in NSW, including IIOs.

Questions regarding Dungowan Dam

13. In response to my question asking if the extra seven gigalitres would be used for town water supply would irrigators like Namoi Water potentially lose out or have an increased loss of that seven gigalitres.

You responded-

“What it does is actually give more security for users for a greater length of period, and that is the way the calculation is worked out. But Dr Bentley is absolutely correct; there is not a greater allocation. We still have to operate within the Murray-Darling cap, but if you have more water there more often means those farmers and the town will be more secure for water for greater periods of time.”

However, in a letter to the Member for Barwon, Roy Butler MP, dated 15 June 2020, you state that-

Under the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, any increased diversion due to the proposed dam will need to be included in the calculations for compliance with the Sustainable Diversion Limit for the Namoi Sustainable Limit resource unit.

Considering both your response to Mr Butler and your response in Budget Estimates, will you now confirm if irrigators like Namoi Water will lose out or have an increased loss of that seven gigalitres through a reduction in the Sustainable Diversion Limit available to them?

Answer

The Basin Plan Sustainable Diversion Limit for the broader Namoi valley, including the Peel, will not change with the construction of the new Dungowan Dam, and total take will be managed within this limit.

Questions from the Hon Mark Buttigieg MLC (on behalf of the Opposition)

Odour Control Unit at Wolli Creek

33. An Odour Control Unit (OCU) is to be installed next to the section of the Southern and Western Suburbs Ocean Outfall Sewer (SWSOOS) that crosses Wolli Creek. Can you explain the process of planning for the installation of OCU's?

Answer

The proposed odour control unit (OCU) is a critical piece of infrastructure to prevent deterioration of the wastewater system and minimise odour. This will thereby protect public health and the environment.

The process of planning starts with identifying a need where a wastewater system or asset may require repair, replacement, renewal or upgrade.

A scoping activity and options review are undertaken to identify possible solutions to address the need. In this case several locations across the system were reviewed. A Multi Criteria Assessment was completed to assess the technical, environmental, social, and economic feasibility of the options.

The assessment was completed by a panel of qualified personnel and the most suitable option was recommended for development.

Following the design development, the proposed delivery strategy will be determined, and a delivery business case developed to seek approval and funding to finalise design and deliver (build) the project, in accordance with statutory requirements.

34. Is there any compulsory community consultation conducted before a final decision is made about the installation of an OCU?

a) If so was the local community consulted?

Answer

Community consultation will occur through the design and construction phases of the project. Consultation with the Wolli Creek Preservation Society (WCPS) and other stakeholders including the adjacent landowner started in 2018.

35. The Wolli Creek Preservation Society (WCPS), a community environmentalist action group, acknowledges that it has been in consultation with Sydney Water regarding the installation of the OCU at the Wolli Creek SWSOOS crossing. However, they remain concerned about the present proposed site of installation. They argue that the proposed site is unnecessary and unacceptably intrusive, as the installation will require Sydney Water to cut and remove native restored bushland, deface a natural sandstone structure, and negatively affect the amenity of the local walking trail. Are you aware of the WCPS's concerns?

Answer

I am advised Sydney Water acknowledges the concerns of the WCPS and will continue to assess how it can refine the design to reduce the impacts raised by the WCPS as much as possible.

36. The WCPS recommends an alternate location for the OCU. It happens that the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) owns a parcel of land next to the SWSOOS at Wolli Creek. The WCPS believes that it is large enough for an OCU and says that the site is desirable as it has little native vegetation, has no sandstone structures, and it will not disrupt the amenity of the local walking trail. Are you aware of the WCPS's alternative suggestion?

Answer

I am advised Sydney Water met with the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE), NSW National Parks and Wildlife Services and the impacted property owner to discuss the viability of a land swap deal to relocate the OCU to the alternate location suggested by the WCPS.

37. Have you discussed the alternative site with Sydney Water?

a) If not, will you?

Answer

Yes.

38. Have you discussed the alternative site with DPIE?

a) If not, will you?

Answer

Yes.

39. Will you advocate Sydney Water to choose the alternative location?

Answer

I encourage Sydney Water to consider all options.

Dungowan Dam

60. Minister Pavey advised in Budget Estimates 2021 that the Dungowan Dam Final Business Case is now due first quarter of 2022:

a) What has caused the delay as WaterNSW Frequently Asked Questions lists construction commencement as October 2021?

b) What is the revised construction commencement date?

Answer

a) Main works construction commencement is now expected to be later than previously announced as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the associated restrictions on face to face engagement and regional travel, delayed critical environmental, aquatic and cultural heritage field surveys, and engagement with local communities and First Nations people.

b) The Final Business Case is expected to be completed by around the end of 2021, with State and Commonwealth Government final planning approvals by mid-2022

61. In Budget Estimates 2020, the Final Business Case for Dungowan Dam project was due mid-2021 (June 2021) but Minister Pavey and WaterNSW have prefaced in February this year that it may now not be completed until late 2021 –

a) What has caused the delay?

b) Is the expected project cost still estimated to be \$380 million or has that amount been increased?

c) If the final business case and the Exhibition of the Environmental Impact Assessment are both anticipated for late 2021 is construction still anticipated to commence late 2021 (October 2021)?

Answer

a) See answer to Question 60.

b) Expected costs will be determined through the final business case.

c) Construction is expected to start in mid-2022.

62. Has an agreement on the final form of the funding contribution been decided by the State and Commonwealth Governments who are co-funding the Dungowan Dam project?

a) Has the Commonwealth Government put a cap on their contribution amount?

b) If yes, what is the cap?

Answer

To date, the Commonwealth Government has committed to providing funding of \$242 million towards the Dungowan Dam and Pipeline Project. This is funded from the National Water Infrastructure Development Fund. The Commonwealth Government has advised once the Final Business Case is completed they would consider whether additional funding may be provided.

63. Did the feasibility study for a new Dungowan Dam completed in 2017 and provided to the Commonwealth Government include a cost:benefit ratio?

a) If yes, what was the cost:benefit ratio?

Answer

The Dungowan Dam and Peel Valley Feasibility Study – Feasibility Assessment Report, is publicly available.

64. As advised by WaterNSW in Dungowan Dam & Pipeline Frequently Asked Questions issued January 2021, WaterNSW has not looked at alternative projects or options as part of the scope because these projects were announced by the NSW and Commonwealth Governments. As the principal objective is to secure long-term water supply security for Tamworth, why were alternative options not investigated?

Answer

Alternative options to secure long-term water supply security for Tamworth were considered in Dungowan Dam and Peel Valley Feasibility Study – Feasibility Assessment Report.

65. WaterNSW advises that a key benefit of the project is ‘Increased supply for agriculture’, yet the Project Update Frequently asked questions issued December 2020 advises: The new dam and pipeline will improve water security and reliability for agricultural users. We are committed to maintaining the 5.65GL of average annual use for agriculture. If the new dam is ‘maintaining’ then where is the increase for agriculture?

Answer

The proposed new Dungowan Dam and Pipeline will allow more supply to be available to agricultural water users during times of drought. The primary priority for the dam will be providing long-term supply security for Tamworth water use.

66. As who will own and operate the dam and pipeline has not yet been determined and will not be until the final business case has been completed, will the chosen owner and operator have any input to the decision or will the Government/s simply dictate the decision with no recourse?

Answer

The future owner and operator of the new Dungowan Dam and Pipeline will be determined through a collaborative process.

67. Is the Environmental Impact Assessment on schedule to be completed to enable the Final Business Case to be completed by Late 2021?

a) How long will the Environmental Impact Assessment be on display (also scheduled for Late 2021)?

Answer

The EIS will occur in parallel with the Final Business Case and is scheduled for public display in November 2021. It will be displayed for at least 28 days in line with the requirements set out in the State Significant Infrastructure Guide.

68. If the final business case and Environmental Impact Assessment and the commencement of construction are all slated for Late 2021, are the communities concerns going to be considered or is this just a ‘tick and flick’ exercise on behalf of the Government/s and their departments?

Answer

We are committed to genuine engagement and consultation with communities, and have been engaging throughout the business case development.

69. Why has a Commence construction date (Late 2021) been included in the Estimated project timeline for Dungowan Dam Project when the final business case has not yet been completed and yet Mole River Dam Project is dependent on the final business case and then the Government funding decision will be made in 2021?

a) What criteria dictates that a final business case is not required prior to a funding commitment/allocation?

b) Does the Minister make the decision or is the decision made by the relevant department hierarchy?

Answer

a)

An investment decision for the Dungowan Dam Project will be made after the Final Business Case is completed, which is expected around end-2021.

b) An investment decision for the Mole River Dam Project will be made after the Final Business Case is completed.

Wyangala Dam Wall Raising

70. What amount were the biodiversity costings when the first costings of the Wyangala Dam Wall Raising Project 'came out in about 2018' but were announced by the Premier and Prime Minister in October 2019?

a) Why has this amount now risen to 'up to \$500 million'?

Answer

The Preliminary Business Case prepared in 2017 estimated the biodiversity costs at \$151 million based on desktop analysis on the inundation area and an estimate of the number of ecosystem credits that would need to be acquired under the Biodiversity Offset Scheme.

Final costs will be determined as part of the final business case.

71. Yes. Minister Pavey advised Budget Estimates that there is up to \$300 million worth of 'repairing and dam safety and maintenance work' for Wyangala Dam. Is this amount included in the current quote of \$650 million for the Dam Wall Raising Project?

Answer

These works are considered the base case as they are required.

72. Has the projected timeline for the Wyangala Dam Wall Raising project changed whereby construction works are due to commence October 2021?

a) If yes, what is the revised timeline?

b) If yes, what has been the cause of the change?

Answer

a) Construction is expected to commence in October 2022.

b) Main works construction commencement is now expected to be later than previously announced as the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the associated restrictions on face to face engagement and regional travel, delayed critical environmental, aquatic and cultural heritage field surveys, and engagement with local communities and First Nations people.

Responsible Division: WINSW

Approved by: Ingrid Emery Date Approved: 13/03/2021

73. What is the current yield for general security licence use when modelling predicts an additional 21.05GL per annum estimated yield out of an expected dam increase capacity storage of 650 giga litres?

Answer

The 21.05GL estimated yield was prepared as part of the Preliminary Business Case. Updated hydrological modelling is being completed as part of the Final Business Case, including scenarios using paleo-climatic data. The updated modelling will inform the estimated yield for general security licence use from the enlarged dam.

74. Will none of the increased capacity (additional 650GL) be made available for environmental flows?

Answer

A number of the general security licences in Wyangala Dam are owned by the Commonwealth Environmental water Holder (CEWH).

75. How many existing infrastructure are anticipated to be required to be replaced once Wyangala Dam project has been completed and the dam full that will fall below the new water line owned by:

- a) Federal entities
- b) State entities
- c) Local entities
- d) Community entities
- e) Private entities?

Answer

Any potential modifications to other infrastructure that may be required due to the Wyangala Dam Wall Raising project will be known once the final hydrological modelling, wall raising design, and inundation area are completed as part of the Final Business Case.

Greater Sydney Water Strategy

76. Is The Greater Sydney Water Strategy on schedule for completion Mid-2021?

- a) How often is GSWS scheduled to be revised?
- b) Has GSWS been designed and completed by the same department/s who completed the Sydney Metropolitan Water Plan 2017?
 - i. If no, which contributors are different?

Answer

a) The Greater Sydney Water Strategy is currently being developed. A draft Strategy is scheduled for public exhibition in the second half of 2021 following cabinet consideration. The final Strategy is proposed to be released with an implementation plan the Strategy revised every five years.

b) The Water Group in the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment is developing the Greater Sydney Water Strategy.

IPART

77. Can the Minister for Water make unsolicited recommendations and/or suggestions to IPART for consideration?

- a) Since 2 April 2019, has the Minister done this?
 - i. If yes, on how many occasions?
- b) Were any of these recommendations/suggestions acted on?
 - i. Which ones?

Answer

Section 7 of the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal Act 1992 expressly states that IPART is not subject to the direction or control of any minister other than, to an extent, the responsible ministers.

There is no legal impediment to any person making a comment to IPART. The degree to which (if any) IPART pays regard to those comments is a matter for IPART.

Water Sharing Plans

78. How many Water Sharing Plans are to be remade in 2022?

- a) Has work commenced on each of these plans as at 28 February 2021 to ensure completion on time?
 - i. If no, which plans have not yet commenced?
- b) What is the average time required to remake a Water Sharing Plan?

Answer

There are currently five plans to be replaced in 2022 (

- a) Yes
- i) Not applicable
- b) Minimum of two years.

79. How many Water Sharing Plans are to be amended in 2022?

- a) Has work commenced on each of these plans as at 28 February 2021 to ensure completion on time?
 - i. If no, which plans have not yet commenced?
- b) What is the average time required to amend a Water Sharing Plan?

Answer

The number of amendments is uncertain as they are generally not identified in advance.

- i) Not applicable
- a) This varies dependent on the basis for the amendment and whether consultation is required.

80. When was the last audit conducted for the following Water Sharing Plans (WSP) that have been extended and have a cease date of 2030:

- a) WSP for the Murrumbidgee Regulated River – 2030
- b) WSP for the Murray and Lower Darling Regulated River – 2030
- c) WSP for the Upper and Lower Namoi Regulated River – 2030
- d) WSP for the Gwydir Regulated River – 2030
- e) WSP for the Lachlan Regulated River – 2030
- f) WSP for the Macquarie and Cudgong Regulated Rivers – 2030
- g) WSP for the Lachlan Alluvium Water Sources – 2030
- h) WSP for the Upper & Lower Namoi Alluvium Water Sources – 2030
- i) WSP for the NSW MDB Fractured Rock Water Sources – 2030
- j) WSP for the Murrumbidgee Alluvium Water Sources – 2030
- k) WSP for the Murray Alluvium Water Sources – 2030
- l) WSP for the NSW Border Rivers Regulated Water Sources – 2030
- m) WSP for the NSW Border Rivers Alluvium Water Sources – 2030
- n) WSP for the NSW GAB Shallow Water Sources – 2030
- o) WSP For the NSW MDB Porous Rock Water Sources – 2030
- p) WSP for the Gwydir Alluvium Water Sources – 2030
- q) WSP for the Macquarie Castlereagh Alluvium – 2030
- r) Water Sharing Plan for the Peel River Regulated Water Sources – 2030?
- i. Have each of the Water Sharing Plans had 2 audits conducted since their inception?
- ii. If no, which ones have not?

Answer

The Regulated River WSPs (a, b, c, d, e, f, l, r) do not have a cease date of 2030. They were not replaced in 2020.

The groundwater WSPs (g, h, i, j, k, m, n, o, p, q) have a cease date of 2030 as they were replaced in July 2020. Most of these plans are an amalgamation of two or more pre-2020 plans. Those groundwater 'sources' that were previously in Unregulated and Alluvial WSPs were audited in 2019. The other 'stand-alone' groundwater plans were audited in 2012/2013.

i) No plan has been subject to two audits since its inception. The Act requires a plan to be audited only once during its 10 year term – being in its fifth year. All plans were audited during their first term.

ii) See answer to ii) above. At this time, all statutory requirements have been met.

81. How many Water Sharing Plans were submitted within Water Resource Plans without concurrence of the Minister for the Environment?

- a) How many of these have had amendments recommended?
- b) How many of these have been accepted without change?

Answer

NSW submitted all its 20 Water Resource Plans (WRPs) in 2020 (11 Groundwater WRPs in April 2020 and 9 Surface Water WRPs in June 2020). These 20 draft WRPs included 31 associated draft water sharing plans. Concurrence of the Minister for the Environment is not required for submission of draft water sharing plans to the Commonwealth for accreditation assessment.

DPIE Water has worked closely with DPIE Biodiversity, Conservation and Science in the development of the WRPs, including the Water Sharing Plan (WSP) components.

Illawarra Desalination Plant

82. Has WaterNSW submitted a Strategic Business Case to the Government for the Illawarra Desalination Plant?

- a) If yes, when?
- b) If no, when is it expected?

Answer

WaterNSW has not submitted a Strategic Business Case to the NSW Government. The need for the Strategic Business Case will be determined by the outcomes from the Greater Sydney Water Strategy. The Strategy is currently being prepared.

Lachlan Valley

83. What is the current status of The Lachlan Valley Water Security Study?

- a) When was Phase 1 completed?
- b) When was Phase 2 completed?
- c) How many phases will be included in the study?

Answer

Water security has historically been a challenge in the Lachlan Valley and is limiting economic growth for the region. The valley has been subject to severe town water restrictions with long periods of little or no general security, agricultural water availability and restricted high security water.

WaterNSW is responsible for delivering and operating infrastructure to provide for the State's bulk water supply needs. As part of the State Infrastructure Strategy, the NSW Government has committed to investing in the water supply for the Lachlan region.

Phase 1 of the Lachlan Valley Water Security project was undertaken by WaterNSW in 2014.

Phase 2 was completed in April 2018.

84. Was a cost:benefit ratio included in the Lachlan Valley Priority Catchment Water Security – Preliminary Business Case which was submitted to the Federal Government?

Answer

Yes.

Drought

85. Are there any towns/locations that are still having to have water carted due to being in drought?

a) How many?

b) Where are the locations?

Answer

No.

86. The following water utilities source more than 50% of water supply from groundwater (as advised in BE 2020 Supplementary Questions):

a) Bega Valley

b) Kempsey

c) Nambucca

d) Moree Plains

e) Narrabri

f) Gunnedah

g) Bellingen

h) Liverpool Plains

i) Narromine

j) Narrandera

k) Coonamble

l) Gwydir

m) Gilgandra

n) Murrumbidgee

o) Carrathool

- p) Riverina County Council
- q) Goldenfields County Council:
 - i. Do any of these locations remain in drought?
 - ii. Which locations?
 - iii. Which of these locations have applied for funding for/to investigate alternative water sources since 2018?
 - iv. Do any of these locations have 1 year or less of groundwater supply remaining?

Answer

There are currently no town water supply schemes in these LGA's that are at high risk of failure. Locations in the list that have applied for funding since 2018 for alternative water sources include Moree Plains, Bellingen, Liverpool Plains, Narromine and Gilgandra. None of the above locations have 1 year or less of groundwater supply remaining (based on recent and assumed recharge).

Financial

87. What were the actual Department of Planning, Industry & Environment – Water figures for financial year 2019-20 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
- 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?

Answer

The Water group is a business area within the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (the Department). Financial data for the Water group is incorporated in the audited financial statements included in the Department's Annual Report 2019-20.

88. Are dividend payments made to Treasury from WaterNSW, Sydney Water and Hunter Water calculated and decided:
- a) By a formula
 - b) By a request from Treasury
 - c) By consultation between Treasury and the relative entities
 - d) By relevant Ministers and their departments?

Answer

This question is a matter for the Shareholding Minister, the Treasurer.

NRAR

89. Has NRAR completed its investigation (CIRAM00541-2020) to examine allegations of non-compliance with the Water Management Act 2000 on Toorale Station?

- a) If yes, when was it completed?
- b) If no, when is it anticipated to be completed?

Answer

NRAR concluded an investigation at Toorale National Park in November 2020. This followed allegations that were raised in February that operations were in breach of the Water Management Act 2000. NRAR found no breach of the Act had occurred. A public statement was issued by NRAR on 10 November 2020.

90. Since 2018 when Natural Resources Commission assumed responsibility for water sharing plan audits, how many have been completed?

Answer

No water sharing plan audits have been completed by the Natural Resources Commission (NRC) since they assumed responsibility for this in 2018.

91. How many of Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR) staff are/were funded under Commonwealth programs ie such as Healthy Floodplains?

- a) What programs?
- b) When did each program commence?
- c) When did each program finish?
- d) Were staff on a contract for a specified time period?
- e) Have all staff on finalised programs been retained by NRAR?
 - i. If not, how many were lost?
 - ii. If not, how many were retained?

Answer

NRAR contributed nine staff to the Commonwealth funded Healthy Floodplains program. NRAR's contribution commenced on 30 April 2018. All nine staff were on contract for a specified time period. NRAR's contribution ended as agreed on 31 December 2020. All staff have been retained within NRAR and DPIE Water Group.

Commonwealth

92. How much funding has the Commonwealth provided for the development of the final business cases for:

- a) Dungowan Dam?

- b) Mole River Dam?
- c) Wyangala Dam Wall Raising?

Answer

The Commonwealth Government has signed funding agreements with the NSW Government under the National Partnership Agreement – National Water Infrastructure to provide the following funding provided agreed milestones are met:

- a. Dungowan Dam - \$40 million
- b. Mole River Dam - \$12 million
- c. Wyangala Dam Wall Raising - \$40 million

93. What are the significant financial obligations if New South Wales cannot meet the deadlines in relation to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and the Commonwealth Government?

Answer

Until a decision is made by NSW and the Commonwealth to progress these projects to implementation, NSW has no financial obligations arising from SDLAM deadlines in the Basin Plan.

94. Has New South Wales received the federal funding which Minister Littleproud refused to approve in January 2020 now that all Water Resource Plans have been submitted?

Answer

NSW received funding from the Commonwealth for its performance in 2018-19 under the National Partnership Agreement on Implementing Water Reform in the Murray Darling Basin.

DPIE

95. When was the infrastructure unit within Department of Primary Industries – Water established?
- a) How many staff are in this unit?
 - b) Were the staff seconded from within the Department of Primary Industries or from another Department?
 - c) Were any of the roles advertised externally?
 - i. If yes, how many roles?
 - d) Is this unit known as Water Infrastructure NSW?

Answer

Water Infrastructure NSW is a division within the Department of Planning, Industry & Environment (DPIE)'s Water Group. Approval to establish Water Infrastructure NSW was signed off by the Secretary DPIE on 23 November 2020. As at 28 February 2021, there was a headcount of 140 staff. The majority of staff were transitioned from the former Water Group Program & Services Division. Five were seconded from other departments

96. Why has the Water Infrastructure NSW unit been removed from Department of Planning, Industry and Environment to Department of Planning and Industry when much of water is in concurrence with the environment?

Answer

Water Infrastructure NSW is a new division within the Water Group of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.

97. As Dr Bentley received legal advice from general counsel verbally in relation to 'triple bottom line' advice, is Dr Bentley able to get the advice in writing?

a) If yes, is he able to provide that written advice?

Answer

I am advised Dr Bentley received verbal advice from General Counsel regarding the 'triple bottom line'.

98. When is the Peak Bodies Stakeholders Group referred to in Budget Estimates by Dr Bentley expected to:

a) Be finalised?

b) Hold its first meeting?

c) Will the regularity of meetings be decided at or prior to the first meeting?

i. Further multi-level list

Answer

A statewide peak stakeholder body is being established to provide constructive and collaborative advice and support the effective delivery of NSW's water strategies. A consultative approach will be undertaken to ensure stakeholders' insights contribute to the design of the forum and that it is representative of diverse perspectives.

Information on the approach and opportunities to engage will be published on the department's website and communicated via usual channels.

99. How much funding has Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and its subsidiaries applied for and been granted from the Snowy Hydro Fund?

a) Which projects was the funding for?

Answer

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment has received the following funding commitments from the Snowy Hydro Legacy Fund:

- \$9.0 million towards the development of Regional Water Strategies
- \$6.4 million towards investigations of four water infrastructure projects (Macquarie River weir, Lake Rowlands to Carcoar Dam pipeline, Hunter Water Corporation to Singleton interconnection, and Lostock to Glennies Dam pipeline), and
- \$18.4 million towards streamlining planning in Special Activation Precincts.

100. What is the official definition of 'dewatering'?

Answer

The meaning of 'dewater' in the Macquarie Dictionary is "to drain, permanently or temporarily, water flowing over or groundwater underneath (a wet area of land), as for agriculture, construction, mining, etc."

101. When Minister Pavey advised Budget Estimates that 'we are realigning those resources' in relation to staffing, was she referring to:

- a) Transferring staff between departments?
- b) Locating staff at different rural and/or regional locations?
- c) Changing positions from full-time to part-time?
- d) Changing positions from part-time to full-time?
- e) Employing more staff?
- f) Decreasing staff numbers?
- g) Employing more contractors?

Answer

Strategic realignment is about working with the full strength of the water sector to bring about improvements for the community, economy and environment.

102. Minister Pavey advised Budget Estimates in relation to final business cases 'we still have the obligations and responsibilities to ensure best value for money for taxpayers':

- a) Which office/department makes the decision that this requirement is met?
 - i. Can this decision be overridden by the relevant Minister?
 - ii. Can this decision be overridden by Treasury?

Answer

- a) Final investment decision on government projects made by the Expenditure Review Committee of Cabinet.
 - i) No
 - ii) No

20 Year Infrastructure Options Study Rural Valleys

103. When will the next edition of the 20 Year Infrastructure Options Study Rural Valleys Summary Report be released and available (as per page 13 of the June 2018 edition)?

Answer

In 2018 WaterNSW released a 20-year infrastructure options study for the state's major rural river valleys to address future challenges in operating regulated river systems, with potential to enhance service levels and guide future investment.

The study is helping to inform the development of 12 regional water strategies, currently under development.

104. Since releasing the 20 Year Infrastructure Options Study Rural Valleys Summary Report published June 2018, has WaterNSW applied for and been successful in obtaining funding to minimise the frequency and impact of cold water releases on the environment and develop strategies for the future?

a) If yes, how much funding was received and what program/s was the funding used for?

Answer

Water NSW has applied for additional operational expenditure funding via the IPART Rural Pricing submission FY22-25 for \$3.75m for Coldwater pollution (CWP) mitigation studies in the Gwydir, Murrumbidgee, Lachlan, North Coast and Hunter Valleys. IPART's draft report was released on 16 March 2021.

Barmah Choke

105. What volume of water does WaterNSW send down through the Murray Irrigation system for customers/obligations downstream of the Barmah Choke?

Answer

The volumes are dependent on many factors and are often influenced by the seasonal conditions.

Murray Darling Basin Plan

106. Did Minister Pavey and Minister Barilaro discuss with Minister Kean the option to seek legal advice to withdraw from the Murray Darling Basin Plan during the Cluster Ministers regular meetings prior to releasing the information to the media?

a) If yes, which other Ministers were included in these discussions?

Answer

Cluster Minister's Committee (CMC) is a sub-committee of Cabinet.

Regional Water Strategies

107. Which 7 Regional Water Strategies are currently out at consultation?

a) Which 5 are to start consultation?

Answer

Draft Regional Water Strategies for Namoi and for North Coast are currently out for consultation. Draft Regional Water Strategies for Border Rivers, Gwydir, Lachlan, Macquarie/Castlereagh, Far North Coast and South Coast were exhibited last year and are no longer at consultation stage.

Draft Regional Water Strategies for Murray, Murrumbidgee and Western are yet to be released for consultation.

All Regional Water Strategies will go out for further consultation prior to being finalised.

The Greater Hunter Regional Water Strategy is in implementation.

Sydney Science Park Project

The Sydney Science Park Project is set to deliver 2.4 million litres of recycled water a day to Western Sydney:

108. Which other companies/groups/departments are involved with this project besides Sydney Water?

- a) What stage of planning is the Project currently at?
- b) Has any funding been allocated/provided for the project?
 - i. How much?
- c) What suburbs will the recycled water support?
 - i. Is growth areas such as Wilton included?
- d) What is the time frame for the completion of the project?
- e) Is there a short list of suitable designs for the project?
 - i. Will these be available for public consultation?
 - ii. When?
- f) Will any current SEPP disallowing water recycling be repealed?
 - i. Wilton?
- g) Has a preliminary cost-benefit ratio been conducted?
 - i. Is the CBR greater than or less than 1?
- h) Will the finished project be:
 - i. Publicly owned and operated?
 - ii. Privately owned and operated?
 - iii. Public/Private partnership?

Answer

Sydney Water and the developer, Celestino, have entered a commercial partnership for the provision of water, wastewater and recycled water for Sydney Science Park. There are no other companies, groups or departments involved in the project.

- a) The project is currently in the detailed design stage.
- b) Yes
 - i) The project is a commercial agreement between Sydney Water and developer, Celestino.
- c) As This agreement is specific to the Sydney Science Park.
- i) Not applicable.
- d) Sydney Water will provide staged water, wastewater and recycled water services from December 2021.

- e) The final project design meets the servicing obligations agreed between Sydney Water and the developer, Celestino, as part of a commercial agreement. The actual design for the Integrated Water Recycling Hub is determined between Sydney Water and the construction contractor/s.
- i) This is a private development and public consultation is managed by Celestino as part of the standard development application process with the local council.
- ii) Not applicable.
- f) There is no requirement for any State Environmental Planning Policy to be repealed.
- i) Not applicable.
- g) A cost-benefit ratio is not applicable.
- i) Not applicable.
- h) Sydney Water will own and operate the scheme's infrastructure.

WaterNSW

109. How many dams and land assets has WaterNSW made available for privately developed on-demand, dispatchable energy generation and energy storage?

- a) How many Expressions of Interest have been received?
- b) How many tenders have been received?
- c) What form of energy generation has been expressed?
- d) What form of energy storage has been expressed?
- e) Have any contracts been prepared?
- i. Have any contract been signed?
- f) What is the minimum contract term length being considered?

Answer

- a) 65 submissions were received.
- b) Two formal tenders have been received from proponents.
- c) All forms of energy generating process were expressed including; pumped hydro, mini hydro, solar, wind, hydrogen generation, flow shaping and combinations of pumped hydro with solar or wind or duplication of existing hydro schemes.
- d) Pumped hydro being the main form, with battery storages offered linked to solar or wind.
- e) Yes
- i. No
- f) Minimum term for wind is 25 years and pumped hydro 50 years with options to extend.

Expressions of Interest

110. What is the standard timeframe for Expressions of Interest (EOI) when tenders are called for major projects?

- a) Do these vary for the types of projects?
- i. What are the different types of projects?
- b) Do these vary for the different stages of projects?
- i. What are the different stages of projects?
- c) Why was the new Dungowan Dam project for early works packages EOI only 22 days from release to due and the Wyangala Dam Wall Raising project 16 days from release to due?

Answer

a)&b) An Expression of Interest (EOI) is the process of seeking the interest of service providers capable of undertaking specific works or services, to provide information on that capability or a detailed proposal to undertake work. It is usually the first stage of a multi-stage tender process.

Tender periods must give respondents reasonable time to effectively price and prepare their submissions or bids, consistent with the agency's reasonable needs.

c) Timeframes for Expressions of Interest vary depending on the nature and scope of the work being procured. The timeframe for the Dungowan and Wyangala Early Works were different given the differences in the work being procured. The timeframes were appropriate relative to the complexity of the information being sought by proponents. Note - this was an Expression of Interest, a relatively brief document requesting high-level interest in a project and seeking to understand the capability and experience of the proponent's organisation. A Request for Proposal seeks specific and detailed information about the proponent's proposal for the delivery of the project.

Water Recycling at Newcastle Jockey Club

148. Does the Minister support Newcastle Jockey Club's plan to use recycled water for irrigation purposes at the racecourse, Merewether Golf Course and local parks and gardens?

- a) What work has Hunter Water undertaken on this proposal?
- b) What is the expected total cost of this project?
- c) How much water is this initiative expected to save each year?

Answer

I am advised that Hunter Water has undertaken engineering investigations on this proposal to understand the costs of the recycled water irrigation scheme; the volume of recycled water that could be supplied for parks, sporting fields and other green space in Newcastle; the upgrade requirements for a new recycled water plant at Burwood Wastewater Treatment Works; and pipelines required for the irrigation of sites.

b) I am advised that the estimated capital cost of the scheme is approximately \$10 million. The present value of operating the scheme over the next 30 years is estimated to be \$3 million.

c) I am advised that up to 120 megalitres could be saved each year.

WATER

Questions from Ms Cate Faehrmann MLC

Water Management (General) Amendment (Emergency Works Exemption) Regulation 2021

149. How many investigations has NRAR undertaken since 2017 relating to (the egs. In the reg fact sheet)?

Answer

NRAR has not undertaken any investigations on situations as described in the fact sheet being, the removal of water from an excavation that had to be dug to fix a burst water supply pipe or sewer pipe.

150. Did the Department have any consultation with the irrigation industry regarding the reg?

Answer

No.

151. Who were the industry bodies that approached the Department about introducing the reg?

Answer

Several public and private entities requested the exemption to facilitate emergency works, including Sydney Water, Hunter Water, the Water Directorate (on behalf of local councils) and the Hire and Rental Industry Association of Australia.

Floodplain Harvesting

152. What is NRAR's estimation of water extracted via floodplain harvesting by valley by month for 2020 and 2021

Answer

NRAR has not made estimations of water extracted via floodplain harvesting by valley by month for 2020 and 2021.

153. The Department engaged Alluvium (Greg Claydon and Tony Weber) to undertake a review of the NSW Floodplain harvesting policy implementation:

- a) How much did that review cost the Department?
- b) Did the review check whether the volumes being licenced are actually within the Cap or plan limits for the NSW Border Rivers and the Gwydir valleys?
- c) On the Department's website, the review is described as an 'Independent Peer Review'.
 - i. Was the report reviewed by any academics?
 - 1. If so, please provide the names and qualifications of each academic.
 - ii. Was the report formerly reviewed by any other experts?
 - 1. If so, please provide the names and qualifications of each expert.
 - iii. On what basis can it be described as a 'peer review'?

Answer

- a) The original peer review of Policy implementation was a cost of up to \$135,440, with the MDBA and DPIE sharing those costs equally.

The ongoing peer review of modelling results is a cost of up to \$128,860.

The advice and support on submissions to the Committee is \$32,160.

b) Yes, this is documented in the modelling reports for each valley.

c) The reports were reviewed only by Tony Weber and Greg Claydon. With regards to Tony Weber, he has a Bachelor of Applied Science (Chemistry) degree from QUT in 1989, is a Visiting Scientist with CSIRO's Land and Water Division and was a Visiting Fellow with the Australian National University, and is a Fellow of the Modelling and Simulation Society of Australia and New Zealand. He has also been an author or co-author of more than 20 peer-reviewed journal papers, book chapters and conference papers presented nationally and internationally.

For Greg Claydon, he has formal qualifications in agricultural engineering specialising in water engineering, is a Chartered Professional Engineer, and has also been the author or co-author of many peer-reviewed journal papers and conference papers presented nationally and internationally. Greg has extensive water industry and natural resources management knowledge, experience and achievements, built primarily on his roles as a senior executive with Queensland's and Western Australia's state government water, environment and natural resources agencies.

Both Greg Claydon and Tony Weber are recognised nationally and internationally as experts in their respective fields and were not involved in any activities regarding the modelling and/or implementation of the NSW Floodplain Harvesting Policy prior to their commencement of the review tasks. The basis on which it could be described as a "peer review" (with peer review meaning the evaluation of work by one or more people with at least similar competencies as the producers of the work) was that both Greg Claydon and Tony Weber were peers of departmental staff who have developed the models and/or formulated the policy and its implementation approach, with Greg Claydon being a peer of policy development and implementation staff, and Tony Weber being a peer of modelling and communication staff, both through each of their more than 30 years of experience in undertaking similar activities in other agencies and jurisdictions. We therefore consider that their review is both independent and at the peer (or above) level of scrutiny.

In undertaking their review, Tony Weber and Greg Claydon also consulted widely with peers in the MDBA and other Commonwealth Agencies (e.g. Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder), in addition to stakeholders from a wide range of land holders and water users, plus environmental and natural resource group members.

154. The Department says that it is bringing Floodplain harvesting within Cap and within legal plan limits.

a) If floodplain harvesting was never measured, how does the department determine what floodplain harvesting volumes were taken under Cap (1994) or plan limits (2000)?

Answer

An estimate of the amount of water taken by floodplain harvesting under current and historical development conditions is an output of the models. The inputs to the models are based on multiple lines of evidence that are transparently reported on in our peer-reviewed reports.

155. In regards to the Healthy Floodplains Review Committee;
- a) How were the members appointed?
 - b) How much are the members paid?
 - c) Is it correct that NSW Farmers Federation asked the Department that their representative on the committee be removed from the committee?
 - i. Why is this person still a committee member?
 - d) Have the members disclosed any conflicts of interest?
 - ii. If so, what are these conflicts of interest?
 - e) Do any of the committee members act as a consultant to any northern irrigator groups?
 - f) Do any of the members stand to receive floodplain harvesting licences?
 - g) Is the committee approving works, volumetric conversions, licence applications or any other approvals?

Answer

- a) Membership of the committee is through invitation from the Deputy Secretary, NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment – Water, who accepts responses to invitations and appoints members to the committee.
- b) The chair and members are paid in accordance with the Public Service Commission's guidelines for NSW Government boards and committees. Remuneration for the Chair is \$350 for a full day and \$175 half day, while members receive \$220 for a full day and \$110 half day.
- c) Yes
- i) The former NSW Farmers Association representative has been removed and replaced at the request of the Association.
- d) Members have declared any pecuniary interests as required for membership of the committee.
- e) The department has not been made aware of committee members acting as a consultant to northern irrigator groups.
- f) Two committee members have been determined to be eligible in terms of the NSW Floodplain Harvesting Policy and therefore stand to receive floodplain harvesting licences. These members have not in the past and will not in the future participate in any committee deliberations with respect their individual interests.
- g) The committee does not make determinations. Its functions are to:
 - analyse issues raised by individual floodplain harvesting registrants in respect of preliminary determinations of the department concerning floodplain harvesting eligibility and proposed floodplain harvesting entitlements
 - provide advice and make recommendations to the Director, Healthy Floodplains Project, Department of Planning, Industry and Environment – Water regarding resolution of such issues.

156. Are there any NRAR staff that have any interest in floodplain harvesting, and/or stand to benefit from floodplain harvesting licences?

Answer

No NRAR staff have declared a conflict of interest in relation to floodplain harvesting.

157. What number of the volumetric conversions of floodplain harvesting licences have been completed?

- a) How many are in the process of being converted?
- b) How many conversions are left to do?

Answer

None have been issued at this point.

a) In the order of 500 floodplain harvesting licences will be issued in the northern Basin spanning 6 designated floodplains.

b) There are a further 10 designated floodplains across NSW, the number of floodplain harvesting licences that relate to these designated floodplains are unknown at this stage.

Wyangala Dam

158. Is it correct that the level of water in Wyangala will need to be lowered during construction?

- a) What level will the dam need to be lowered to?
- b) How long will the disruption be for?
- c) What will be the impact on town water?
- d) What will be the impact on General Security water?
- e) Has disruption been modelled?

Answer

The level of Wyangala Dam storage could be a factor during some stages of the proposed wall-raising project once approvals are received and main construction is underway. This will only be confirmed once construction partners are appointed and the construction methodology is confirmed in finalising the Final Business Case later this year.

159. Has the Department of the Minister been in any discussions with gold mining companies in the Lachlan valley about water supply or security?

Answer

The department consults with a broad range of stakeholders.

160. Why did the Department / the Minister seek to split the EPBC Act approval for the Wyangala dam expansion?

Answer

To align the timelines for the Environmental Impact Statement and Water Sharing Plan processes for the dam's operations.

161. Why did the MDBA reject the Water Resource Plan for the Lachlan Valley?

Answer

This is not unusual. The MDBA has had issues with most if not all WRPs initially submitted by all jurisdictions. This iterative process is normal and expected.

The Department and stakeholder engagement

162. How often does the Department prepare social media content for stakeholders?

Answer

The DPIE – Water Group prepares social media content for use on the Department's official social media channels and on occasion this is also made available to stakeholders for voluntary use.

163. Who attends the fortnightly meetings with the Water Relationships officer or delegates?

a) Are there minutes for these meetings?

Answer

The department is focused on engaging with stakeholders in a fair and transparent manner. Fortnightly information catch ups were initiated in 2020 to ensure stakeholders were kept up-to-date on planned water engagement activities. Standard and official information was relayed at these online information sessions attended by NSW Irrigators Council, NSW Farmers' Association, Local Government NSW, The Water Directorate, the Murray Darling Association and the NSW Minerals Council.

To ensure a broader range of stakeholders may be informed about water engagement activities, regular Water Engagement Roundups will be held online.

Information on current and past water engagement activities is available on the department's website and communicated via usual channels.

164. Why are these meetings secret?

Answer

The fortnightly information catch ups shared publicly available information.

165. Have invitations been sent to the groups that Peter Hansen said to avoid?

Answer

No recommendations were made to avoid any groups.

166. What was the procurement process to engage Peter Hansen?

Answer

There was no procurement process. Mr Hansen was employed following an externally advertised merit-based assessment in accordance with the Government Sector Employment Act 2014. Mr Hansen was appointed as part-time, ongoing employee on 25 March 2019.

167. How much is Peter Hansen receiving annually and to date?

Answer

The Department will not release personal information. Non-senior executive employees within the Water Division are paid in accordance with the relevant Award. In the case of Peter Hansen it's the Administration & Clerical Award.

Sydney Water Bushland Restoration

168. Please provide a breakdown of how much Sydney Water is spending on each of its bush restoration projects along the Cooks River and on Johnstons Creek in Annandale.

Answer

Sydney Water's ongoing bush regeneration program includes approximately 22,000m² of naturalised stormwater channel along the Cooks River. Sydney Water's recent spending on Cooks River bush restoration has been:

Cooks River bush restoration Spent (ex GST)

2019/20 \$118,826.29

2020/21 (to Feb 2021) \$158,801.43

The Johnstons Creek Naturalisation Project is currently estimated at \$23 million. This naturalisation project will involve the planting of over 32,000 native plants. The project will care for and maintain these plantings for a two-year period. When the planting along the creek have established after the two years, the maintenance of these areas will be included in Sydney Water's bush regeneration program.

Responsible Division: Sydney Water

Approved by: Sydney Water Date Approved: 12/03/2021

Dungowan Dam

169. Will modelling for the proposed Dungowan Dam include the new climate data that was developed for the Namoi Regional Water Strategy?

Answer

Yes

170. How will the increased capture of water in the proposed Dungowan Dam interact with the rules in the Namoi Regulated River Water Sharing Plan?

Answer

Any impact of the additional storage in Dungowan Dam on access in the Namoi River will be assessed as part of the environmental assessment.

171. Will the cost-benefits analysis in the business case for the proposed Dungowan Dam assess the downstream impacts on the Namoi Regulated River water users such as loss of access to supplementary flows?

Answer

Yes

172. Will the business case assess the possibility of increased releases from Keepit Dam to meet the end of system flow rules in the Namoi Regulated Water Sharing Plan?

Answer

If needed, this will be identified and assessed in the business case.

Mole River Dam

173. Is there a planned Stage 2 and Stage 3 for the proposed Mole River Dam?

Answer

The NSW Government is completing a business case for the proposed Mole River Dam project. Once the business case is complete the Government will make decisions as to whether to proceed with the project..

174. Water use from the Mole River currently operates under water sharing rules for unregulated streams which involves only a fixed charge not charges per megalitre. Will existing licences below the dam be changed to regulated flow licences?

a) will the business case for the proposed Mole River Dam include an assessment of the social and economic impacts on those licence holders of any changes to their water shares, water use and charges, and likely consequent changes to their business operations if the dam proceeds?

Answer

Water sharing arrangements for any future Mole River Dam have not yet been fully scoped.

175. A substantial part of the costs of managing and maintaining large publicly owned dams is normally recouped via water use charges set by IPART. After Pindari Dam was greatly enlarged in the 1990s, water use charges also included repaying construction costs, but the high water charges made irrigation prohibitively expensive for some water licence holders.

a) If the Mole River dam proposal proceeds, who will pay for managing and maintaining this extra dam?

b) Will the business case benefit-cost analysis include the social and economic costs of losing existing agricultural production that would cease to be financially viable at various levels of management-and-maintenance cost recovery and at various levels of construction-cost recovery?

Answer

The potential economic impacts of changes to water allocations are being considered in the Mole River Dam business case.

176. How much of the \$24million being spent on this business case is to be used to assess the impacts of the dam on downstream environments and communities so that these social and environmental costs can be included in the benefit-cost analysis?

a) Will this include different impacts of alternative options for release and use of the water including loss of high flows past Mungindi into the Barwon-Darling, and impacts on meeting the end-of-system flow targets set in the Border River Regulated Water Sharing Plan rules?

Answer

The business case being developed for the proposed Mole River Dam will include the potential economic, social and environmental costs on downstream environments and communities.

Fish Passage

177. What is the current status of the NSW Fish Passage Strategy?

a) When will it be released for public comment?

Answer

This is a matter for the Minister for Agriculture and Western New South Wales.

178. What is the total dollar value of the full implementation of the strategy?

a) Over what timeframe will this be spent?

Answer

This is a matter for the Minister for Agriculture and Western New South Wales.

179. Who will pay for the implementation of the strategy (i.e. tax payers or water users or both)?

Answer

This is a matter for the Minister for Agriculture and Western New South Wales.

180. Does the NSW fish passage strategy (and funds to implement it) encompass the Western Weirs project, the SDL projects and the three new dams (Wyangala, Mole River and Dungowan)?

Answer

This is a matter for the Minister for Agriculture and Western New South Wales.

181. If not, where will the funds to mitigate the impacts of Western Weirs, SDL projects and the three new dams be drawn from?

Answer

This is a matter for the Minister for Agriculture and Western New South Wales.

Questions from Mr Justin Field MLC

November 2020 ICAC report into water management

In regards to the November 2020 report by ICAC into water management:

182. On page 12 of the transcript, the Minister suggested that 5 recommendations in the ICAC report have been completed. For each of the recommendations the Minister indicated is complete,

please indicate how each of those recommendations have been implemented and when they were considered implemented?

Answer

Recommendation 3

The following changes to the Water Sharing Plan for the Barwon-Darling Unregulated Water Source commenced when the plan was amended from 1 July 2020:

- Individual daily extraction components (IDECs) (previously referred to as IDELs) were implemented as of 1 July 2020, including trade restrictions. The Total Daily Extraction Limits (TDELS) are the sum of IDECs in the Barwon-Darling system
- Following an independent review by the NRC, A-class cease-to-pump thresholds were changed on 1 July 2020 based on the most up to date scientific information contained in the Long-Term Water Plan and expert opinion. A consistent approach was applied throughout the Barwon-Darling water source
- The imminent flow rule was removed from the Barwon-Darling water sharing plan on 1 July 2020
- Resumption of flow rule was introduced on 1 July 2020 to protect first-flush events in the Barwon-Darling after extended dry periods, informed by modelling and expert opinion. It was first triggered in January 2021.
- Active management was introduced on 1 December 2020 to protect water that has been purchased for the environment (Held Environmental Water) in the Barwon-Darling, lower Macquarie, and lower Gwydir (noting that normal operation of our regulated rivers already protects this water in upstream regulated river water sources).

Recommendation 4

DPIE Water has a dedicated Water Planning Implementation Team. Approval to establish the team was gained in December 2019, and recruitment was finalised over 2020.

Recommendation 6

Audits of water sharing plans under s. 44 of the Water Management Act 2000 are up to date.

The function of conducting audits under s. 44 has been transferred to the independent Natural Resources Commission through amendments to the Act in 2018, so that these audits are done at arm's length to the department.

Recommendation 11

The Water Group works closely and collaboratively with the Environment, Energy and Science (EES) Group within the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. This is formalised through a series of forums at various levels:

- The DPIE Leadership Team, chaired by the Secretary, reviews all major cluster policy issues, and endorses all submissions to Cluster Ministers Committee and Cabinet.
- Regional Water Senior Officers Group (RWSOG) is a senior executive level interagency committee that includes EES. All key water policy and plan development, reviews and amendments are managed through the RWSOG. This includes proposed amendments to water sharing plans as part of statutory reviews and remakes prior to and after public consultation. Minor amendments to water sharing plans that are made outside the statutory review cycle also include consultation with EES and concurrence from the Minister for Energy and Environment.
- EES is part of Ministerial Council and Basin Officials Committee pre/de briefs.
- EES is part of the inter-agency Critical Water Technical Advisory Group that meets fortnightly.

- EES is a part of the water sharing plan development governance structure including representations on Water Science and Regional working groups at officer level, coastal and inland planning and policy working groups at manager level and the RWSOG at the senior executive level.
- EES is a member of the Regional Water Strategies governance and technical committees, including at the Cluster leadership level.
- There is an Environmental Objectives Monitoring working group that has met through all stages of water resource plan development that combines EES, DPI Fisheries and Water Group's approach to ecological monitoring.
- EES is a joint member of the NSW Modelling and Monitoring Hub which makes formal communication, information sharing and improvement initiatives in water modelling, monitoring and data.
- A regulatory issues working group has representatives from EES, NRAR, WaterNSW and Water Group that meets fortnightly to work through any regulatory/implementation issues that arise from implementation of the water sharing plans and other statutory instruments.

Recommendation 12

One action from the Water Reform Action Plan released in December 2017 was to “Build capability, improve standards and embed an ethical culture” and this included a commitment to “roll out department-wide ethics and professional standards training” within the former Department of Industry. This action was completed, and implementation of actions under the Water Reform Action Plan was independently reviewed.

DPIE released its Code of Ethics and Conduct in March 2020 which includes information management requirements. In addition the following mandatory actions are required by staff:

- completion of the online Code of Ethics and Conduct training which addresses records management
- submission of an annual declaration within the DPIE's Ethics Portal setting out they have read and understood their obligations under the Code of Ethics and Conduct.

In December 2020, DPIE's Records and Information Management Policy was approved. This policy is supported by mandatory online training on core records and information management obligations for Water Group staff, and continuing to improve guidance to staff of records and information management practices.

183. In regards to Recommendation 11, relating to establishing communication protocols with EES, will the Minister provide a copy of those protocols?

Answer

See response to question 182 above.

184. In regards to recommendation 3, will the Minister list how each recommendation from the Natural Resources Commission's recommendations have been implemented and when they were implemented

Answer

Recommendation 3 of the ICAC report has been implemented in full. See response to question 182.

185. What process will the Minister use to ensure that the application of the NSW Government Floodplain Management Policy, especially any regulations required to implement the licencing of floodplain harvesting, will comply with Section 5 of the NSW Water Management Act 2000.

Answer

The department manages floodplains through the development of two distinct statutory plans; Floodplain Management Plans, that manage flood flow connectivity and protect cultural and environmental assets on the floodplain, and Water Sharing Plans, that manage the sharing of water between all consumptive uses and the environment. Both these Plans contain objectives that relate directly to section 5 of the Water Management Act 2000, strategies aimed at achieving the objectives, and performance indicators that may be used to assess the success of the strategies in achieving the objectives. Under section 44 of the Water Management Act 2000, the Natural Resources Commission must audit these plans within their first 5 years, to ascertain whether their provisions (including those objectives and strategies, based on the performance indicators) are being given effect to. Advice of the Natural Resources Commission is then considered when remaking those plans.

Water Management Act hierarchy of water sharing

186. In regards to the advice received on the application of the water sharing hierarchy contained in section 5 of the Water Management Act 2000, referred to on page 21 of the transcript, please confirm:

- a) Who provided this advice?
- b) When was this advice provided?
- c) Has any advice been sought by the Crown Solicitor? If not, will such advice be sought?
- d) Will any legal advice be made available to the Committee?

Answer

- a) The General Counsel of the Department.
- b) At various times during in 2020 and 2021.
- c) Yes.
- d) The advice was provided verbally to Dr Bentley.

Floodplain harvesting - peer reviewed figures

187. A Sydney Morning Herald article found at: <https://www.smh.com.au/environment/sustainability/world-of-hurt-toxic-blooms-take-over-lower-darling-river-as-dam-debate-ramps-up-20210225-p575r7.html> included the following quote from a spokesperson from the Minister for Water:

“The NSW government is in the process of releasing peer-reviewed figures on floodplain harvesting”.

- a) What are these peer-reviewed figures?
- b) Who peer-reviewed them?
- c) When will they be released?

Answer

- a) Modelling undertaken as part of the NSW Floodplain Harvesting Policy produces results that show updated estimates on the legal limits of take, estimates of the current levels of diversions, draft entitlement figures, anticipated environmental outcomes and anticipated downstream effects.
- b) The independent peer review is undertaken by Tony Weber and Greg Claydon. See answer to question 153 for information on their qualifications.
- c) Draft figures have been released on the DPIE website for the Border Rivers, Gwydir and Macquarie valleys. It is anticipated that draft figures for the Barwon-Darling and Namoi valleys will be released in April 2021.

Floodplain harvesting - exemption

188. Regarding the Draft Water Management (General) Amendment (Exemption for Rainfall Run-off Collection) Regulation 2020:

- a) Is there an estimate of annual (or similar reporting period) water take that the Regulation will allow?
 - i. If so, please provide
 - ii. If not, is there an intention for this to be measured?
 - iii. If not, what is the government doing to ensure this exemption does not allow excessive water take
- b) What prevents non-rainfall run-off being collected in the irrigation field and counted as rainfall run-off?
- c) What is the justification for this exemption, considering that 10% harvestable rights are allowed?

Answer

- a) i) estimates of these volumes are published on the Department's website for the Border Rivers and Gwydir valleys. Estimates for Macquarie, Namoi and Barwon-Darling valleys will be published over the next couple of months. There are no estimates outside of the northern Basin at this stage.
- ii) Not applicable
- iii) Interception activities, such as retaining rainfall runoff on properties, are required under the Basin Plan to be accounted for, and if growth occurs in these activities other forms of take will need to be controlled to ensure compliance with Sustainable Diversion Limits.
- b) It is an offence under the WMA 2000 to take water that is not taken pursuant to a basic right, licence or licence exemption.
- c) Contrary to the misleading advice being provided by Horne Legal, the 10% harvestable rights allowance for the central and eastern divisions is limited to establishing an in-stream dam on a first or second order dam. It does not cover rainfall runoff on a property, which is why the regulation is proposed to ensure farmers do not face the double-jeopardy situation between having to have all take licenced while preventing any runoff under pollution rules.

Healthy Floodplains Committee

189. In regards to the functions of the Healthy Floodplains Committee:

- a) What is the Committee approving or reviewing? I.e. is the Committee considering floodplain harvesting licence applications?
- b) What is the justification behind the confidentiality arrangements with the Committee?
- c) Are meeting minutes, with attendees and decisions, made public?
 - i. If not, why not?

Answer

a) The committee does not make determinations. Its functions are to:

- analyse issues raised by individual floodplain harvesting registrants in respect of preliminary determinations of the department concerning floodplain harvesting eligibility and proposed floodplain harvesting entitlements
- provide advice and make recommendations to the Director, Healthy Floodplains Project, Department of Planning, Industry and Environment – Water regarding resolution of such issues.

b) The Healthy Floodplains Project has collected comprehensive data from floodplain harvesting registrants concerning the operations of their irrigation farms that is commercially sensitive. This information has been provided on the basis that it remains confidential and will only be used for determining the eligibility of the individual registrants and the ensuing authorisation of eligible floodplain harvesting works and calculation of draft floodplain harvesting entitlements. Hence the need for confidentiality agreements.

c) Minutes are kept in accordance with normal meeting procedures, including attendances and decisions. Minutes are not made public.

i) Minutes are not made public because of the confidential nature of the matters discussed (see answer to (b) above).

Floodplain harvesting - Gwydir and general rules

190. Why is DPIE claiming there is no power under the Water Management Act 2000 that allows for the announcement of access to floodplain harvesting events when there are proposed rules in the Gwydir Regulated Water Sharing Plan and the Gwydir Unregulated Water Sharing Plan to provide protection for actively managed overbank flows?

a) Why can't similar rules to those for supplementary access in the Gwydir Regulated Water Sharing Plan be implemented for floodplain harvesting access that recognise flow targets listed in Schedule 1?

Answer

Section 70 of the Water Management Act 2000 provides the power for a water sharing plan to have provisions or rules that specify the circumstances in which the taking of water pursuant to supplementary water access licences is authorised. This power only extends to the taking of water under a supplementary water access licence, and these licences are only in regulated rivers.

The rules specified in three unregulated river water sharing plans aimed at protecting actively managed water are implemented through a Ministerial notice or announcement. These rules are currently proposed to be applied to floodplain harvesting licences where the actively managed water is present on the floodplain.

It is important that any access rule is designed to achieve an intended and measurable outcome. Until the models have been improved to represent the return of water from the floodplain into a river or creek, there is no plausible way to assess whether a restriction of floodplain harvesting would contribute to achieving an intended outcome (such as flow targets).

191. Why is DPIE-Water tying return flows to consideration of end of system targets when considering floodplain harvesting access rules?

Answer

It is important that any access rules are designed to achieve an intended and measurable outcome. Until the models have been improved to represent the return of water from the floodplain into a river or creek, there is no plausible way to assess whether a restriction of floodplain harvesting would contribute to achieving an intended downstream outcome.

192. How is the proposed implementation of floodplain harvesting access rules meeting the objectives of the Water Management Act 2000?

Answer

The rules specified in three unregulated river water sharing plans aimed at protecting actively managed water are implemented through a Ministerial notice or announcement. Similar rules are currently proposed to be applied to floodplain harvesting licences where the actively managed water is present on the floodplain. These rules, applied to floodplain harvesting, promote the principles specified under section 5 (2) and (3) of the Water Management Act 2000 as they relate to the protection of the environment and sharing of water.

193. How is the Gwydir Floodplain Management Plan being implemented in regard to structures hindering high flood flow connectivity?

Answer

Floodplain management plans specify rules and assessment criteria for the granting of approvals for structures, known as flood works, located on a floodplain. These rules apply to existing or proposed flood works and are intended to maintain flood flow connectivity. If an existing unapproved flood work does not comply with the rules or assessment criteria, the Natural Resources Access Regulator may take compliance action. This action may involve the modification or removal of the flood work to ensure that flood flow connectivity is maintained.

194. How does the Floodplain Management Plan interact with eligibility criteria of floodplain structures to be licenced for floodplain harvesting in the Gwydir?

Answer

Structures used for floodplain harvesting are considered to be water supply works and subsequently require a water supply work approval. These approvals are being issued as part of implementing the

NSW Floodplain Harvesting Policy. In some instances, these structures are also considered to be flood works and subsequently require a flood work approval. Where a structure is considered to be both a water supply work for floodplain harvesting and a flood work, and does not have a flood work approval, the department will not be issuing a water supply work approval for floodplain harvesting until a flood work approval has been granted. This means that the structure cannot be used for floodplain harvesting until the flood work approval has been granted.

195. If 94% of properties in the regulated Gwydir have structures to be licenced for floodplain harvesting within zone A & zone D of the Floodplain Management Plan, how will the Gwydir Floodplain Management Plan protect sensitive areas and high flood flow connectivity on the floodplain?

Answer

The works used for floodplain harvesting and located in management zones A or D will either not impede flood flow connectivity or, if they do impede flood flow connectivity, require a flood work approval. If the latter applies, the rules and assessment criteria specified in the floodplain management plan will apply. These rules are intended to maintain flood flow connectivity and protect cultural and environmental areas.

196. What process is being undertaken by NRAR to remove unapproved structures from the floodplain?

Answer

Works that are unauthorised will need to be either licensed, decommissioned or made exempt. Some works may have to be altered so they can be authorised.

197. Why is DPIE-Water favouring a 5 year accounting period for floodplain harvesting when there are adequate methods available to manage growth in use?

Answer

A five year accounting approach provides better environmental outcomes. It is seen as a precautionary approach that considers the highly variable nature of floodplain harvesting compared to other forms of water take. As well as minimising the risk of growth in use to occur, a 5-year accounting framework delivers restrictions in moderate and small flood events. In contrast, annual accounting will only deliver restrictions during the wettest periods. It is the restrictions during the small and moderate flood events that deliver the most significant environmental benefits.

198. Why is modelling used to demonstrate growth in use of floodplain harvesting through the installation of new works (as outlined on p 29 Gwydir Community Report - DPIE, Feb 2021. Gwydir floodplain harvesting in water sharing plans. Report to assist community consultation) when the proposed rules for the Gwydir Regulated Water Source and Gwydir Unregulated Water Source prevent new works from being installed or modified for increased take in zones A or D of the Gwydir Floodplain Management Plan.

Answer

The assumption that growth in use could occur in floodplain harvesting through the installation of new works is based on the location of those works outside management zones A or D. While the

occurrence of management zone A or management zone D are common throughout the floodplain, they are not extensive. Hence, it is reasonable that new works can be constructed to take water from the floodplain, which may result in a growth in use. Any growth which leads to the cap being exceeded will require another form of take being limited in some form to ensure cap compliance.

199. What is the modelling outcome under model growth Test B when full allocation is available once every 5 years rather than every year, as reported in Table 12 p 29 Gwydir Community Report?

Answer

The intent of the scenarios provided in Appendix 1 of the Gwydir Community Report is to demonstrate the differences between annual, 3-year and 5-year accounting. A basic assumption in these scenarios is the crediting of allocation each year.

Under water sharing plans, allocations are credited to water allocation accounts every year. It is not possible within this framework to credit allocation every five years.

200. Why is only the 5 year accounting framework used in the model to assess environmental outcomes in the Gwydir?

Answer

The models used to determine floodplain harvesting licence entitlement have been developed using a 5-year accounting framework. This model is used to assess changes in the water present on the floodplain before and after floodplain harvesting is licenced. This assessment demonstrates the predicted environmental outcomes associated with licencing floodplain harvesting. We have examined the hydrological changes with shorter accounting periods and these results indicate less significant environmental improvements than 5 year accounting. This is because 5 year accounting results in more restrictions during moderate and small flood events than shorter accounting periods, and it is the restrictions during these small and moderate flood events that generate the most significant environmental benefits.

Natural Resource Commission review of Peel Valley Water Sharing Plan

201. Has the Government provided a response to the Natural Resource Commission's review of Peel Valley Water Sharing Plan completed in May 2020?

a) If so, is this public and will it be made public?

Answer

The Minister provided a response to the NRC in February 2021 on its review of the Coffs Harbour, Hunter, Lower North Coast Central Coast and Peel WSPs.

a) The response has not been published on the NRC website. Publication is at the discretion of the NRC.

202. Did the Peel Valley Water Sharing Plan submitted to the Murray Darling Basin Authority incorporate the findings of the NRC review?

a) If so, which recommendations and which clauses were adjusted as a result?

b) If not, how will the recommendations be implemented in the water sharing plan?

Answer

Partially.

a) The NRC review of the Peel Valley water sharing plan identified four immediate recommendations (3, 10, 11 and 19) to be undertaken before the water sharing plan was amended in June 2020. The details are:

Recommendation 3 - By 1 July 2020, include an enabling provision to bring the Peel Regulated River Water Source LTAAEL assessment process in line with other NSW Murray-Darling Basin water sharing plans by removing the 10-year rolling average comparison from the LTAAEL assessment measures.

Recommendation 10 - By 1 July 2020, recognise the need to align environmental water provisions in the Water Sharing Plan for the Peel Regulated River Water Source 2020 and Water Sharing Plan for the Namoi and Peel Unregulated River Water Sources 2012 with the recently finalised Namoi Long Term Water Plan. Include amendment provisions in these plans that enable alignment to occur and set a timeframe for alignment by 1 July 2022.

Recommendation 11 - By 1 July 2020: a) update the draft Water Sharing Plan for the Peel Regulated River Water Source 2020 to include an amendment clause that allows for changes to planned environmental water provisions (for example, based on environmental water requirements in the Namoi Long Term Water Plan or potential for carryover of the ECA).

There was a further recommendation related to the WSP and two recommendations related to the Namoi Regional Water Strategy to be completed by 1 July 2022.

Recommendation 19 - By 1 July 2020, ensure relevant settings are cross-referenced in the water sharing plans and there is ongoing monitoring of these connected water sources to determine if provisions to provide for and protect connectivity are effective.

Recommendations 3, 10 and 11 were acted upon through the inclusion of amendment clauses in the amended Water Sharing Plan for the Peel Regulated River Water Source 2010 (clause 99). Recommendation 19 was undertaken before the plan was amended on 30 June 2020.

The other 24 NRC recommendations will be addressed as part of the review of the water sharing plan before it is remade on 1 July 2022. This is the usual course of action undertaken by the Department in response to NRC reviews.

b) The immediate recommendations were implemented on 1 July 2020 in the amended Water Sharing Plan for the Peel Regulated River Water Source 2010. The other recommendations will be considered and acted upon before the water sharing plan is remade in 2022.

Water resource plan development process

In regards to the water resource plan development process as required under the Basin Plan:

203. Please provide a list or table of water resource plans and water sharing plans that have been submitted to the Murray Darling Basin Authority?

a) Which water sharing plans received concurrence from the Environment Minister?

Answer

WRP	Associated WSPs
Barwon Darling surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the Barwon Darling Unregulated Rivers Water Source 2012
Darling Alluvium	Water Sharing Plan for the Darling Alluvial Water Sources 2020
Gwydir Alluvium	Water Sharing Plan for the Gwydir Alluvial Water Sources 2020
Gwydir surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the Gwydir Regulated River Water Sources 2020 (draft) Water Sharing Plan for the Gwydir Unregulated River Water Sources 2012
Intersecting Streams surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the Intersecting Streams Unregulated River Water Sources 2011
Lachlan Alluvium	Water Sharing Plan for the Lachlan Alluvial Water Sources 2020
Lachlan surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the Lachlan Regulated River Water Sources 2020 (draft) Water Sharing Plan for the Lachlan Unregulated River Water Sources 2012 Water Sharing Plan for the Belubula Regulated River Water Source 2012
Macquarie - Castlereagh groundwater	Water Sharing Plan for the Macquarie Castlereagh Groundwater Sources 2020
Macquarie Castlereagh surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the Macquarie and Cudgegong Regulated Rivers Water Source 2020 (draft) Water Sharing Plan for the Macquarie and Bogan Unregulated River Water Sources 2012 Water Sharing Plan for the Castlereagh Unregulated River Water Sources 2011
Murray Alluvium	Water Sharing Plan for the Murray Alluvial Water Sources 2020
NSW Murray and Lower Darling surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Murray and Lower Darling Regulated Rivers Water Sources 2020 (draft) Water Sharing Plan for the Murray Unregulated River Water Sources 2011 Water Sharing Plan for the Lower Murray Darling Unregulated River Water Sources 2011
Murrumbidgee Alluvium	Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Alluvial Water Sources 2020
Murrumbidgee surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Regulated River Water Source 2020 (draft) Water Sharing Plan for the Murrumbidgee Unregulated River Water Sources 2012

NSW Border Rivers surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Border Rivers Regulated River Water Source 2020 (draft) Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Border Rivers Unregulated River Water Sources 2012
NSW Border Rivers Alluvial	Water Sharing Plan for the NSW Border Rivers Alluvial Water Sources 2020
NSW MDB Fractured Rock groundwater	Water Sharing Plan for the NSW MDB Fracture Rock Groundwater Sources 2020
NSW Great Artesian Basin Shallow groundwater	Water Sharing Plan for the NSW GAB Shallow Groundwater Sources 2020
NSW MBD Porous Rock groundwater	Water Sharing Plan for the NSW MDB Porous Rock Groundwater Sources 2020
Namoi surface water	Water Sharing Plan for the Upper Namoi and Lower Namoi Regulated River Water Sources 2020 (draft) Water Sharing Plan for the Namoi and Peel Unregulated Rivers Water Sources 2012 Water Sharing Plan for the Peel Regulated River Water Source 2020 (draft)
Namoi Alluvium	Water Sharing Plan for the Namoi Alluvial Water Sources 2020

a) NSW was not required to seek concurrence from the Minister for the Environment for the submission of the NSW draft water resource plans and associated draft water sharing plans to the Murray Darling Basin Authority for accreditation assessment. Concurrence from the Minister for the Environment is only required prior to water sharing plans being 'made' under the NSW Water Management Act 2000.

204. Which plans (water resource or water sharing) have been sent back by the Murray Darling Basin Authority

a) For each plan returned what was the reason for the Murray Darling Basin Authority?

Answer

The Department has received formal notification in relation to three WRPs (Lachlan surface water, Namoi surface water and Namoi Alluvial). The MBDA has advised that it would not recommend that the Commonwealth Minister accredit the plans as submitted. This is not unusual. The MDBA has had issues with most if not all WRPs initially submitted by all jurisdictions. This iterative process is normal and expected.

205. What is the justification for introducing, after exhibition, in several regulated water sharing plans the new clause on underuse (see for example clause 76 of the draft Gwydir Regulated River Water Source 2020 submitted to the Murray Darling Basin Authority)?

Answer

A number of changes were made to the publicly exhibited water sharing plans as a result of feedback from the public exhibition process.

206. What is the justification for the change, after exhibition, to the definition of Planned Environmental Water in several regulated water sharing plans (see for example clause 15 of the draft draft Gwydir Regulated River Water Source 2020 submitted to the Murray Darling Basin Authority)?

a) Was advice sought from EES on this change before submission?

b) If so, what was that advice?

Answer

A number of changes were made to the publicly exhibited water sharing plans as a result of feedback from the public exhibition process.

Macquarie Re-regulating Weir

207. How will the proposed Macquarie River Reregulating Storage impact on the 5 GL flow target at Marebone Weir that triggers supplementary flow access through rules in the Water Sharing Plan for the Macquarie-Cudgegong Regulated River?

Answer

Assessments to date have determined that there will be no change or impact on the 5 GL flow target at Marebone Weir that triggers supplementary flow access through rules in the Water Sharing Plan for the Macquarie-Cudgegong Regulated River. The river operations and flow management upstream and downstream of the re-regulating storage, should it be constructed, will not fundamentally change.

208. How will capture of rainfall rejections in the proposed Macquarie River Reregulating Storage change flow access for downstream unregulated irrigators?

Answer

WaterNSW in consultation with DPIE Water is continuing hydrological assessments of the flow changes and access in the lower parts of the Macquarie system. Assessments to date have determined that for all climate scenarios there will be minimal change to the flow regime as a result of the re-regulating storage. WaterNSW has committed to stakeholders in the lower Macquarie that consultation will continue to present the findings of assessments, including potential impacts, and work with stakeholders to identify how any changes can be mitigated or addressed.

209. How will capture of rainfall rejection in the proposed Macquarie River Reregulating Storage impact on water availability at Warren Weir?

Answer

There will be no change to water availability at Warren Weir. The river operations and flow management upstream and downstream of the re-regulating storage, should it be constructed, will not fundamentally change.

210. Why are the water debiting rules in the Macquarie Valley so complex?

Answer

Water management and interpretation of policy and plans is a complex area. Where appropriate, WaterNSW consults on operational policies and procedures with customers – including environmental customers. The Macquarie Cudgegong Customer Service Committee developed the rules and recommended the implementation of water order debiting in May 2012.

Water debiting rules in the Macquarie Valley are succinctly explained in this document – https://www.waternsw.com.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/122685/Water-order-debiting_rev3.pdf

211. How has the issue of water debiting been considered in regard to the volumes of rainfall rejections provided in Hansard Question and Answer 1835?

Answer

The primary objectives of the re-regulating storage are to improve long term water security in the Macquarie Valley, and improving water delivery efficiency and reliability with resilience to climatic conditions.

WaterNSW analysis has determined that water order debiting as a single option will not deliver on these objectives, and the assumption that this would be the case is ill-informed.

212. Why is a new highly expensive, publicly funded instream structure with multiple dis-benefits to downstream users being considered when improved water order debiting would provide the same level of improved reliability to general security licences?

Answer

WaterNSW is working with the NSW Government, Federal Government, customers and stakeholders to determine the final cost and most appropriate funding model for the project as part of the Final Business Case development.

213. Has the business case for the proposed Macquarie River Reregulating Storage been finalised?

Answer

The Final Business Case will be finalised in late 2021.

214. Will the commitment in the draft Macquarie Regional Water Strategy that funding will only be allocated to the business case be maintained?

Answer

Any final investment decision to progress with the project will be made by the NSW Government once the business case and relevant environmental approvals are finalised.

215. What is the annual average volume of water orders supplied to customers from tributary inflows to the Macquarie River that replace filling orders from Burrendong Dam releases?

Answer

River operations and flow management upstream and downstream of the proposed re-regulating storage, should it be constructed, will not change.

HOUSING AND PROPERTY SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

Land claims

1. On the current numbers there is a more than 110-year waitlist for Aboriginal Land Claims – can you advise what additional resources you are allocating in the next 10 years to manage this situation?

ANSWER:

Over the last year, staff employed in processing Aboriginal Land Claims in the Department has increased from 8 to 21 full-time staff members. These staffing changes have enabled the Department to process more claims over the last year than ever before.

2. Have you sought legal advice on the implications of this delay which amounts to a constructive denial of these claims?

ANSWER:

No

3. Where in the process is the delay or bottleneck for this?

ANSWER:

It is a statutory process that is followed to determine a claim, requiring a high degree of due diligence.

Parts of the statutory process are outside the control of Crown Lands, including:

- Obtaining evidence from externally referenced parties/stakeholders (LGA's, other Agencies, tenure holders and infrastructure providers). All information is supplied voluntarily. The time taken for parties to respond is outside the Department's control.
- The Aboriginal Land Rights Act, 1983 provides Aboriginal Land Councils with the legislated right to lodge claims without limits. There is no limit on the number of new claims that can be lodged in any given period.

4. If it is in the assessment stage, how many staff members currently work in this area?

ANSWER:

Refer to answer in question 3.

5. How has this changed over the last 10 years?

ANSWER:

Refer to answer in question 1.

6. How is this anticipated to change in the next 3 years?

ANSWER:

Last year more Aboriginal Land Claims were determined than ever before. We remain committed to improving wherever possible.

7. What are the stages each claim goes through?

ANSWER:

The assessment of each Aboriginal Land Claim goes through a number of steps which can change depending if granted land requires a survey.

- Initial status and triage of new claims when lodged.
- Initial assessment to determine the need for external referencing.
- Referencing to internal and external stakeholders identified in the initial assessment.
- Review of material supplied by referenced parties. If evidence is sufficient, then it progresses. If not, further enquiries are made with the referenced party to ensure all evidence has been gathered.
- An assessment brief. This step commences at the beginning but can only be completed once all evidence has been submitted.
- Assessment brief processed through internal review and submitted for determination.
- Determination of claims which are refused progress through a 4-month appeals period. Granted claims which do not require survey progress to transfer.
- Determined claims which require survey are progressed for transfer once the survey has been completed.

8. How many are currently at each stage indicated by you?

ANSWER:

As at 1 March 2021, 677 claims were under active assessment and 98 claims in the determination stage.

Bondi beach club

9. Are you aware of the proposal for a “beach club on Bondi Beach” known as the “Amalfi Beach Club”?

ANSWER:

This is a matter for the Minister for Planning and Public Places.

10. Can you advise what protections are in place to ensure Crown Lands are protected from developments like this that seek to privatise public spaces?

ANSWER:

The protections in place include:

- Any permitted use of a reserve needs to be aligned with the reserve purpose. For example, Bondi Beach is dedicated for public recreation.
- To provide a long-term tenure, a council would need to prepare a Plan of Management (PoM) under either the Crown Land Management Act 2016 (CLMA) or Local

Government Act 1993 for the reserve, and it would need to expressly provide for the proposal.

- Plans of management include mandatory community consultation in their development.
- The relevant Minister could refuse to endorse a Plan of Management that seeks to allow such a proposal.
- The relevant Minister could vary a council's Crown Land Manager appointment instrument under section 3.9 of the CLMA to regulate the reserve/proposal.
- The relevant Minister could make a Crown land management rule (where consistent with the CLMA) under section 3.15(5)(i) that could provide for
public access to, and the use (including by the Aboriginal people of the State) of, dedicated or reserved Crown land.
- The proposed development must be permissible within the relevant zone under the relevant Local Environment Plan (LEP).
- Where development consent is required for such a proposal, the relevant Minister could refuse to provide landowners consent to enable lodgement of a development application under Clause 49 Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000.

Summer Night Walks

11. How much was paid to Tim Ross, Julia Baird and Kurt Furnley to appear in, and in Ross's case possibly to produce the Summer Night Walks videos?

Answer:

This is a matter for the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.

Crown Reserve Improvement Fund

14. Please provide the names and position titles of the people who sit on any panel/committee involved in decision making regarding the allocation of Crown Land Improvement Funds.

ANSWER:

The composition of the 2020-21 Crown Reserves Improvement Fund Assessment Committee (CRIFAC) was:

- Jonathan Wheaton, Executive Director, Regional Programs, Department of Regional NSW (Independent Chair)
- Hugh Phemister, Executive Director, Reform and Engagement, Crown Lands
- Claudia Huertas, Executive Director, Customer & Systems, Crown Lands
- Kylee Warner, A/Director, Strategy, Crown Lands

15. In relation to the Crown Reserve Improvement Fund and subsequent funds, can you please advise:

- a) How many applications were submitted; and,
- b) How many applications were successful?

ANSWER:

- a) 1,047 applications were received in the 2020-21 CRIF funding round.
- b) 705 applications were successful in the 2020-21 CRIF funding round

16. Of the applications received for Crown Reserve Improvement Fund that were unsuccessful, what reasons were applicants given as to why they were not successful for a grant?

ANSWER:

Successful projects are determined by available funds in the program. Applicants are welcomed to contact the Department to seek further detailed feedback on their application.

Crown Land Grants

17. What is the selection criteria when applying for the following:

- a) Showgrounds Stimulus Funding Program – Phase 1A Funding
- b) Showgrounds Stimulus Funding Program – Phase 1B Funding
- c) Showgrounds Stimulus Funding Program – Phase 2 Funding
- d) Crown Reserve Improvement Fund

ANSWER:

The selection criteria for all phases of the Showground Stimulus Funding Program is the same and is publicly available.

The selection criteria for the Crown Reserve Improvement Fund is publicly available in the 2020-21 CRIF Information.

Native Title Claim Management

18. What is the budget within Crown Lands for managing Native Title claims?

ANSWER:

In accordance with Premier's Memorandum M2011-18 'Native Title and Indigenous Land Use Agreements', the NSW Attorney General has responsibility for managing native title claims in New South Wales and has been nominated as the State Minister responsible for native title under the Commonwealth's Native Title Act 1993.

At the Departmental level, native title claims in NSW are managed by the Native Title team in the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE).

Swansea Channel dredging

19. Is Lake Macquarie as a whole or in part a watercourse vested in the Crown for the purposes of the Crown Lands Management Act?

20. Why is the dredging of Swansea Channel not a programmed, consistent maintenance activity?

21. On what basis has the contract for dredging services been awarded to a Queensland based contractor?
22. Was a public tender process undertaken each time a contract has been let to Sandpiper Dredging in the past ten years?
23. Who is the person responsible for managing these contracts on behalf of Government?
a) What is their position title?
24. Does the Acting Principal Environment Officer or the Environment Officer within the Coastal Infrastructure Unit of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment have any involvement in the awarding of contracts for dredging works?
25. Are contracts in the vicinity of \$250,000 - \$300,000 subject to a probity process or a competitive tender?
26. When the aggregate value of contracts let to one contractor exceed a certain threshold is there a further probity process or tender process undertaken?
27. How many contracts have been let to Sandpiper Dredging by the Department since 2011?
28. What is the aggregate value of those contracts?
29. Please list the Financial Year and value of each contract.
30. Where else apart from Swansea Channel has Sandpiper Dredging undertaken works for the Department?
31. Have all of these contracts been approved or awarded by the same person within the Department?
32. Does the Department have any capacity to undertake these works internally or without recourse to an external service provider?

Answer:

Questions 19 – 32 are a matter for the Minister for Transport and Roads.

Social Housing in the Swansea Electorate

40. How much did the Government spend on property maintenance for social housing properties located in the Swansea electorate during the:
 - a) 2018/2019 financial year?
 - b) 2019/2020 financial year?
 - c) 2020/2021 financial year?

Answer:

- (a) 2018/19 - \$1,895,085.80
- (b) 2019/20 - \$2,246,350.11

(c) 2020/21 - data is not available until the release of the audited financial statements

41. How much did the Government spend on property maintenance for social housing properties located in NN02 Lake Macquarie/ East allocation zone during the:
- a) 2018/2019 financial year?
 - b) 2019/2020 financial year?
 - c) 2020/2021 financial year?

Answer:

- (a) 2018/19 - \$7,132,962.67
- (b) 2019/20 - \$11,390,923.83
- (c) 2020/21 - Data is not available until the release of the audited financial statements

42. How much did the Government spend on property maintenance for social housing properties located in the NN20 Wyong allocation zone during the:
- a) 2018/2029 financial year?
 - b) 2019/2020 financial year?
 - c) 2020/2021 financial year?

Answer:

- (a) 2018/19 - \$5,845,696.71
- (b) 2019/20 - \$6,964,715.40
- (c) 2020/21 - Data is not available until the release of the audited financial statements

Waterloo

43. During the budget estimates hearing Mr Michael Cassel made mention that Land and Housing Corporation has spent \$20 million so far on the Waterloo proposal with Sydney City Council. To Quote "But I am sure you can appreciate that to this point in time we have spent over \$20 million on this proposal, it still sits before council and I have stopped a lot of work moving forward on those types of detailed things until we can get some type of clarity on what the project will look like.
- a) Please provide a breakdown of this 20 million?
 - b) How much has been spent on contractors who have been outsourced?
 - c) Is this 20 million inclusive of LAHC employee wages?
 - d) If not, how much additional expense is from LAHC employee wages connected to the Waterloo proposal?
 - e) What is the estimated delay on the Waterloo project?
 - f) What is the current status of the LAHC preferred masterplan for the Waterloo public housing redevelopment?

- g) What percentage pf public housing will be specifically affordable Aboriginal Housing in the Waterloo redevelopment?

Answer:

(a)

Waterloo Project Costs

<u>Category</u>	<u>Vendor Name</u>	<u>PO Description</u>	<u>Total \$</u>
Internal Labour	Permanent		126,179
Internal Labour Total			126,179
External Cost to LAHC	URBAN GROWTH NSW DEVELOPMENT C	Waterloo Development Management Services	8,295,704
	TSA MANAGEMENT PTY LTD	Development Services	2,079,738
	KATHY JONES & ASSOCIATES PTY.	Project Director, Comm's, Masterplanning	2,017,833
	INFRASTRUCTURE NSW	Gateway Reviews	1,138,873
	THELEM CONSULTING PTY LTD	Project Director	950,400
	Family & Community Services	FACS Tenant Resources	804,048
	NICHOLAS TURNER PTY. LIMITED	Architectural and Design Services	766,563
	COUNTERPOINT COMMUNITY SERVICE	Aboriginal Community Development Services	573,281
	INNERSYDNEY REGIONAL COUNCIL	Aboriginal Liaison Services	563,385
	ELTON CONSULTING GROUP PTY LTD	Sustainability Services	205,915
	ETHOS URBAN PTY LTD	Planning advice	187,272
	CINETEL PRODUCTIONS PTY LIMITE	Historic Study Services	150,567
	City of Sydney	Council Application Fee	146,000
	ERNST & YOUNG	Business Case Review	135,281
	The Trustee for JUMBANA TRUST	Aboriginal consultation	122,645
	KINESIS PTY LTD	Sustainability Benchmarking	88,529
	The trustee for IPG Services T	Office Fit Out	67,496
	AECOM AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Environmental Studies	60,955
	CARDNO (NSW/ACT) PTY LTD	Visual Impact Study	56,810

DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES PTY LTD	Feasibility Concepts	49,599
THE TRUSTEE FOR FORMOSA FAMILY	Human Services Consultation	49,399
JOEL SPENCER DESIGN PTY LTD	Marketing Services	43,272
BLUE BALANCE PTY LIMITED T/A	Printing and distribution	41,308
HILL PDA	Affordability Housing Feasibility	39,401
SLR Consulting Australia Pty L	Noise, Light Spill, Air Quality Assessments	38,200
JACOBS GROUP (AUSTRALIA) PTYL	Transport Study	35,550
Y G AND PARTNERS PTY LTD	Display Suite	26,829
GHD PTYLTD	Social Sustainability Model	26,192
MBMPL PTYLTD	Quantity Surveying Services	25,400
WINDTECH CONSULTANTS PTY LTD	Wind Study	25,110
Agency Contractor	External Labour Services	22,848
I.D. CONSULTING PTYLTD	Population & Employment Profile	20,000
DESIGN DAVEY PTY LIMITED	Brochures	19,253
miscellaneous	Various	19,119
KWIK KOPY FIVE DOCK	Printing Services	18,992
MACROPLAN HOLDINGS PTY LTD	Retail Study	17,250
URBIS PTY LTD	Heritage Services	17,050
SAPIO Pty Ltd	Security & Access Control Services	14,951
Entire Installations (Aust) Pt	Audio-visual refurbishment - community event	14,573
STRATEGIC AIRSPACE PTY LTD	Air Traffic Study	13,750
THE TRUSTEE FOR DINCER DEVELOP	Waterloo Connect Refurb	12,650
CLAYTON UTZ	Consultants agreements - legal services	11,667
ORIGIN ENERGY ELECTRICITY LTD	Electricity Services	11,565
WATTS OFFICE FURNITURE MANUFAC	Waterloo Connect - Office Refurbishment	11,380
PATTI'S HIRE SERVICE PTY LTD	Community Event	11,161
ARTERRA DESIGN PTYLTD	Urban Forest Study	9,860
The Trustee for Seymour Family	Positioning of Waterloo Estate	8,750
deziGNIT Pty Limited	Graphic Design services	8,400
IMPRESSIVE PRINT SOLUTIONS	Newsletters & Printing	8,168
CONNECT CONSULTING	Human Services Plan	7,832

All Suburbs Pty Ltd	Catering for community event	7,546
Susan Milne	Art & Cultural Plan	6,840
Biri Biri Catering Pty Ltd	Catering	5,818
ECO LOGICAL AUSTRALIA PTY LTD.	Flora & Fauna Study	5,400
ERM POWER RETAILS PTY LTD	Electricity Supply	4,681
MASTERPRINT PTY LTD	Newsletters	4,543
NATIONAL CENTRE OF INDIGENOUS	Aboriginal performers	4,400
TAYLOR THOMSON WHITTING (NSW)	Quantity Surveying Services	3,900
ENTIRE INSTALLATIONS (AUST) PTY LTD	TV Installations	3,333
SALTY DINGO PTY LTD	Photography Services	3,036
AREA SAFE PRODUCTS PTY LTD	Replacement Suggestion boxes	2,706
COMPLETE OFFICE SUPPLIES PTYL	Stationery and Supplies - complete	2,636
LENOVO (AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND) P/	Waterloo Connect IT Equipment	2,218
AJP HOLDINGS PTY LTD	Waterloo Connect Christmas BBQ	2,212
PROJECT SURVEYORS	Sketch Plans	1,830
RAY DAWE PROOFREADING PTY LTD	Proofreading Visioning Report	1,650
NORMAN BOOKER	Facilitator - Waterloo NGO	1,400
AGL SALES PTY LIMITED	Electricity Supplies	1,128
ALL GRADUATES INTERPRETING	Waterloo History Prjt Russian translation	879
COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMISSION OF	Cultural language session - translation	808
JAMES PHOTOGRAPHIC SERVICES	NAB Open Day BBQ photographer	770
H & Y BLINDS	Supply and install 4 roller blinds	630
WINC AUSTRALIA PTY LIMITED	stationery and supplies	530
GT REMOVALS	Wellington St Shop	520
OFFICEMAX AUSTRALIA LIMITED	Stationery	466
BUSFLEET AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Waterloo Site Tour	440
CLOWN BALLOONS AUSTRALIA PTYL	Waterloo Connect Balloons	401

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND	envelopes	294
flick-anticimex Pty Ltd	Pest control for Waterloo Connect	220
GRACE JONES	Translation Services - Waterloo Connect	200
NATALIA KONYUSHINA	Cultural language session	200
TERRALINKS GROUP PTY LTD	Survey Drawing Amendments- Waterloo	150
ACER COMPUTER AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	IT Equipment	88
WILARD PTY LTD	Stationery and Supplies - complete	76
BUNZL OUTSOURCING SERVICES	stationery and supplies	25
External Cost Total		19,162,747
Grand Total		19,288,926

(b) \$22, 848

(c) Yes, \$126,179

(d) N/A

(e) The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment has recently called in this project and we are hopeful there will be no more unnecessary delays.

(f) The Waterloo South Planning Proposal is currently with the City of Sydney. The remaining precincts, Waterloo Central and North are subject to future planning proposals which will be developed once there is planning certainty for Waterloo South.

(g) LAHC commits to no net loss in dwellings occupied by Aboriginal tenants in Waterloo South following redevelopment.

LAHC maintenance expenses

44. Last year it was estimated \$430 million would be spent on maintenance on social housing. How much has been spent this year on Maintenance?

a) How much is forecast for planned maintenance?

b) How much is forecast on responsive maintenance?

c) How much is forecast on programmed maintenance?

Answer:

Maintenance expenditure for the current financial year is not available until release of the audited financial statements.

- a) The budget for recurrent planned maintenance in 20/21FY is \$179.2 million
- b) The budget for responsive maintenance in 20/21FY is \$126.5 million
- c) The budget for planned works and capital improvements in 20/21FY is \$196.4 million

45. The NSW Government allocation of \$200 million stimulus for maintenance works, of which LAHC received \$160 million please provide a breakdown of maintenance expense allocation for each LGA of NSW?

Answer:

Expenditure cannot be provided by local government area until the program is complete.

Vacant properties

46. What is the allocation of money spent from the maintenance budget has been spent on vacant restoration of LAHC properties in NSW 2020 to current?
- a) How many LAHC properties have been vacant for a period of 12 months and over since 2019?
 - b) Please provide information with regard to the vacant properties located in Manix Street Warwick Farm. Number 5,7,9,11 and 13 Manix Street Warwick Farm.
 - i. How long have these properties been vacant?
 - ii. What is the future plan for the site?
 - iii. Has the land been sold?
 - iv. If so, how much money was received in exchange of the site?
 - v. If sold, how will the money be reinvested into the area of Warwick Farm?

Answer:

From 1 July 2021 to 28 February 2021, LAHC has spent \$39,473,643 on vacant restoration works.

- For the 2019/20 period, LAHC has had three properties intended for reletting that remained vacant more than 365 days due to:

(b)

i. Properties at 11 and 13 Mannix Parade, Warwick Farm were vacated in November 2018. Properties at 5, 7 and 9 Mannix Parade were vacated in 2017.

ii. 43 new social housing apartments are proposed for construction at 11 and 13 Mannix Parade, Warwick Farm, LAHC is currently exploring future opportunities to reuse the 5,7 and 9 Mannix Parade properties.

iii, iv and v. No sales have occurred.

Social Housing Property Sales

47. For each financial year please provide the combined dollar value of all state-owned social housing properties or land sold by the Government to overseas purchasers?
- a) 2011-2012?
 - b) 2012-2013?
 - c) 2013-2014?
 - d) 2014-2015?
 - e) 2015-2016?
 - f) 2016-2017?
 - g) 2017-2018?
 - h) 2018-2019?
 - i) 2019-2020?
 - j) 2020-2021 (to current)?

Answer:

The New South Wales Land and Housing Corporation's property disposal reports from 2011-12 to 2020-21 do not contain information about the nationalities of purchasers.

48. Please provide the number of social housing properties managed by both LAHC and community housing providers in each LGA for NSW for each financial year from 2011-2012 to 2020 to current?
- a) 2011-2012?
 - b) 2012-2013?
 - c) 2013-2014?
 - d) 2014-2015?
 - e) 2015-2016?
 - f) 2016-2017?
 - g) 2017-2018?
 - h) 2018-2019?

i) 2019-2020?

j) 2020-2021 (to current)?

Answer:

(a)

FY11-12	FY11-12	FY11-12	FY11-12
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	925	76	1001
ARMIDALE-DUMARESQ	342	90	432
ASHFIELD	192	140	332
AUBURN	839	120	959
BALLINA	553	105	658
BALRANALD		14	14
BANKSTOWN	6018	718	6736
BATHURST	606	104	710
BAULKHAM HILLS	372	21	393
BEGA VALLEY	303	75	378
BELLINGEN	99	15	114
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	9059	585	9644
BLAND	33		33
BLAYNEY	60		60
BLUE MOUNTAINS	55	522	577
BOGAN	50		50
BOMBALA		16	16
BOOROWA	4	3	7
BOTANY BAY	1675	153	1828
BOURKE	47		47
BREWARRINA	17	1	18
BROKEN HILL		109	109
BURWOOD	350	23	373
BYRON	22	242	264
CABONNE	28	8	36
CAMDEN	377	8	385
CAMPBELLTOWN	6047	316	6363
CANADA BAY	705	154	859
CANTERBURY	2928	450	3378
CENTRAL DARLING		1	1
CESSNOCK	665	51	716
CLARENCE VALLEY	323	139	462
COBAR	82		82
COFFS HARBOUR	928	255	1183
COOLAMON	3	4	7
COOMA-MONARO	2	125	127

COONAMBLE	55		55
COOTAMUNDRA	189		189
COROWA	41	3	44
COWRA	227		227
DENILIKUIN		150	150
DUBBO	775	50	825
DUNGO	25	8	33
EUROBODALLA	331	79	410
FAIRFIELD	4423	592	5015
FORBES	204	1	205
GILGANDRA	40	5	45
GLEN INNES	1	86	87
GLOUCESTER	36	1	37
GOSFORD	2053	370	2423
GOULBURN MULWAREE	623	20	643
GREAT LAKES	231	63	294
GREATER HUME	6	11	17
GREATER TAREE	476	129	605
GRIFFITH	313	39	352
GUNDAGAI	36		36
GUNNEDAH	7	159	166
GUYRA	10	3	13
GWYDIR		3	3
HARDEN		20	20
HAWKESBURY	259	647	906
HAY	34		34
HOLROYD	2307	384	2691
HORNSBY	635	141	776
HUNTERS HILL	344	27	371
HURSTVILLE	1232	107	1339
INVERELL	164	21	185
JERILDERIE		6	6
JUNEE	72		72
KEMPSEY	215	148	363
KIAMA	9	58	67
KOGARAH	213	44	257
KU-RING-GAI	34	1	35
KYOGLE	27		27
LACHLAN	63	1	64
LAKE MACQUARIE	3336	408	3744
LANE COVE	228	32	260
LEETON	167	6	173
LEICHHARDT	1118	146	1264
LISMORE	533	160	693
LITHGOW	516	10	526
LIVERPOOL	4687	487	5174
LIVERPOOL PLAINS	29	1	30
LOCKHART	3	7	10

MAITLAND	1370	70	1440
MANLY	292	34	326
MARRICKVILLE	810	360	1170
MID-WESTERN			
REGIONAL	44	288	332
MOREE PLAINS	228	28	256
MOSMAN	53	17	70
MURRAY		9	9
MURRUMBIDGEE	5		5
MUSWELLBROOK	27	416	443
NAMBUCCA	254	21	275
NARRABRI	162	21	183
NARRANDERA	52		52
NARROMINE	87		87
NEWCASTLE	3921	481	4402
NORTH SYDNEY	521	45	566
OBERON	30		30
ORANGE	899	195	1094
PALERANG	13		13
PARKES	285	5	290
PARRAMATTA	5120	650	5770
PENRITH	2575	475	3050
PITTWATER	2		2
PORT MACQUARIE-			
HASTINGS	861	240	1101
PORT STEPHENS	815	77	892
QUEANBEYAN	596	94	690
RANDWICK	3781	353	4134
RICHMOND VALLEY	216	102	318
ROCKDALE	805	128	933
RYDE	1486	206	1692
SHELLHARBOUR	1699	148	1847
SHOALHAVEN	953	550	1503
SINGLETON	405	2	407
SNOWY RIVER		10	10
STRATHFIELD	500	69	569
SUTHERLAND	1766	364	2130
SYDNEY CITY	8616	508	9124
TAMWORTH	740	174	914
TEMORA	61	4	65
TENTERFIELD		49	49
TUMBARUMBA	14		14
TUMUT	202	11	213
TWEED	877	229	1106
UPPER HUNTER		139	139
UPPER LACHLAN		22	22
URALLA	9	3	12
URANA		3	3

WAGGA WAGGA	1187	127	1314
WALCHA	22	2	24
WALGETT	41	6	47
WARREN	30		30
WARRINGAH	942	111	1053
WARRUMBUNGLE	56	4	60
WAVERLEY	453	55	508
WEDDIN	18		18
WELLINGTON	98	8	106
WENTWORTH		16	16
WILLOUGHBY	417	28	445
WINGECARRIBEE	6	448	454
WOLLONDILLY	5	152	157
WOLLONGONG	6403	455	6858
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77
WYONG	1571	475	2046
YASS VALLEY	3	89	92
YOUNG	5	156	161

From 2011-12 to 2016-17 there are minor timing differences between LAHC's tenancy management system and LAHC's financial system.

(b)

FY12-13	FY12-13	FY12-13	FY12-13
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	921	76	997
ARMIDALE-DUMARESQ	341	90	431
ASHFIELD	192	142	334
AUBURN	837	120	957
BALLINA	552	105	657
BALRANALD		14	14
BANKSTOWN	5924	740	6664
BATHURST	606	104	710
BAULKHAM HILLS	372	21	393
BEGA VALLEY	301	75	376
BELLINGEN	99	15	114
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	8921	584	9505
BLAND	32		32
BLAYNEY	60		60
BLUE MOUNTAINS	54	523	577
BOGAN	50		50

BOMBALA		16	16
BOOROWA	4	3	7
BOTANY BAY	1666	153	1819
BOURKE	45		45
BREWARRINA	13	1	14
BROKEN HILL		109	109
BURWOOD	350	23	373
BYRON	23	242	265
CABONNE	28	8	36
CAMDEN	381	8	389
CAMPBELLTOWN	5915	334	6249
CANADA BAY	701	154	855
CANTERBURY	2845	455	3300
CESSNOCK	659	51	710
CLARENCE VALLEY	318	139	457
COBAR	82		82
COFFS HARBOUR	937	255	1192
COOLAMON	3	4	7
COOMA-MONARO	2	125	127
COONAMBLE	41		41
COOTAMUNDRA	189		189
COROWA	41	3	44
COWRA	226		226
DENILQUIN		150	150
DUBBO	767	50	817
DUNGOG	25	8	33
EUROBODALLA	329	79	408
FAIRFIELD	4426	596	5022
FORBES	203	1	204
GILGANDRA	40	5	45
GLEN INNES	1	84	85
GLOUCESTER	35	1	36
GOSFORD	2010	396	2406
GOULBURN MULWAREE	606	19	625
GREAT LAKES	192	63	255
GREATER HUME	4	11	15
GREATER TAREE	453	129	582
GRIFFITH	310	39	349
GUNDAGAI	36		36
GUNNEDAH	7	159	166
GUYRA	10	3	13
GWYDIR		3	3
HARDEN		18	18
HAWKESBURY	256	646	902
HAY	33		33
HOLROYD	2294	384	2678
HORNSBY	644	142	786
HUNTERS HILL	344	27	371

HURSTVILLE	1216	112	1328
INVERELL	164	21	185
JERILDERIE		6	6
JUNEE	72		72
KEMPSEY	210	148	358
KIAMA	9	58	67
KOGARAH	212	44	256
KU-RING-GAI	29	1	30
KYOGLE	26		26
LACHLAN	63	1	64
LAKE MACQUARIE	3290	421	3711
LANE COVE	223	32	255
LEETON	162	6	168
LEICHHARDT	1118	146	1264
LISMORE	527	156	683
LITHGOW	515	10	525
LIVERPOOL	4686	503	5189
LIVERPOOL PLAINS	28	1	29
LOCKHART	3	7	10
MAITLAND	1350	70	1420
MANLY	290	35	325
MARRICKVILLE	809	360	1169
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	44	287	331
MOREE PLAINS	221	28	249
MOSMAN	53	17	70
MURRAY		9	9
MURRUMBIDGEE	5		5
MUSWELLBROOK	25	415	440
NAMBUCCA	253	21	274
NARRABRI	161	21	182
NARRANDERA	48		48
NARROMINE	86		86
NEWCASTLE	3906	482	4388
NORTH SYDNEY	521	45	566
OBERON	30		30
ORANGE	822	238	1060
PALERANG	12		12
PARKES	282	5	287
PARRAMATTA	5045	707	5752
PENRITH	2537	476	3013
PITTWATER	2		2
PORT MACQUARIE-			
HASTINGS	829	240	1069
PORT STEPHENS	801	77	878
QUEANBEYAN	600	94	694
RANDWICK	3775	353	4128
RICHMOND VALLEY	206	102	308
ROCKDALE	797	129	926

RYDE	1481	206	1687
SHELLHARBOUR	1695	148	1843
SHOALHAVEN	908	578	1486
SINGLETON	398	8	406
SNOWY RIVER		10	10
STRATHFIELD	498	69	567
SUTHERLAND	1753	364	2117
SYDNEY CITY	8583	508	9091
TAMWORTH	721	143	864
TEMORA	61	4	65
TENTERFIELD		49	49
TUMBARUMBA	14		14
TUMUT	199	10	209
TWEED	875	237	1112
UPPER HUNTER		139	139
UPPER LACHLAN		22	22
URALLA	9	3	12
URANA		3	3
WAGGA WAGGA	1162	127	1289
WALCHA	22	2	24
WALGETT	41	6	47
WARREN	30		30
WARRINGAH	942	111	1053
WARRUMBUNGLE	55	4	59
WAVERLEY	453	55	508
WEDDIN	18		18
WELLINGTON	97	8	105
WENTWORTH		16	16
WILLOUGHBY	413	28	441
WINGECARRIBEE	6	448	454
WOLLONDILLY	5	152	157
WOLLONGONG	6349	485	6834
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77
WYONG	1554	475	2029
YASS VALLEY	3	89	92
YOUNG	5	156	161

From 2011-12 to 2016-17 there are minor timing differences between LAHC's tenancy management system and LAHC's financial system.

(c)

FY13-14	FY13-14	FY13-14	FY13-14
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	897	53	950

ARMIDALE-DUMARESQ	335	35	370
ASHFIELD	178	143	321
AUBURN	835	115	950
BALLINA	549	80	629
BALRANALD		14	14
BANKSTOWN	5893	726	6619
BATHURST	597	46	643
BAULKHAM HILLS	372	21	393
BEGA VALLEY	297	75	372
BELLINGEN	99	15	114
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	8881	532	9413
BLAND	32		32
BLAYNEY	60		60
BLUE MOUNTAINS	51	523	574
BOGAN	49		49
BOMBALA		16	16
BOOROWA	4	3	7
BOTANY BAY	1661	153	1814
BOURKE	45		45
BREWARRINA	12	5	17
BROKEN HILL		109	109
BURWOOD	350	29	379
BYRON	22	230	252
CABONNE	28	6	34
CAMDEN	382	8	390
CAMPBELLTOWN	5837	292	6129
CANADA BAY	701	153	854
CANTERBURY	2730	549	3279
CESSNOCK	658	51	709
CLARENCE VALLEY	310	134	444
COBAR	78	6	84
COFFS HARBOUR	933	263	1196
COOLAMON	3	4	7
COOMA-MONARO	2	123	125
COONAMBLE	40		40
COOTAMUNDRA	186		186
COROWA	39	3	42
COWRA	223		223
DENILIQUIN		150	150
DUBBO	742	50	792
DUNGO	25	8	33
EUROBODALLA	326	79	405
FAIRFIELD	4389	532	4921
FORBES	202	1	203
GILGANDRA	40	7	47
GLEN INNES	1	83	84
GLOUCESTER	35	1	36

GOSFORD	2014	417	2431
GOULBURN MULWAREE	601	19	620
GREAT LAKES	198	63	261
GREATER HUME	4	15	19
GREATER TAREE	446	129	575
GRIFFITH	304	39	343
GUNDAGAI	36		36
GUNNEDAH	7	165	172
GUYRA	10	3	13
GWYDIR		3	3
HARDEN		18	18
HAWKESBURY	255	646	901
HAY	30		30
HOLROYD	2305	376	2681
HORNSBY	643	142	785
HUNTERS HILL	344	4	348
HURSTVILLE	1219	110	1329
INVERELL	164	21	185
JERILDERIE		12	12
JUNEE	71		71
KEMPSEY	200	149	349
KIAMA	9	58	67
KOGARAH	200	46	246
KU-RING-GAI	19	1	20
KYOGLE	26		26
LACHLAN	61	1	62
LAKE MACQUARIE	3245	422	3667
LANE COVE	221	32	253
LEETON	158	6	164
LEICHHARDT	1032	204	1236
LISMORE	518	121	639
LITHGOW	515	10	525
LIVERPOOL	4627	451	5078
LIVERPOOL PLAINS	27	7	34
LOCKHART	3	7	10
MAITLAND	1345	70	1415
MANLY	288	35	323
MARRICKVILLE	807	360	1167
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	42	251	293
MOREE PLAINS	213	28	241
MOSMAN	53	17	70
MURRAY		9	9
MURRUMBIDGEE	4		4
MUSWELLBROOK	24	415	439
NAMBUCCA	253	21	274
NARRABRI	161	20	181
NARRANDERA	46		46
NARROMINE	84		84

NEWCASTLE	3874	484	4358
NORTH SYDNEY	521	45	566
OBERON	27		27
ORANGE	807	46	853
PALERANG	11		11
PARKES	278	5	283
PARRAMATTA	5007	604	5611
PENRITH	2495	511	3006
PITTWATER	1		1
PORT MACQUARIE-HASTINGS	839	244	1083
PORT STEPHENS	800	77	877
QUEANBEYAN	590	97	687
RANDWICK	3776	340	4116
RICHMOND VALLEY	203	65	268
ROCKDALE	809	108	917
RYDE	1481	163	1644
SHELLHARBOUR	1686	148	1834
SHOALHAVEN	899	578	1477
SINGLETON	392	9	401
SNOWY RIVER		10	10
STRATHFIELD	489	45	534
SUTHERLAND	1746	352	2098
SYDNEY CITY	8623	508	9131
TAMWORTH	718	72	790
TEMORA	60	4	64
TENTERFIELD		49	49
TUMBARUMBA	14		14
TUMUT	191	10	201
TWEED	874	191	1065
UPPER HUNTER		139	139
UPPER LACHLAN		22	22
URALLA	9	3	12
URANA		3	3
WAGGA WAGGA	1142	69	1211
WALCHA	22	2	24
WALGETT	40	6	46
WARREN	28		28
WARRINGAH	938	134	1072
WARRUMBUNGLE	54	4	58
WAVERLEY	458	63	521
WEDDIN	18		18
WELLINGTON	95	8	103
WENTWORTH		16	16
WILLOUGHBY	422	28	450
WINGECARRIBEE	6	448	454
WOLLONDILLY	6	152	158
WOLLONGONG	6314	493	6807
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77

WYONG	1551	475	2026
YASS VALLEY	3	89	92
YOUNG	5	156	161

From 2011-12 to 2016-17 there are minor timing differences between LAHC's tenancy management system and LAHC's financial system.

(c)

FY14-15	FY14-15	FY14-15	FY14-15
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	897	53	950
ARMIDALE-DUMARESQ	335	35	370
ASHFIELD	178	143	321
AUBURN	835	115	950
BALLINA	547	80	627
BALRANALD		14	14
BANKSTOWN	5906	620	6526
BATHURST	597	46	643
BAULKHAM HILLS	372	21	393
BEGA VALLEY	297	75	372
BELLINGEN	94	15	109
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	8877	413	9290
BLAND	32		32
BLAYNEY	59		59
BLUE MOUNTAINS	51	491	542
BOGAN	48		48
BOMBALA		16	16
BOOROWA	4	3	7
BOTANY BAY	1659	153	1812
BOURKE	43		43
BREWARRINA	11	5	16
BROKEN HILL		109	109
BURWOOD	350	29	379
BYRON	23	228	251
CABONNE	28	6	34
CAMDEN	357	8	365
CAMPBELLTOWN	5928	291	6219
CANADA BAY	700	153	853
CANTERBURY	2716	563	3279
CESSNOCK	667	23	690

CLARENCE VALLEY	310	134	444
COBAR	76	6	82
COFFS HARBOUR	933	265	1198
COOLAMON	3	3	6
COOMA-MONARO	2	123	125
COONAMBLE	39		39
COOTAMUNDRA	186		186
COROWA	39	3	42
COWRA	222		222
DENILQUIN		150	150
DUBBO	713	48	761
DUNGO	25	8	33
EUROBODALLA	326	33	359
FAIRFIELD	3695	1238	4933
FORBES	202	1	203
GILGANDRA	40	7	47
GLEN INNES	1	83	84
GLOUCESTER	35	1	36
GOSFORD	2043	291	2334
GOULBURN MULWAREE	601	13	614
GREAT LAKES	198	63	261
GREATER HUME	4	15	19
GREATER TAREE	445	96	541
GRIFFITH	307	39	346
GUNDAGAI	36		36
GUNNDAH	7	165	172
GUYRA	10	3	13
GWYDIR		3	3
HARDEN		18	18
HAWKESBURY	255	646	901
HAY	30		30
HOLROYD	2302	376	2678
HORNSBY	642	76	718
HUNTERS HILL	344	4	348
HURSTVILLE	1234	120	1354
INVERELL	164	21	185
JERILDERIE		12	12
JUNEE	71		71
KEMPSEY	200	141	341
KIAMA	9	58	67
KOGARAH	200	46	246
KU-RING-GAI	19	1	20
KYOGLE	26		26
LACHLAN	59	1	60
LAKE MACQUARIE	3229	232	3461
LANE COVE	221	32	253
LEETON	158	6	164
LEICHHARDT	1032	204	1236

LISMORE	485	121	606
LITHGOW	515	10	525
LIVERPOOL	4621	426	5047
LIVERPOOL PLAINS	26	7	33
LOCKHART	3	7	10
MAITLAND	1342	51	1393
MANLY	286	35	321
MARRICKVILLE	807	360	1167
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	43	250	293
MOREE PLAINS	213	28	241
MOSMAN	53	17	70
MURRAY		9	9
MURRUMBIDGEE	4		4
MUSWELLBROOK	24	349	373
NAMBUCCA	253	21	274
NARRABRI	160	20	180
NARRANDERA	46		46
NARROMINE	84		84
NEWCASTLE	3865	490	4355
NORTH SYDNEY	521	45	566
OBERON	27		27
ORANGE	803	46	849
PALERANG	11		11
PARKES	276	5	281
PARRAMATTA	5012	619	5631
PENRITH	2516	353	2869
PITTWATER	1		1
PORT MACQUARIE- HASTINGS	838	175	1013
PORT STEPHENS	800	69	869
QUEANBEYAN	589	64	653
RANDWICK	3776	340	4116
RICHMOND VALLEY	203	65	268
ROCKDALE	809	108	917
RYDE	1487	154	1641
SHELLHARBOUR	1678	148	1826
SHOALHAVEN	899	500	1399
SINGLETON	392	2	394
SNOWY RIVER		10	10
STRATHFIELD	499	65	564
SUTHERLAND	1748	352	2100
SYDNEY CITY	8590	516	9106
TAMWORTH	717	72	789
TEMORA	60	4	64
TENTERFIELD		49	49
TUMBARUMBA	14		14
TUMUT	191	10	201
TWEED	874	191	1065

UPPER HUNTER		133	133
UPPER LACHLAN		22	22
URALLA	9	3	12
URANA		3	3
WAGGA WAGGA	1139	69	1208
WALCHA	22	2	24
WALGETT	39	6	45
WARREN	28		28
WARRINGAH	937	130	1067
WARRUMBUNGLE	53	4	57
WAVERLEY	458	63	521
WEDDIN	18		18
WELLINGTON	95	8	103
WENTWORTH		16	16
WILLOUGHBY	422	28	450
WINGECARRIBEE	6	448	454
WOLLONDILLY	6	129	135
WOLLONGONG	6313	493	6806
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77
WYONG	1551	391	1942
YASS VALLEY	3	89	92
YOUNG	5	156	161

From 2011-12 to 2016-17 there are minor timing differences between LAHC's tenancy management system and LAHC's financial system.

(e)

FY15-16	FY15-16	FY15-16	FY15-16
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	898	53	951
ARMIDALE-DUMARESQ	348	35	383
ASHFIELD	177	143	320
AUBURN	830	115	945
BALLINA	548	80	628
BALRANALD		14	14
BANKSTOWN	5916	620	6536
BATHURST	605	46	651
BAULKHAM HILLS	369	21	390
BEGA VALLEY	297	75	372
BELLINGEN	94	15	109
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	8886	378	9264
BLAND	32		32
BLAYNEY	59		59

BLUE MOUNTAINS	51	491	542
BOGAN	47		47
BOMBALA		16	16
BOOROWA	4	3	7
BOTANY BAY	1658	154	1812
BOURKE	42		42
BREWARRINA	11	5	16
BROKEN HILL		109	109
BURWOOD	350	29	379
BYRON	23	228	251
CABONNE	29	5	34
CAMDEN	357	8	365
CAMPBELLTOWN	5930	296	6226
CANADA BAY	706	161	867
CANTERBURY	2703	563	3266
CESSNOCK	668	23	691
CLARENCE VALLEY	308	134	442
COBAR	76	6	82
COFFSHARBOUR	935	265	1200
COOLAMON	3		3
COOMA-MONARO	2	123	125
COONAMBLE	39		39
COOTAMUNDRA	186		186
COROWA	39	3	42
COWRA	222		222
DENILIKUIN		150	150
DUBBO	709	48	757
DUNOG	25	8	33
EUROBODALLA	326	33	359
FAIRFIELD	3697	1237	4934
FORBES	201	1	202
GILGANDRA	39	7	46
GLEN INNES	1	84	85
GLOUCESTER	35	1	36
GOSFORD	2043	291	2334
GOULBURN MULWAREE	606	13	619
GREAT LAKES	198	63	261
GREATER HUME	4	15	19
GREATER TAREE	442	96	538
GRIFFITH	306	39	345
GUNDAGAI	35		35
GUNNEDAH	7	165	172
GUYRA	10		10
GWYDIR		3	3
HARDEN		18	18
HAWKESBURY	255	646	901
HAY	30		30
HOLROYD	2298	375	2673

HORNSBY	641	76	717
HUNTERS HILL	344	4	348
HURSTVILLE	1355	120	1475
INVERELL	164	21	185
JERILDERIE		12	12
JUNEE	71		71
KEMPSEY	199	145	344
KIAMA	9	58	67
KOGARAH	200	46	246
KU-RING-GAI	18	1	19
KYOGLE	26		26
LACHLAN	59	1	60
LAKE MACQUARIE	3216	232	3448
LANE COVE	219	32	251
LEETON	158	6	164
LEICHHARDT	1031	204	1235
LISMORE	485	121	606
LITHGOW	514	10	524
LIVERPOOL	4678	439	5117
LIVERPOOL PLAINS	26	7	33
LOCKHART	3	7	10
MAITLAND	1356	51	1407
MANLY	285	35	320
MARRICKVILLE	804	360	1164
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	42	254	296
MOREE PLAINS	213	34	247
MOSMAN	53	17	70
MURRAY		9	9
MURRUMBIDGEE	4		4
MUSWELLBROOK	24	349	373
NAMBUCCA	253	21	274
NARRABRI	160	20	180
NARRANDERA	46		46
NARROMINE	84		84
NEWCASTLE	3861	490	4351
NORTH SYDNEY	521	45	566
OBERON	27		27
ORANGE	808	46	854
PALERANG	11		11
PARKES	276	5	281
PARRAMATTA	4987	468	5455
PENRITH	2523	356	2879
PITTWATER	1		1
PORT MACQUARIE-			
HASTINGS	841	177	1018
PORT STEPHENS	793	69	862
QUEANBEYAN	588	64	652
RANDWICK	3773	351	4124

RICHMOND VALLEY	203	66	269
ROCKDALE	808	108	916
RYDE	1495	154	1649
SHELLHARBOUR	1695	148	1843
SHOALHAVEN	906	499	1405
SINGLETON	392	2	394
SNOWY RIVER		10	10
STRATHFIELD	504	64	568
SUTHERLAND	1754	352	2106
SYDNEY CITY	8499	401	8900
TAMWORTH	726	72	798
TEMORA	60	4	64
TENTERFIELD		45	45
TUMBARUMBA	14		14
TUMUT	191	10	201
TWEED	887	191	1078
UPPER HUNTER		133	133
UPPER LACHLAN		22	22
URALLA	9	3	12
URANA		3	3
WAGGA WAGGA	1142	69	1211
WALCHA	22	2	24
WALGETT	38	6	44
WARREN	28		28
WARRINGAH	961	130	1091
WARRUMBUNGLE	51	4	55
WAVERLEY	458	64	522
WEDDIN	18		18
WELLINGTON	93	8	101
WENTWORTH		16	16
WILLOUGHBY	422	28	450
WINGECARRIBEE	6	448	454
WOLLONDILLY	6	129	135
WOLLONGONG	6310	493	6803
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77
WYONG	1551	391	1942
YASS VALLEY	3	89	92
YOUNG	5	156	161

From 2011-12 to 2016-17 there are minor timing differences between LAHC's tenancy management system and LAHC's financial system.

(f)

FY16-17	FY16-17	FY16-17	FY16-17
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	915	53	968
ARMIDALE REGIONAL	358	41	399
ARMIDALE-DUMARESQ	7		7
BALLINA	550	80	630
BALRANALD		14	14
BANKSTOWN	8		8
BATHURST	608	46	654
BEGA VALLEY	297	77	374
BELLINGEN	94	15	109
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	8881	373	9254
BLAND	32		32
BLAYNEY	59		59
BLUE MOUNTAINS	52	491	543
BOGAN	47		47
BOTANY BAY	1658	154	1812
BOURKE	42		42
BREWARRINA	11	5	16
BROKEN HILL		109	109
BURWOOD	349	24	373
BYRON	20	229	249
CABONNE	28	5	33
CAMDEN	356	7	363
CAMPBELLTOWN	5967	294	6261
CANADA BAY	706	161	867
CANTERBURY	16		16
CANTERBURY-BANKSTOWN	8553	1156	9709
CENTRAL COAST	3573	670	4243
CESSNOCK	665	23	688
CLARENCE VALLEY	308	134	442
COBAR	76	6	82
COFFS HARBOUR	943	265	1208
COOLAMON	3		3
COONAMBLE	38		38
COWRA	222		222
CUMBERLAND	4325	582	4907
DUBBO	4		4
DUNOG	25	8	33
EDWARD RIVER		150	150
EUROBODALLA	333	33	366
FAIRFIELD	3744	1188	4932
FEDERATION	39	6	45
FORBES	201	1	202
GEORGES RIVER	1573	173	1746

GILGANDRA	39	7	46
GLEN INNES	1	84	85
GOSFORD	4		4
GOULBURN MULWAREE	625	8	633
GREAT LAKES	6		6
GREATER HUME	4	14	18
GRIFFITH	311	39	350
GUNDAGAI	221		221
GUNNEDAH	7	157	164
GWYDIR		3	3
HAWKESBURY	254	648	902
HAY	30		30
HILL TOPS	7	179	186
HORNSBY	608	68	676
HUNTERS HILL	343	4	347
HURSTVILLE	12		12
INNER WEST	2038	714	2752
INVERELL	163	21	184
JUNEE	71		71
KEMPSEY	199	145	344
KIAMA	8	59	67
KU-RING-GAI	15	1	16
KYOGLE	26		26
LACHLAN	60	1	61
LAKE MACQUARIE	3208	232	3440
LANE COVE	215	32	247
LEETON	158	6	164
LISMORE	487	121	608
LITHGOW	513	10	523
LIVERPOOL	4668	444	5112
LIVERPOOL PLAINS	26	7	33
LOCKHART	3	7	10
MAITLAND	1367	53	1420
MARRICKVILLE		6	6
MID-COAST	674	147	821
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	55	255	310
MOREE PLAINS	202	34	236
MOSMAN	41	29	70
MURRAY RIVER		5	5
MURRUMBIDGEE	4	12	16
MUSWELLBROOK	20	352	372
NAMBUCCA	253	21	274
NARRABRI	160	20	180
NARRANDERA	46		46
NARROMINE	83		83
NEWCASTLE	3857	480	4337
NORTH SYDNEY	509	45	554
NORTHERN BEACHES	1239	165	1404

OBERON	27		27
ORANGE	808	46	854
PARKES	275	5	280
PARRAMATTA	4058	388	4446
PENRITH	2549	356	2905
PORT MACQUARIE-HASTINGS	841	177	1018
PORT STEPHENS	786	69	855
QUEANBEYAN-PALERANG			
REGIONAL	599	64	663
RANDWICK	3770	354	4124
RICHMOND VALLEY	203	66	269
ROCKDALE	809	114	923
RYDE	1511	153	1664
SHELLHARBOUR	1692	96	1788
SHOALHAVEN	910	497	1407
SINGLETON	390	2	392
SNOWY MONARO REGIONAL	2	149	151
SNOWY VALLEYS	204	10	214
STRATHFIELD	491	64	555
SUTHERLAND	1768	352	2120
SYDNEY CITY	8378	401	8779
TAMWORTH	723	82	805
TEMORA	60	4	64
TENTERFIELD		45	45
THE HILLS	129	7	136
TWEED	892	192	1084
UPPER HUNTER		133	133
UPPER LACHLAN		21	21
URALLA	9	3	12
WAGGA WAGGA	1144	69	1213
WALCHA	22	2	24
WALGETT	38	6	44
WARREN	28		28
WARRINGAH		1	1
WARRUMBUNGLE	51	4	55
WAVERLEY	458	57	515
WEDDIN	18		18
WENTWORTH		16	16
WESTERN PLAINS REGIONAL	798	56	854
WILLOUGHBY	417	28	445
WINGECARRIBEE	7	448	455
WOLLONDILLY	6	129	135
WOLLONGONG	6311	391	6702
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77
WYONG	44	36	80
YASS VALLEY	3	89	92

From 2011-12 to 2016-17 there are minor timing differences between LAHC's tenancy management system and LAHC's financial system.

(g)

FY17-18	FY17-18	FY17-18	FY17-18
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	918	53	971
ARMIDALE REGIONAL	373	41	414
BALLINA	549	82	631
BALRANALD		14	14
BATHURST	614	46	660
BAYSIDE	2413	321	2734
BEGA VALLEY	296	78	374
BELLINGEN	94	15	109
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	8820	399	9219
BLAND	32		32
BLAYNEY	59		59
BLUE MOUNTAINS	15	528	543
BOGAN	47		47
BOURKE	42		42
BREWARRINA	11	5	16
BROKEN HILL		110	110
BURWOOD	348	24	372
BYRON	7	242	249
CABONNE	32	5	37
CAMDEN	379	7	386
CAMPBELLTOWN	5879	297	6176
CANADA BAY	697	161	858
CANTERBURY-BANKSTOWN	8533	1232	9765
CENTRAL COAST	3557	783	4340
CESSNOCK	662	23	685
CLARENCE VALLEY	308	134	442
COBAR	76	6	82
COFFSHARBOUR	945	270	1215
COOLAMON	3		3
COONAMBLE	38		38
COOTAMUNDRA - GUNDAGAI REGIONAL	220		220
COWRA	222		222
CUMBERLAND	4331	644	4975

DUBBO	2		2
DUBBO-REGIONAL	801	56	857
DUNGOG	25		25
EDWARD RIVER		149	149
EUROBODALLA	333	33	366
FAIRFIELD	3737	1196	4933
FEDERATION	39	6	45
FORBES	201	1	202
GEORGES RIVER	1587	173	1760
GILGANDRA	39	7	46
GLEN INNES		83	83
GOULBURN MULWAREE	638	8	646
GREATER HUME	4	14	18
GRIFFITH	306	39	345
GUNNEDAH	1	163	164
GWYDIR		3	3
HAWKESBURY	200	711	911
HAY	30		30
HILLTOPS	4	182	186
HORNSBY	606	70	676
HUNTERS HILL	343	4	347
INNER WEST	1951	802	2753
INVERELL	163	21	184
JUNEE	71		71
KEMPSEY	199	144	343
KIAMA		67	67
KU-RING-GAI	12	1	13
KYOGLE	26		26
LACHLAN	60	1	61
LAKE MACQUARIE	3190	247	3437
LANE COVE	214	32	246
LEETON	155	6	161
LISMORE	489	121	610
LITHGOW	512	10	522
LIVERPOOL	4647	463	5110
LIVERPOOL PLAINS	26	7	33
LOCKHART	3	7	10
MAITLAND	1368	53	1421
MID-COAST	680	147	827
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	14	295	309
MOREE PLAINS	195	34	229
MOSMAN	28	42	70
MURRAY RIVER		5	5
MURRUMBIDGEE	4	12	16
MUSWELLBROOK	6	366	372
NAMBUCCA	253	21	274
NARRABRI	160	21	181
NARRANDERA	44		44

NARROMINE	83		83
NEWCASTLE	3823	509	4332
NORTH SYDNEY	581	46	627
NORTHERN BEACHES	1224	178	1402
OBERON	27		27
ORANGE	823	46	869
PARKES	274	5	279
PARRAMATTA	4027	392	4419
PENRITH	2550	372	2922
PORT MACQUARIE-HASTINGS	849	177	1026
PORT STEPHENS	786	69	855
QUEANBEYAN	10		10
QUEANBEYAN-PALERANG REGIONAL	595	64	659
RANDWICK	3731	393	4124
RICHMOND VALLEY	203	65	268
RYDE	1464	162	1626
SHELLHARBOUR	1687	96	1783
SHOALHAVEN	897	490	1387
SINGLETON	385	5	390
SNOWY MONARO REGIONAL		151	151
SNOWY VALLEYS	202	10	212
STRATHFIELD	487	64	551
SUTHERLAND	1742	421	2163
SYDNEY CITY	8175	445	8620
TAMWORTH	725	82	807
TEMORA	59	4	63
TENTERFIELD		45	45
THE HILLS	129	8	137
TWEED	900	191	1091
UPPER HUNTER		133	133
UPPER LACHLAN		21	21
URALLA	9	3	12
WAGGA WAGGA	1144	69	1213
WALCHA	22	2	24
WALGETT	37	6	43
WARREN	28		28
WARRUMBUNGLE	51	4	55
WAVERLEY	458	57	515
WEDDIN	18		18
WENTWORTH		16	16
WILLOUGHBY	417	28	445
WINGECARRIBEE	3	451	454
WOLLONDILLY	3	132	135
WOLLONGONG	6294	392	6686
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77
YASS VALLEY	1	91	92

(h)

FY18-19	FY18-19	FY18-19	FY18-19
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	917	53	970
ARMIDALE REGIONAL	7	406	413
BALLINA	549	82	631
BALRANALD		14	14
BATHURST	613	46	659
BAYSIDE	2406	321	2727
BEGA VALLEY	294	78	372
BELLINGEN		109	109
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	8779	398	9177
BLAND	30		30
BLAYNEY	59		59
BLUE MOUNTAINS	15	528	543
BOGAN	47		47
BOURKE	42		42
BREWARRINA	11	5	16
BROKEN HILL		110	110
BURWOOD	344	23	367
BYRON	7	242	249
CABONNE	32	5	37
CAMDEN	379	7	386
CAMPBELLTOWN	5706	294	6000
CANADA BAY	692	161	853
CANTERBURY-BANKSTOWN	8501	1289	9790
CENTRAL COAST	3552	783	4335
CESSNOCK	4	678	682
CLARENCE VALLEY	307	134	441
COBAR	76	6	82
COFFS HARBOUR	9	1205	1214
COOLAMON	2		2
COONAMBLE	38		38
COOTAMUNDRA - GUNDAGAI REGIONAL	220		220
COWRA	222		222
CUMBERLAND	4360	644	5004
DUBBO-REGIONAL	795	56	851
DUNGOG		25	25
EDWARD RIVER		149	149
EUROBODALLA	332	33	365
FAIRFIELD	3757	1198	4955
FEDERATION	39	6	45
FORBES	201	1	202
GEORGES RIVER	1628	188	1816

GILGANDRA	39	7	46
GLEN INNES		85	85
GOULBURN MULWAREE	637	8	645
GREATER HUME	4	14	18
GRIFFITH	304	39	343
GUNNEDAH		164	164
GWYDIR		3	3
HAWKESBURY	200	711	911
HAY	29		29
HILLTOPS	4	182	186
HORNSBY	5	669	674
HUNTERS HILL		346	346
INNER WEST	1945	806	2751
INVERELL	1	182	183
JUNEE	71		71
KEMPSEY	9	333	342
KIAMA		67	67
KU-RING-GAI		13	13
KYOGLE	26		26
LACHLAN	60	1	61
LAKE MACQUARIE	3151	279	3430
LANE COVE	20	220	240
LEETON	153	6	159
LISMORE	500	121	621
LITHGOW	511	10	521
LIVERPOOL	4611	495	5106
LIVERPOOL PLAINS		33	33
LOCKHART	3	7	10
MAITLAND	1366	53	1419
MID-COAST	6	820	826
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	14	295	309
MOREE PLAINS		229	229
MOSMAN	28	42	70
MURRAY RIVER		5	5
MURRUMBIDGEE	4	12	16
MUSWELLBROOK	6	366	372
NAMBUCCA	1	273	274
NARRABRI	1	179	180
NARRANDERA	44		44
NARROMINE	82		82
NEWCASTLE	3819	523	4342
NORTH SYDNEY	1	552	553
NORTHERN BEACHES	1221	178	1399
OBERON	27		27
ORANGE	822	46	868
PARKES	274	5	279
PARRAMATTA	4031	391	4422
PENRITH	2548	372	2920

PORT MACQUARIE-HASTINGS	5	1021	1026
PORT STEPHENS	785	69	854
QUEANBEYAN-PALERANG REGIONAL	604	64	668
RANDWICK	3734	390	4124
RICHMOND VALLEY	203	65	268
RYDE	235	1391	1626
SHELLHARBOUR	1693	97	1790
SHOALHAVEN	6	1380	1386
SINGLETON		413	413
SNOWY MONARO REGIONAL		151	151
SNOWY VALLEYS	202	10	212
STRATHFIELD	486	64	550
SUTHERLAND	1738	422	2160
SYDNEY CITY	8070	467	8537
TAMWORTH	2	808	810
TEMORA	59	4	63
TENTERFIELD		45	45
THE HILLS	128	8	136
TWEED	900	191	1091
UPPER HUNTER		133	133
UPPER LACHLAN		21	21
URALLA		11	11
WAGGA WAGGA	1131	69	1200
WALCHA	2	22	24
WALGETT	37	12	49
WARREN	28		28
WARRUMBUNGLE	51	4	55
WAVERLEY	458	57	515
WEDDIN	18		18
WENTWORTH		15	15
WILLOUGHBY	39	406	445
WINGECARRIBEE	2	452	454
WOLLONDILLY	3	132	135
WOLLONGONG	6303	398	6701
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77
YASS VALLEY	1	91	92
(blank)	3		3

(i)

FY19-20	FY19-20	FY19-20	FY19-20
LGA	DCJ Managed	Community Housing	Total
ALBURY	914	53	967
ARMIDALE REGIONAL	7	399	406

BALLINA	548	82	630
BALRANALD		14	14
BATHURST	609	46	655
BAYSIDE	2405	321	2726
BEGA VALLEY	294	78	372
BELLINGEN		109	109
BERRIGAN		25	25
BLACKTOWN	8750	398	9148
BLAND	29		29
BLAYNEY	59		59
BLUE MOUNTAINS	14	528	542
BOGAN	47		47
BOURKE	41		41
BREWARRINA	11	5	16
BROKEN HILL		110	110
BURWOOD	344	23	367
BYRON	7	241	248
CABONNE	32	5	37
CAMDEN	376	7	383
CAMPBELLTOWN	5604	293	5897
CANADA BAY	692	161	853
CANTERBURY-BANKSTOWN	8511	1297	9808
CENTRAL COAST	3548	783	4331
CESSNOCK	11	675	686
CLARENCE VALLEY	311	134	445
COBAR	74	6	80
COFFS HARBOUR	7	1204	1211
COOLAMON	2		2
COONAMBLE	38		38
COOTAMUNDRA - GUNDAGAI REGIONAL	220		220
COWRA	222		222
CUMBERLAND	4347	645	4992
DUBBO-REGIONAL	789	56	845
DUNGOG		25	25
EDWARD RIVER		149	149
EUROBODALLA	330	33	363
FAIRFIELD	3705	1238	4943
FEDERATION	39	6	45
FORBES	200	1	201
GEORGES RIVER	1602	203	1805
GILGANDRA	39	7	46
GLEN INNES		85	85
GOULBURN MULWAREE	637	8	645
GREATER HUME	4	14	18
GRIFFITH	301	39	340
GUNNEDAH		165	165
GWYDIR		3	3

HAWKESBURY	196	711	907
HAY	29		29
HILLTOPS	4	182	186
HORNSBY	5	669	674
HUNTERS HILL		346	346
INNER WEST	1945	802	2747
INVERELL	1	185	186
JUNEE	71		71
KEMPSEY	4	333	337
KIAMA		67	67
KU-RING-GAI		13	13
KYOGLE	26		26
LACHLAN	68	1	69
LAKE MACQUARIE	3159	279	3438
LANE COVE	16	219	235
LEETON	151	6	157
LISMORE	494	125	619
LITHGOW	510	10	520
LIVERPOOL	4581	521	5102
LIVERPOOL PLAINS		33	33
LOCKHART	3	7	10
MAITLAND	3	1411	1414
MID-COAST	5	819	824
MID-WESTERN REGIONAL	14	295	309
MOREE PLAINS		225	225
MOSMAN		70	70
MURRAY RIVER		5	5
MURRUMBIDGEE	4	12	16
MUSWELLBROOK	6	366	372
NAMBUCCA	1	273	274
NARRABRI	1	179	180
NARRANDERA	44		44
NARROMINE	82		82
NEWCASTLE	3777	553	4330
NORTH SYDNEY		552	552
NORTHERN BEACHES	18	1377	1395
OBERON	26		26
ORANGE	812	50	862
PARKES	274	5	279
PARRAMATTA	4022	391	4413
PENRITH	2546	372	2918
PORT MACQUARIE-HASTINGS	6	1021	1027
PORT STEPHENS	3	847	850
QUEANBEYAN-PALERANG REGIONAL	600	64	664
RANDWICK	3731	390	4121
RICHMOND VALLEY	203	65	268
RYDE	27	1391	1418
SHELLHARBOUR	1680	97	1777

SHOALHAVEN	6	1376	1382
SINGLETON		413	413
SNOWY MONARO REGIONAL		151	151
SNOWY VALLEYS	197	10	207
STRATHFIELD	483	64	547
SUTHERLAND	1738	422	2160
SYDNEY CITY	8068	467	8535
TAMWORTH	2	801	803
TEMORA	56	4	60
TENTERFIELD		45	45
THE HILLS	127	8	135
TWEED	900	191	1091
UPPER HUNTER		133	133
UPPER LACHLAN		21	21
URALLA		10	10
WAGGA WAGGA	1128	69	1197
WALCHA	2	22	24
WALGETT	37	12	49
WARREN	27		27
WARRUMBUNGLE	51	4	55
WAVERLEY	458	57	515
WEDDIN	17		17
WENTWORTH		15	15
WILLOUGHBY	39	406	445
WINGECARRIBEE	2	452	454
WOLLONDILLY	3	131	134
WOLLONGONG	6258	403	6661
WOOLLAHRA	75	2	77
YASS VALLEY	1	89	90

(j) 2020-21 - this figure is not available until release of the audited financial statements.

49. Please provide the number of social housing properties (residential dwellings) for each financial year from 2011-2012 to 2020- to current?

a) 2011-2012?

b) 2012-2013?

c) 2013-2014?

d) 2014-2015?

e) 2015-2016?

- f) 2016-2017?
- g) 2017-2018?
- h) 2018-2019?
- i) 2019-2020?
- j) 2020-2021 (to current)?

Answer:

- a) 130,326
- b) 129,612
- c) 126,349
- d) 126,119
- e) 126,137
- f) 126,311
- g) 126,149
- h) 125,880
- i) 125,334
- j) This figure is not available until release of the audited financial statements.

50. Please provide the number of social housing properties (residential dwellings) sold in each financial year from 2011-2012 to 2020 – to current?

- a) 2011-2012?
- b) 2012-2013?
- c) 2013-2014?
- d) 2014-2015?
- e) 2015-2016?
- f) 2016-2017?

- g) 2017-2018?
- h) 2018-2019?
- i) 2019-2020?
- j) 2020-2021 (to current)?

Answer:

- a) 861
- b) 723
- c) 470
- d) 191
- e) 322
- f) 282
- g) 454
- h) 352
- i) 302
- j) this figure is not available until the release of the audited financial statements

LAHC Maintenance contracts and contractors

51. Please provide detailed information of how Mr Robert Weir formally of G26/48 Belvoir Street Surry Hills remained in a property for 3 years with multiple reported water leaks to maintenance?
- a) How many times did contractors attend Mr Robert Weir's property to inspect and report on the water leak from 2018?
 - b) Has Broadspectrum failed to thoroughly assess and diagnose the underlying issue over a three year period causing inhabitable conditions for Mr Robert Weir?
 - c) How many non-compliance orders have been issued to maintenance contractors each financial year since 2016 to current?

- d) Please provide information with regard to how LAHC manage and monitor contractor performance to confirm quality maintenance services are provided to standard?
- e) How are contractors paid?
- i. Are contractors paid per sight visit or property inspection or paid on completion of the job?
 - ii. Why are some social housing tenant reporting that a contractor is visiting their property on several occasions to scope the work but work is never completed?
 - iii. Is there an incentive for contractors to complete multiple inspections than necessary to maximise income or to reach KPI's?

Answer:

a) LAHC's works order history show that plumbers attended G26/48 Belvoir Street, Surry Hills, on eight occasions from 2018 until the end of the tenant's tenancy on 29 November 2020.

b) Plumbers subcontracted to Ventia (formerly Broadspectrum) had difficulty identifying the cause as the apartment is located on the ground floor of a 12-storey building. Investigations found deficiencies in the processes employed by the contractor to manage this issue. As a result, LAHC issued a non-conformance notice to Ventia. Ventia has implemented actions detailed in their Performance Improvement Plan to avoid similar occurrences. Also, one of the sub-trades involved in undertaking the works is no longer performing services for Ventia under the current contract arrangements.

c)

FY 2016/17	8,861
FY 2017/18	7,490
FY 2018/19	5,987
FY 2019/20	4,508
FY2020/21* up to Feb	3,160

d) LAHC samples risk-based compliance inspections to verify that the contractors' performance in delivering services meet the required standard. Performance Notices are issued to contractors where work is not to standard, and LAHC has requested work be rectified within a timeframe. Reinspections of defects continue until all issues are rectified. These Notices can impact the contractors' monthly performance scores through Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), with abatements applied if the specified benchmark requirements are not met. Performance scores are also reported and discussed at monthly and quarterly performance meetings between the contractor and LAHC.

e) i. Contractors are paid on completion of the job.

- ii. There are a many reasons why multiple visits may occur to scope work, and for work not being completed which includes, but is not limited to:
- multiple contractors attending site to undertake different types of work

- assessment being undertaken to determine the condition of the property, and the work being programmed for a later date
- delays in the negotiations with contractors regarding the scope and cost of work, and as a result additional attendance may be required.

There is some confusion by tenants between a technical inspection (to confirm the maintenance request from a tenant), site visit to develop a scope for maintenance works and, and the conduct of annual property condition assessments to determine the status of various components in the home. LAHC is responding to this confusion by implementing scripts for contractors to improve certainty and consistency of communication with tenants.

iii. There is no incentive for contractors to undertake more inspections than is required of them.

52. How many NSW Government properties have been transferred to community housing providers since 2016?

Answer:

There were 14,038.

53. The Inquiry into the Management of NSW Public Housing Maintenance Contracts recommendation 8. *The Committee recommend that the Department of Family and Community Services examines the current funding formula for maintenance and modifications of housing stock with a view to funding modifications separately, thereby improving service delivery arrangements for tenants with a disability.*

- Please provide detailed information of how has this recommendation been implemented?

Answer:

LAHC's funding approach to disability modifications now aligns with the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) principles as outlined below:

- LAHC provides 'Reasonable Adjustment' to meet its Disability Discrimination Act commitments - these are termed minor modifications by LAHC and are undertaken at LAHC's cost.
- Specialised home modification for tenants with complex and permanent disability are deemed 'reasonable and necessary' under the NDIS, (called major modifications by LAHC), with costs to be met/reimbursed to LAHC by the NDIS. Works commence if the property is suitable, regardless of the funding source and only if the property is considered to be long term accommodation. Major modifications for a tenant are still undertaken by LAHC without an NDIS modification support package.

Accurately estimating the funding for disability modifications is difficult as it is based on individual tenant's needs. All disability modifications work is undertaken in accordance with

LAHC's Disability Modification Policy, where public housing tenants, with an identified need for a disability modification, may apply to have their property modified. A determination may be made by LAHC that the property is not suitable for modifications and DCJ will work with the tenant to be relocated to alternative property that can accommodate the disability modifications.

Communities Plus

54. What commitment has been made under Communities Plus in terms of increasing social housing stock?
- a) How many additional social housing properties have been promised via Communities Plus?
 - b) How many properties through Communities Plus will be renewed?

Answer:

The Communities Plus \$22 billion building program plans to deliver 23,000 new and replacement social housing, 500 affordable housing dwellings and 40,000 private housing dwellings over 10 years, in partnership with the private, non-government and community housing sectors. More information is available at www.communitiesplus.com.au.

Bellambi

55. What is the future plan for Bellambi social housing estate?
- a) Are there future plans to redevelop Bellambi?
 - b) If so, how many properties will be sold?
 - c) How many properties have been sold in the past five years in Bellambi?

Answer:

(a) and (b)

At present, there are no plans to redevelop the Bellambi housing estate.

(c) One.

56. What is the total number of social housing dwellings across the state in each year from 2011 to present?
- a) How many of these in each year are owned by a community housing provider?
 - b) How many are managed in each year by a community housing provider?
 - c) How many of these in each year are managed by the Aboriginal Housing Authority?

Answer:

The number of LAHC owned residential dwellings for each financial year as follows:

2011-2012: 130,326

2012-2013: 129,612

2013-2014: 126,349

2014-2015: 126,119

2015-2016: 126,137

2016-2017: 126,311

2017-2018: 126,149

2018-2019: 125,880

2019-2020: 125,334

2020-2021: this figure is not available until the release of the audited financial statements

a) None

b)

2011-12	18,036
---------	--------

2012-13	18,279
---------	--------

2013-14	17,451
---------	--------

2014-15	16,876
---------	--------

2015-16	16,620
---------	--------

2016-17	16,417
---------	--------

2017-18	17,265
---------	--------

2018-19	27,329
---------	--------

2019-20	30,791
---------	--------

c) None

57. How many social housing dwellings across the state have been sold in each year from 2011 to present?

a) Have any of these been sold to the tenant? If so how many?

b) How many have been sold to community housing providers?

c) How much money has been raised by these sales?

Answer:

The number of LAHC owned residential dwellings sold in each financial year from 2011-12 to 2020-current as follows:

2011-2012: 868

2012-2013: 724

2013-2014: 470

2014-2015: 191

2015-2016: 322

2016-2017: 282

2017-2018: 453

2018-2019: 351

2019-2020: 302

2020-21: Data is not available until the release of the 2020-21 audited financial statements

a) Yes, 185

b) 76

c) The total gross asset sales proceeds from these sales is \$2.11 billion

58. How many new social housing dwellings (available to people on the public housing waiting list) have been constructed across the state in each year from 2011 to present?

a) How many of these have been constructed by community housing providers?

b) How many of these have been constructed by/for the Aboriginal Housing Authority?

c) How much money has been spent by the state on these constructions?

Answer:

New residential dwellings constructed

2011-12 - 1,393

2012-13 - 444

2013-14 - 385

2014-15 - 463

2015-16 - 412

2016-17 - 382

2017-18 - 657

2018-19 - 352

2019-20 - 144

Data for the 2020-21 financial year is not available until release of the audited financial statements

a) To date, six new social housing dwellings have been completed by community housing provider, Pacific Link Housing, as part of a mixed tenure project delivering a total of 21 dwellings at 537-541 Main Road, Glendale. Construction on a further 24 new social housing dwellings in the areas of Liverpool and Lane Cove North is targeted to be completed by community housing provider, Blue CHP Ltd in 2022 and 2024 respectively.

b)

	FY 11/12 \$'000	FY 12/13 \$'000	FY 13/14 \$'000	FY 14/15 \$'000	FY 15/16 \$'000	FY 16/17 \$'000	FY 17/18 \$'000	FY 18/19 \$'000	FY 19/20 \$'000	Budget FY 20/21 \$'000	Total \$'000
Construction spend	5,024	5,130	8,016	3,163	3,345	3,322	6,745	7,645	11,862	28,218	82,482

	FY 11/12 (units)	FY 12/13 (units)	FY 13/14 (units)	FY 14/15 (units)	FY 15/16 (units)	FY 16/17 (units)	FY 17/18 (units)	FY 18/19 (units)	FY 19/20 (units)	Budget FY 20/21 (units)	Total (units)
Number of units	16	14	25	10	9	10	15	19	29	73	220

Note: The AHO has grown its portfolio by about 20% over the past 10 years. Build costs reflect the remote location where at times can be 30 to 40% above Sydney prices. As a strategy to reduce long standing maintenance obligations and to ensure the properties are fit for purpose for the changing demographics of the Aboriginal Community. Examples include building very large houses for large families and also smaller houses for smaller families, seniors and single parents. Build costs will reflect the type of property being constructed. Please note that in some remote locations, there is no viable real estate market or no new housing available for acquisition. Overall, this strategy also fosters local and regional jobs in the construction industry and grows not community stock.

c) \$1.525 billion.

59. How many vacant parcels of land in public housing estates across the state have been sold in each year from 2011 to present?

a) How many have been sold to a community housing provider?

b) How many have been leased to a community housing provider?

c) How much money has been raised by these sales?

Answer:

LAHC's financial system does not distinguish land sales within or outside a public housing estate.

NSW Government Property Sales in Newcastle

111. How many government properties have been sold in the Newcastle Local Government Area since FY2011-12 to date?

Answer:

884

a) What is the total value of these sales?

Answer:

\$427,911,517

112. Can the Minister provide the addresses of all properties in the Newcastle Local Government Area sold since FY2011-12 to date?

a) I note this information has been provided to the committee in previous years.

Answer: Due to privacy reasons we are unable to provide addresses.

Newcastle Crown Lands

113. Can the Minister please provide the details of all crown land within the Newcastle Local Government Area?

- a) Please include address, DP and Lot number and reserve management details.

Answer: As at 12 March 2021 in the State electorate of Newcastle there is about 730 hectares of Crown land.

The detail requested in this question is not able to be prepared within the allocated timeframe for budget estimates responses to be submitted

Crown Lands is endeavouring to make this information public in the first half of 2021.

Land and Housing Corporation Properties in Newcastle

114. How much did Land and Housing Corporation (LAHC) receive in rent from its property portfolio 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;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

Please refer to the annual reports for the audited financial statements which contain details of total rent received in respect of financial years 2011 to 2020 inclusive. Rent information for the 2021 financial year is not available until the audited financial statements are finalised.

115. How much did LAHC spend on maintenance of its property portfolio 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;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

- (a) 2011/12 \$6,666,330.94
- (b) 2012/13 \$6,916,941.39
- (c) 2013/14 \$6,297,031.13
- (d) 2014/15 \$15,891,443.62
- (e) 2015/16 \$23,529,447.81
- (f) 2016/17 \$12,221,146.64
- (g) 2017/18 \$20,624,211.53
- (h) 2018/19 \$12,527,375.93
- (i) 2019/20 \$12,628,103.67
- (j) 2020/21 Data is not available until the release of the audited financial statements
- (k) See (j)

116. How many social housing properties located in NN07 Newcastle zone were 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;

- i) 2019;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

There are no recorded mould issues in NN07 to date.

117. 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;
- j) 2020; and
- k) 2021?
 - i. How much was each property sold for?
 - ii. What are the addresses of the properties sold?
 - iii. How many of the properties sold were studio/1bedroom, 2 bedroom, 3 bedroom, 4+ bedroom?

Answer:

- (a) 2010-11: 5
- (b) 2011-12: 7
- (c) 2012-13: 14
- (d) 2013-14: 31
- (e) 2014-15: 4
- (f) 2015-16: 4
- (g) 2016-17: 3
- (h) 2017-18: 9
- (i) 2018-19: 12
- (j) 2019-20: 7
- (k) Data is not available until release of the audited financial statements

- i. Data not available due to privacy reasons
- ii. Data not available due to privacy reasons
- iii. 24 x one bedroom; 26 x two bedroom; 42 x three bedroom and 4 x four or more bedrooms.

118. How many new social housing properties were constructed in the NN07 Newcastle zone in each of the following years:

- a) 2010-11;
- b) 2011-12;
- c) 2012-13;
- d) 2013-14;
- e) 2014-15;
- f) 2015-16;
- g) 2016-17;
- h) 2017-18;
- i) 2018-19;
- j) 2019-20;and
- k) 2020-21(YTD)?
- i. What are the addresses of these properties?
- ii. How many of these properties were studio/1bedroom, 2 bedroom, 3 bedroom, 4+ bedroom?

Answer:

- a) 41
- b) 59
- c) 28
- d) 8
- e) 0
- f) 0
- g) 0
- h) 11
- i) 22
- j) 0
- k)2020/21 - Data is not available until release of the audited financial statements
- i) Address information is not released for privacy reasons
- ii) 101 x Studio/1 bedroom; 55 x 2 bedroom; 12 x 3 bedroom and 1 x 4+ bedrooms

119. How much was spent on the construction of new social housing properties 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;
- j) 2020; and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

- a) \$14.091 million
- b) \$9.557 million
- c) \$4.172 million
- d) \$3.292 million
- e) 0
- f) 0
- g) 0
- h) \$2.592 million
- i) \$8.223 million
- j) 0
- k) Data is not available until release of the audited financial statements

120. How many maintenance requests were made 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;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

Financial Year Grand Total

- (a) 2011/2012 - 15,892
- (b) 2012/2013 - 13,723
- (c) 2013/2014 - 13,779
- (d) 2014/2015 - 15,771
- (e) 2015/2016 - 13,035
- (f) 2016/2017 - 22,510
- (g) 2017/2018 - 16,980
- (h) 2018/2019 - 15,153
- (i) 2019/2020 - 12,735
- (j) 2020/2021 Data is not available until the release of the audited financial statements.

121. How many maintenance requests were completed 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;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

Financial Year Grand Total

2011/2012 - 15,892

(a) 2012/2013 - 13,723

(b) 2013/2014 - 13,779

(c) 2014/2015 - 15,771

(d) 2015/2016 - 13,035

(e) 2016/2017 - 22,510

(f) 2017/2018 - 16,980

(g) 2018/2019 - 15,153

(h) 2019/2020 - 12,729

(i) 2020/2021 Data is not available until the release of the audited financial statements.

122. What was the average wait time from when a maintenance request was made to when it was completed in 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;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

Average wait time frame (days) for maintenance order to be completed

Financial Year	Planned capital*	Planned recurrent*	Responsive*
2011/2012	94.56	82.52	6.30
2012/2013	91.23	79.24	6.16
2013/2014	137.54	71.24	7.78
2014/2015	133.93	76.61	8.24
2015/2016	184.20	55.98	9.02
2016/2017	60.90	67.31	5.01
2017/2018	41.67	36.93	7.89

2018/2019	51.30	43.77	4.62
2019/2020	38.92	39.00	4.81
2020/2021 Data is not available until the release of the audited financial statements			

123. How many maintenance requests in NN07 Newcastle zone were not actioned in the appropriate timeframe for each of the following years?

- a) 2011;
- b) 2012;
- c) 2013;
- d) 2014;
- e) 2015;
- f) 2016;
- g) 2017;
- h) 2018;
- i) 2019;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?
- i. How many were satisfactorily completed within 30 days?
- ii. How many were satisfactorily completed within 60 days?
- iii. How many were satisfactorily completed within 90 days?

Answer:

Number of maintenance requests not actioned in appropriate timeframe

F/Y	No of responsive requests	Total Responsive	% of Total
2011/2012	4609	9212	50.03%
2012/2013	4044	8574	47.17%
2013/2014	5047	8438	59.81%
2014/2015	5313	9722	54.65%
2015/2016	4723	7989	59.12%
2016/2017	6827	28215	24%
2017/2018	9320	26043	36%
2018/2019	3308	25442	13%
2019/2020	2607	24905	10%
2020/2021*	1,902	13,579	14%

NB.

Data between 2011/12 and 2015-16 provided for properties within NN07 allocation zone.

From 2016/17, following implementation of the Asset Management Services contract, data is only available for Contract Area 7 (Newcastle and Hunter).

*As at 31 January 2021.

124. What was the total value of Land and Housing Corporation assets in the NN07 Newcastle zone:

- a) 2011;
- b) 2012;
- c) 2013;
- d) 2014;

- e) 2015;
- f) 2016;
- g) 2017;
- h) 2018;
- i) 2019;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

LAHC's financial system SAP does not capture property valuations by allocation zone.

125. How many properties, broken down by suburb, did Land and Housing Corporation own in the NN07 Newcastle zone for each of the following years:
- a) 2010;
 - b) 2011;
 - c) 2012;
 - d) 2013;
 - e) 2014;
 - f) 2015;
 - g) 2016;
 - h) 2017;
 - i) 2018;
 - j) 2019;
 - k) 2020;
 - l) 2021?

Answer:

[illegible]

MAYFIELD											
WEST	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55
MEREWETHER	303	303	303	303	303	304	304	304	304	306	306
NEW LAMBTON	135	136	136	136	136	136	136	136	136	137	137
NEWCASTLE	26	26	26	26	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
NEWCASTLE											
EAST	112	112	112	113	113	115	117	136	140	142	146
NEWCASTLE											
WEST	34	34	34	35	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
NORTH											
LAMBTON	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
SHORTLAND	71	74	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	72
STOCKTON	154	154	154	156	158	160	160	172	174	176	176
TARRO	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
THE HILL	11	11	11	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
TIGHESHILL	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
WALLSEND	348	348	348	349	349	349	349	347	350	339	341
WARABROOK	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	58	56	56
WARATAH	221	221	222	223	223	223	222	222	223	224	224
WARATAH											
WEST	108	109	109	109	109	109	110	110	111	111	111
WICKHAM	46	46	46	48	56	56	56	56	56	56	56
Grand Total	4247	4259	4249	4254	4267	4271	4273	4303	4317	4342	4397

l)- Information in respect of the current financial year is not available until release of the audited financial statements

126. 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;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

Answer:

NCAT cases are managed by the Department of Communities and Justice on behalf of the NSW Land and Housing Corporation (LAHC).

127. 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;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?

- i. If the answer refers to another document please provide the name of the document and the specific page number where the information can be found

Answer:

Refer to answer in question 127

128. How many times did LAHC 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;
- j) 2020;and
- k) 2021?
- i. If the answer refers to another document please provide the name of the document and the specific page number where the information can be found

Answer

Refer to answer in question 127

129. 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?
- a) 2011;
 - b) 2012;
 - c) 2013;
 - d) 2014;
 - e) 2015;
 - f) 2016;
 - g) 2017;
 - h) 2018;
 - i) 2019;
 - j) 2020;and
 - k) 2021?
 - i. If the answer refers to another document please provide the name of the document and the specific page number where the information can be found

Answer:

Refer to answer in question 127

130. If a Member of Parliament reports a maintenance issue to the MP Maintenance team that has not yet been reported to the maintenance line will the matter be actioned?
- a) If not, why not?
 - b) If not, what is the most appropriate way for MP's to raise maintenance issues on behalf of constituents?

Answer:

Yes.

131. What action is LAHC taking to address the guttering at 315 Maitland Road, Mayfield which is in an extremely poor condition due to rust?

Answer:

A work order was issued in early March 2021 to replace the rusted sections of guttering, with works to be completed by the end of April 2021.

132. Can Department of Communities and Justice (DCJ) Housing staff report maintenance issues directly to LAHC?
- a) If so, what is this process?
 - b) If not, why not?

Answer:

a) Yes.

b) N/A

133. Does LAHC direct DCJ Housing staff to report matters to the maintenance line instead of directly to them?

Answer:

In the first instance DCJ Housing staff typically log their repair issues via the online e-repairs service.

134. How much money from the NSW Government's Social Housing Maintenance Stimulus Program was spent in the NN07 Newcastle zone?

- a) Please provide a list of all the projects undertaken and the cost of each project.

Answer:

Expenditure of stimulus monies in the Newcastle allocation zone cannot be provided until conclusion of the program.

135. What action is LAHC taking to address the damaged windows at 5 Norton Way, Hamilton South?

- a) When will the window be repaired?

Answer:

The window was made safe on 11 March 2021 and will be replaced once the mandatory procurement process is finalised.

136. Is LAHC aware that a tree fell down at 167 Teralba Road, Adamstown five months ago?

- a) When will the tree be removed from the property?
- b) Why has it not been removed?
- c) What has caused the delay?
- d) Is this an acceptable timeframe to respond to this issue?

Answer:

No.

- a) The tree was removed in mid-March 2021.
- b) The tree was cut down by the State Emergency Service (SES) in February 2021. The SES initially rendered the tree safe but did not remove the tree or associated debris.
- c) The NSW Land and Housing Corporation (LAHC) became aware of the issue in late February 2021 following advice from the Department of Communities and Justice and initiated arrangements with the contractor to provide a scope of works and quotation to remove the remnants of the tree in accordance with existing procedures for this type of work.
- d) Yes - the tree was made safe by the SES and LAHC responded in a timely manner once it became aware of the issue.

137. What are LAHC's responsibilities to ensure that playgrounds they own in housing estates are safe for children and families?

- a) How often are LAHC playgrounds assessed for safety issues?
- b) How often is maintenance undertaken at LAHC playgrounds?

Answer:

Maintenance Contractors have a duty of care under the Lawns, Grounds and Cleaning (LGC) Contract to report any safety and condition issues with playgrounds to LAHC's Regional

Programs Team. Where LAHC manages the playground, LAHC bears the responsibility to either keep it in good order or to remove it and make good the area.

(a) LAHC playgrounds are assessed for safety issues throughout the duration of the LGC Contract. Any decisions around what work needs to occur would be made by LAHC's Regional Teams in consultation with the LGC Contractors.

(b) Maintenance is undertaken in accordance with the terms of the LGC Contract, and dependent on the condition of the playground.

138. What is LAHC's budget for maintenance of community infrastructure?

a) How much of that is specifically for playgrounds?

Answer:

There is no separate budget allocated for community infrastructure/playgrounds.

139. Are you aware of the appalling state of the playground located in Neill Terrace, Hamilton South in Newcastle?

Answer:

LAHC has identified that the playground is no longer fit for purpose and has made arrangements for the playground to be decommissioned with the area to be re-turfed.

140. Do you think your department is meeting their safety requirements for this playground?

a) What actions have you taken to ensure the playground is safe?

Answer:

Yes.

a) See answer to Supplementary Question 139.

141. Do you support your department's decision to demolish the Hamilton South Community Playground at Neill Terrace and not replace it?

a) If so, why?

Answer: Yes. There are options for residents to access other local playgrounds and sporting fields within close proximity to the Neill Terrace public housing complex.

142. Is your department deliberately running these assets into the ground so they can be bulldozed and therefore no longer be LAHC's problem?

Answer:

No.

143. Would you allow the department to bulldoze a playground in your electorate without replacing it?

Answer:

LAHC has a finite repairs and maintenance budget that is prioritised to maintaining homes for people in need. The retention of community infrastructure is a secondary consideration to maintaining the social housing portfolio.

LAHCs assesses its facilities and considers their future use from time to time. For playgrounds, the assessment to inform a decision would include consideration of proximity to other facilities, the tenant profile of the households in the immediate area, the costs associated with the playground (including recurrent costs to maintain), history of maintenance and vandalism.

144. Will you intervene and direct LAHC to replace the playground at Hamilton South?

- a) If not, why?
- b) If not, your government has sold over \$50 million of social housing property in the Newcastle LGA since 2011; why won't you direct some of these funds to replacing the playground?

Answer:

No.

- a) Maintaining the social housing portfolio is a priority. Installing and the ongoing maintenance liabilities to upkeep playgrounds would divert funds from upgrading and repairing tenants' homes.
- b) Proceeds from the sale of social housing property fund the building of new homes for people in need, and capital improvements to existing properties. LAHC has identified options for local residents to access other local playgrounds and sporting fields operated by the Council within the immediate vicinity of the park.

145. What plans does LAHC have for the future of its properties in Stockton?

Answer:

LAHC currently has no future plans for properties in Stockton.

146. Does LAHC plan to sell any further properties in Stockton?

Answer:

Refer to answer for question 145.

147. Does LAHC plan to replace any properties in Stockton?

Answer:

Refer to answer for question 145.