Budget Estimates: Questions on Notice
Treasurer
22 August 2025

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
1	2-3	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Nice call. Treasurer, how much do you expect to cut from the annual Transport budget by merging Sydney Trains with NSW TrainLink? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: The savings there, I expect it to be aligned to approximately — it's probably a 1 per cent operating budget save, and that allows us to deliver two things. The first is — The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: I didn't ask you how much — The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I'm just giving you the context that you asked for. I think, Mr Tudehope, it's about a 1 per cent operating budget save. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: What is that in dollar terms? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I think I can take that part of that question on notice. But I just point out that dollar save means that we will be spending more money delivering services to regional New South Wales.
		Response Details of Sydney Trains expenditure can be found in the budget papers and the Annual Report.
2	3	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Treasurer, what was the total cost of the 14-month back pay of the 4 per cent wage rise for Sydney Trains and NSW TrainLink, and was it allowed for in the 2025-26 budget? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: The answer to the second question is yes. The answer to the first question is I'm happy to come back to you on notice with some more detail on that.
		Response The total costs are provided for in the 2025-26 Budget and includes funding for backpay.
3	4-5	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: How much is the pay rise going to involve redundancies? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: The pay rise for the Combined Rail Unions bargaining unit involves changes at NSW TrainLink and Sydney Trains, which you've already asked me about. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: So the 900-odd employees —

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: They're not related. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: —which have just been offered redundancies by Transport for NSW have nothing to do, is what you're saying, in relation to this pay increase? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Yes. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: In circumstances where that pay increase has been afforded, what services will be reduced to deliver it? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: What services will be reduced? This will deliver more services, Mr Tudehope. Incidentally, it's not just more services but more reliable services. The other part of this agreement that is a big step forward is the agreement for us to be able to deploy a whole bunch of new technology that means that the network can recover after adverse events. To make that a bit more understandable, you would recall this year that we had a powerline that went down, which caused quite a traffic jam on the network at peak hour. The way in which Sydney Trains currently has to respond is by using phone calls and paper to be able to redeploy staff. We got agreement, amongst many other changes, that we can just deploy new technology to do that. That's a big step forward in terms of reliability. You're quite right to press me on this. What's in it for the taxpayers? What's in it for the taxpayers, with this agreement, is better, more reliable services and a more cooperative relationship with the workforce. It was incredibly hard fought. I'll take this opportunity again to make it clear, from my perspective, that we are very appreciative and sorry to the public for the inconvenience that was caused as that bargaining was taking place. At the end of it, what we have gotten is the ability to run our network better, which is also the reason why, since the agreement has been concluded, we have seen a recovery in reliability and service delivery. We've got more work to do there—for sure, we do—but it puts us in a much better position to give people the services that they are right to expect. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Can you give me, in dollar terms, what the value of the back pay amount was? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I think I took that on notice. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: You can't identify that? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I think I've taken it on notice.
		Response Please refer to response provided to the question on transcript page 3.

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
4	7	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: How much have you allowed for, for wage increases for transport workers for each of the four budget years? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I would just refer you to the budget papers. Which transport workers, sorry? Which specific transport workers? The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Go to Budget Paper No. 04, page 11-2. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Budget Paper No. 04, 11-2, sure. Yes. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: You see there, employee expenses for transport? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Yes. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: They only increased $89 million from 2024-25. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Sure. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: That's not going to cover the back pay, let alone the 8.16 per cent wage increase to 2025-26 on the 2024-25 wages, is it? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Why don't I take that on notice? The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: I bet you'll take it on notice.
		Response There is a mix of employees on different awards within Transport for NSW. There is a range of other factors that impact total employee related costs and the difference in employee related costs between years.
5	7-8	The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: You want to talk about the employee expense line item for rail workers and transport workers. It's why I asked you to identify which transport workers you were talking about, and you didn't. By not doing so, you're trying to pass off a department budget as Sydney Trains' budget. You know as well as I do that if you turn to the operating, page 1, you know as well as I do that Sydney Trains is a PNFC. That's not that. Surely, as the shadow Treasurer, you're not deliberately trying to confuse what is a PNFC budget and a general government budget. You're not doing that are you? The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Certainly not. But you have not, in fact, covered the back pay, have you? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Mr Tudehope, on the basis of using — The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Have you done it? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: You're using the department budget. If you want to see where that is, well — can I just grab Budget Paper No. 01. If you go to the revenue, the expenses line item, or the recurrent expenditure aspect, you'll see in the other operating statement —

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: What page are you referring me to? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: How about I come back to you on that in the next session, because we're about to run out of time on this one. But you know as well as I do that the State's contribution to the Sydney Trains operating budget is reflected in the other operating expenses part of Budget Paper No. 01. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: But I will come back to it with you. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I'll get my office to get you some more detail.
		Response The backpay has been allowed for in the 2025-26 Budget. Neither Sydney Trains nor NSW TrainLink are General Government agencies and do not have employee expenses separately identified in the Budget Papers. Rather their total agency expenses are reflected in Budget Paper no 4, Page 11.1 Table 11.1 Agency Expense Summary.
6	9	The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK: Certainly, the rental market's dire in New South Wales, probably elsewhere as well, but do you think it actually will make it cheaper for people to acquire a property and live in, rather than pay rent? Have you done those numbers? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: We are seeing some migration between renters and first home buyers, but you're right to say, Mr Borsak, that's probably more influenced by interest rates — eligibility — than it is necessarily the first home buyers scheme. Bear in mind, the first home buyers scheme can only be triggered by those who are in a position to buy, which does turn more on whether or not a bank's prepared to lend, which does turn heavily on two factors. Firstly, are their wages going up? I'm pleased that in New South Wales just last week we reported the biggest rise in real wage growth in the country at 3.4 per cent. The second aspect is interest rates. We are seeing that, as interest rates fall and normalise, we are seeing first home buyers return a bit more to the markets as well. The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK: You mentioned interest rates. I think we've seen in the last three months, what, 50 or 75 basis points? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Yes, it's come down by 75 basis points since the start of the year. The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK: What's the annual saving to the budget in relation to that? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: To the budget? The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK: Yes. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: That's an interesting question.

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK: Obviously you would have had some assumptions in there. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: We do. As interest rates fall, Mr Borsak, the Commonwealth bond rate falls in general. The exact numbers will be interesting. I might get Treasury to come back to you on that. Usually what we see is that after interest rates fall, the cost of the Commonwealth interest falls, and given that ours tends to be benchmarked to the Commonwealth, ours falls accordingly. That's a three-step sort of transmission chain. I guess the simple way of answering is there are two things we are seeing. Interest rates have fallen which means the cost of government borrowing in general has fallen, but pleasingly for New South Wales the difference between what we pay and what the Commonwealth pays is shrinking. At the start of the year, we would pay about 75 basis points more than the Commonwealth. That's now down to around, depending on which day you check the market, roughly—
		Response The 75 basis points drop is expected to translate to approximately $150 million saved in interest expenses in 2025-26. Treasury notes that these interest rate cuts were factored into the 2025-26 Budget forecasts.
7	10	The CHAIR: Treasurer, do you think a key metric for a healthy corporation is that it makes a profit? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Yes. The CHAIR: Does the New South Wales hardwood forestry SOC make a profit? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: No. The CHAIR: Excellent. Do you think it's going to make a profit? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Not in the short term. The CHAIR: How long is the short term? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I will get that for you. The CHAIR: When will it start making money? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Let me perhaps on detail come back to you on that. But my expectation is that the hardwood division is unlikely to make a profit this decade.
		Response In accordance with the 2025-26 Budget, Forestry Corporation of NSW (FCNSW) is forecast not to make a profit over the forward estimates. The Softwood Plantation Division is profitable, yet the losses in the Hardwood Forest Division impact overall profitability.

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		Recent losses in Hardwood Forest Division have been driven by a combination of rising land management costs, bushfire, flooding and litigation/regulatory issues. As part of its land management function, FCNSW invests in managing more than 60,000 kilometres of public roads, providing free recreation and tourism facilities, carrying out fire hazard reduction and firefighting, controlling weeds and pest animals and providing access for activities such as hunting, grazing and apiary. These costs would be incurred whether under FCNSW's management or another government agency.
8	12	The CHAIR: Has Treasury analysed the impact of the waste levy on the competitiveness of New South Wales as a location for the circular economy or advanced manufacturing? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: Not to my knowledge, Mr Buckingham, but I'll take that on notice.
		Response Treasury has not undertaken this analysis. I am advised that questions regarding the waste levy are more appropriately directed to the Minister for the Environment.
9	12	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: I think the relevant page we were talking about was 11-1 in the same budget paper. The increase is $1.1 billion. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: So 11-1 of which budget paper? The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: No. 4. How much of that figure is back pay? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I think I endeavoured to get that on notice. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: I'll accept that you can't give me that figure, Treasurer.
		Response Please refer to response provided to the question on transcript page 3.
10	23-24	Ms ABIGAIL BOYD: Some 86 per cent of Australians with disability are not on the NDIS and don't have NDIS plans. The NDIS review was very clear that it felt that, after the NDIS was established, the States and Territories had assumed that the Commonwealth would take more responsibility than in fact the NDIS was set up to achieve. As a result, the States and Territories pulled back on their spending and their efforts to create more inclusive and accessible State programs and State infrastructure, particularly within schools and in other areas. Part of the reason for the NDIS review and recommendations was to try and get States and Territories to take back their fair share of responsibility for people with disability. You were quoted after this week's round table as saying that you believe that spending on the NDIS should be

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		brought down. Do you accept, though, that that means, from a State perspective, the State Government is going to have to start doing more for people with disability? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Do you mind, Ms Boyd, if I take that question in parts? To the first part of your question, I can't speak to the history that is associated with what the State's intentions were at the time. To the second dimension of your question about the chain of events, I well and truly respect that there are a lot of disability advocates who share that view that you put through in that question. The third aspect is, yes, I do expect that the States will be doing more contributions when it comes to ensuring that people with a disability are supported, and that is both through the contributions that we make to the NDIS — which I point out we do contribute to. We are increasing our contribution to the NDIS, in line with the agreements that were established at the NDIS at the time. Yes, I do accept your point that States are going to need to spend more, particularly when it comes to schools as well. We are assuming that is going to be a prime contribution we will make. What we are arguing for is for the Commonwealth to recognise that contribution, and also for us to specify and to get to national consistency about what that contribution actually is. Whilst you're very right to say that most people with a disability are not supported by the NDIS, I think that the debate is about those people who are currently supported by the NDIS who might not be after the Federal Government changes the eligibility standards, and whether or not States can step in to provide what are characterised as foundational supports. Ms ABIGAIL BOYD: There are a couple of things going on here. There was already a lot of confusion about the foundational supports, and there seems to have been pushback from the States and Territories on the rollout. We heard from the disability Minister earlier this week in estimates that they would not be accepting cuts to the NDIS until those foundational supports had been agreed. Again, are you supporting Minister Park's comments yesterday that New South Wales won't be putting in money for this new Thriving Kids program? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Ms Boyd, if you don't mind, I will give you a response, but I have to take a bit of that on notice, because I didn't see Minister Park's evidence. I was in a round table yesterday. I don't know if I understand the full context, but I understand in the conversations that I've been having with Minister Park about this — to be fair to Minister Park, I think the point he's making is about the other side of all of this, which is the health agreement. What I do say in support very strongly of the point that Minister Park has made, and that I have also made, is that there is an interaction between the

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		health agreement and the disability agreement. For us to take a position on our contribution to the Thriving Kids program, we need to know what's being offered on the health side.
		Response This question is more appropriately directed to the Minister for Health, the Minister for Regional Health and the Minister for Disability and Inclusion,
11	25	The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Chair, before we go into Opposition time — and feel free to take this from Government time — do you mind if I provide some additional follow-up, with two facts, from this morning? The CHAIR: Let's have some facts. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I was asked about the relative GST share of Western Australia. It turns out that the secretary was right — it's 75¢, not 78¢. Kudos to the secretary. We can further report our expectations as to what the numbers are likely to be, which I might ask the secretary to do. MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: From 2026-27, Western Australia moves to the lower of the relativity of New South Wales or Victoria — in other words, whichever of those two States has the smallest relative share of the GST pool. That will be us, and so Western Australia will go from 75¢ to 84¢. Our estimate is if they did not have this sweetheart deal in place their share of the GST would be 18¢. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Which they obviously object to. The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK: That sweetheart deal you're talking about is the topping up coming from the general fund? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes, from 2018. Exactly. The Hon. ROBERT BORSAK: Why was that done?
		Response Please refer to responses given by the Treasurer and Mr Coutts-Trotter on page 25 of the transcript.
12	27-28	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: And you've told us that on a number of occasions. Can I ask you this: In relation to funding for Woollahra station, which you're about to announce, is it true that you're going to impose a $15,000 additional transport-related tax in respect of the contributions for the development of that station? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Again, on that proposition, I haven't got any policy announcement to make today. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: When? Will you make it tomorrow, or Sunday?

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I'd refer you to the earlier answers on those two particular follow-up questions of yours, Mr Tudehope. But if you actually allow me to say more than one sentence — when it comes to the general proposition that those who benefit from infrastructure investment then contribute to enable more infrastructure investment, that's not a controversial proposition. I would say that, in fact, I've seen Liberal members say that, in the absence of such arrangements, all we're doing is handing more profits to developers. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Why won't you give me a direct answer? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I am, if you'd listen to it. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Give me a direct answer to the question about whether you're going to announce this weekend a development of Woollahra station. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: You've just changed the question. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Have you allocated $193 million? Give me a direct answer. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I'm very reluctant to simply do this — The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: I know you are. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: — given that I've answered that particular question now, on my count, at least 10 times. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: No, you haven't given me a direct answer. The Hon. BOB NANVA: Point of order — The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I'm happy to take that on notice. The Hon. BOB NANVA: It goes to courtesy. The Treasurer has provided his answer. The CHAIR: That's not quite clear. I won't uphold the point of order. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: So the answer now, to the question about whether you have approved $193 million for the development of Woollahra station, is that you have taken it on notice? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Yes.
		Response The NSW Government announced plans to build a train station and rezone land around Woollahra. Questions around the project's budget are more appropriately referred to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Planning and Public Spaces. Transport for NSW and the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure will lead the planning work.
13	31	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: I'll read the relevant provision to you:

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		(2) The sum of $322,700,000 is appropriated to the Treasurer for the following that are not otherwise covered by an appropriation under this Act— as is the normal language used— ... for the appropriation year— (a) State contingencies, (b) expenditure related to the Government's election commitments, (c) essential services. You are given two special appropriations—the $177 million and the $322 million—to cover the Government's conditional offer. How much of that did you actually end up spending? How many employees, for example, got the 0.5 per cent? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Let me take that on notice for you. It's a good question. As you would be aware, you're asking about the 2024-25 budget year. I appreciate you reading it out to me. My office is trying to locate the Act right now as well. The second aspect is that the audit of the 2024-25 year is underway. In large part, the answer to your question will come from that audit. That's standard. I'm happy to take it on notice to see what information we can provide to you in the interim.
		Response Table D.3 in Budget Paper No.1 Budget Statement outlines payments made from State contingencies appropriated to the Treasurer for 2024-25. Approximately $0.4 million was used from the 2024-25 Special Appropriation for expenditure related to the Government's conditional offer of an additional 0.5% increase to salary and salary-related allowances for eligible workers. Most agencies covered the cost of this 0.5% increase from their existing appropriations.
14	36	The Hon. JOHN RUDDICK: It's a debate whose time has come. I have a question for Mr Coutts-Trotter. Could you give us an estimate? How much do you think in the last budget papers the bracket creep has been around payroll tax and land tax? What's your estimate about how much extra revenue that brought into the Treasury? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: I would have to take that on notice, Mr Ruddick. I'm happy to do so.
		Response The 2025-26 Budget forecast $13.9 billion in total payroll tax revenue in 2025-26.
15	39	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Is the money set aside for IRC wage rise determinations for essential services workers—nurses, firefighters and psychiatrists? Would that potentially be a component of that? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: The appropriation certainly does give us legal authority to spend it on matters to do with industrial relations.

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: So any wage rises for those bodies could come out of that appropriation? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: You say "could". It is obviously subject to law and it's available to me, if I feel as though it complies with the law, to do so. Would it help, Mr Tudehope, if I was to give you an example of how it's been used so far for industrial relations? The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Yes. The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: To this point, the only use of the appropriation for industrial relations has been to fund, for the community sector, this year's minimum wage decision. That was the policy that we announced at the NCOSS breakfast, which you attended. The use of the appropriation there arises for two reasons. Firstly, for the very technical reason that the Fair Work Commission had not decided the minimum wage by the time of the budget; and secondly, because the Government now funds those wage rises, and has for the last three years, pending the introduction of five-year contracts with the community sector. In this budget we also announced the way forward for us introducing five-year contracts with the community sector, which I think was a very welcome initiative, as you saw at that breakfast, and which I believe you supported. Equally, I believe you supported the minimum wage decision — and I'm glad you did — in opposition. I would have preferred it if your Government had done it when in government because, to be fair, I was genuinely surprised, when I became Treasurer, about how much anxiety there was about whether or not the minimum wage increase would be funded. We had to do that in the appropriation because it wasn't known what the minimum wage decision was. That's just one example. But the final point is this — The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: How much was it? Can you recall? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: I can get you the exact figures on what that is. I'm happy to take that on notice as to what it is for this year as part of the appropriation...
		Response In 2024-25, $21.2 million was delegated from the Special appropriation to the Treasurer to the relevant Ministers for Non-Government Organisations (NGO) grant payments, to fund increases in line with the Fair Work Commission (FWC) award decision increasing the national minimum wage.
16	40	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Minister Jackson told budget estimates today that Homes NSW has done no work in relation to your $193 million Woollahra train station project. Why are you redeveloping land with no involvement from Homes NSW? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: We haven't made a decision.

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Can you confirm that the Minister for Housing has had no involvement in this project, even though it will involve rezoning? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Mr Tudehope, I think I'm going to take this question on notice, because if the Minister is providing evidence as we speak, I think it's fair and reasonable for me to see what evidence she's providing.
		Response Minister Jackson's evidence is available on the NSW Parliament website. Questions on the planning of this project should be referred to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Planning and Public Spaces as Transport for NSW and the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure will lead the planning work.
17	42	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Treasurer. None of the amendments moved—I won't go there. In the interests of trying to get this resolved, I won't go there. What costing has Treasury done on the impact on the State's public mental health system of cutting off all medical support after 3½ years under workers compensation for psychologically injured workers with a WPI of less than 31 per cent and leaving these injured workers to seek medical support through the public health system? The Hon. DANIEL MOOKHEY: Let me get back to you on notice about the modelling that Treasury has done.
		Response Treasury has provided relevant Workers' Compensation modelling.
18	50	The Hon. CHRIS RATH: How many formal meetings has the New South Wales Government had with Transurban and related parties under the direct deal framework since the last estimates? DONNA AWAD: I can't tell you since the last estimates, but all I can say is we generally are meeting with them about once a week. I actually, based on the questions last time, have come up with—we've had 21 meetings this year, but I can't tell you exactly how many of those were since the last estimates. The Hon. CHRIS RATH: Maybe if you could provide on notice the number of meetings and the dates, that would be very helpful. I don't need them now, but thank you.
		Response Please refer to response provided by Ms Awad on page 69 of the transcript.
19	51	The Hon. CHRIS RATH: What are the next toll road concessions to conclude, and when will they return to public hands as per the concession agreement?

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		DONNA AWAD: The first one, I think, to come back to government hands is the Cross City Tunnel. I think it's in 2038, but I might have to just check that. MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: I think my colleague Ms Campbell is just having a look to see if we've got those details for you, Mr Rath. SONYA CAMPBELL: No, I don't have the end of the concession dates. I can tell you how much the tolls are. The Hon. CHRIS RATH: Maybe on notice? That would be great. MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: Yes, we're happy to, of course.
		Response Please refer to response provided by Ms Awad on page 69 of the transcript.
20	51	The Hon. CHRIS RATH: Within Treasury, has any modelling been done, say, since the last estimates on a two-way toll on the Harbour Bridge? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: I would need to take that on notice, unless—
		Response This question is more appropriately directed to the Minister for Transport.
21	51	The Hon. CHRIS RATH: In the first instance, is NSW Treasury aware of the EPA's proposal to introduce a renewable fuel mandate for coalmining? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: Personally, no. I can take it on notice to ask the question of the organisation. I don't think anyone here at the table is aware of that.
		Response This question is more appropriately directed to the Minister for Climate Change.
22	52	The Hon. CHRIS RATH: In terms of the data collection, we're very good at collating in New South Wales data on the unimproved value of land. Historically, we haven't been very good at collecting data on the improved value of land, which I know the Government has been interested in collecting as part of this ESL process. Where is that at now? Have we collated all of that data in terms of attaining the improved value of property, should the Government go down that path for ESL reform? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: I'd defer to Ms Carter, if you've got an update for Mr Rath. GERALDINE CARTER: I'll have to take that as a question on notice to get the exact detail.

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		Response Data on improved land values has not been collected for the purposes of the emergency services funding reform. Developing a database of improved land values would require time and involve significant up-front costs. As indicated in the Consultation Paper released in April 2024, Value NSW has estimated that it could take five years to implement a capital improved values revenue base for over 3.5 million properties.
23	55	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Well, yes. Who has done any work in relation to Woollahra railway station? Has anyone at the table done any work in relation to the modelling for Woollahra railway station? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: I'd need to take that on notice.
		Response Please refer to response given by Ms Gibson at the Planning and Public Spaces Portfolio hearing on 25 August 2025.
24	55-56	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: But to get to the figure of $193 million, some work must have been done to establish how long the line was going to be closed or the potential purchases of other property around the station. Has that work been done? SAID HIRSH: Presumably, but it's not something we have done. As Mr Gellibrand says, it is a Transport for NSW question. TOM GELLIBRAND: And walking in here this afternoon, I heard a number of 193. MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: We've taken that on notice. TOM GELLIBRAND: I'm just not sure of the origin of it or where it came from. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Could you tell me on Monday? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: We have 21 days, I think, to respond.
		Response: The NSW Government announced plans to build a train station and rezone land around Woollahra. Questions around the project's budget are more appropriately referred to the Minister for Transport and Minister for Planning and Public Spaces as Transport for NSW and the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure will lead the planning work.
25	56	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Just as a broad principle, is it Treasury's position that a new tax would be imposed upon developers by way of $15,000-odd for the purposes of contributions based on the rezoning and their proximity to the new station?

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: You're asking me a hypothetical about a hypothetical, I think. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Has the Government adopted a policy to impose a new tax of $15,000 in respect of contributions to be made by developers for development properties in proximity to the new station? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: The Parliament has legislated the Housing and Productivity Contribution framework, which determines certain — when I say "certain", I mean clear to potential developers and investors — the contribution that attaches in different parts of Sydney to different types of developments. That's a framework that has been endorsed by the Parliament and is being used. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: For a project at Woollahra, has it been agreed that $15,000 per unit or per lot will apply to that development? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: I don't know that there's a certain project at Woollahra, and I'd have to take the subsidiary question on notice. I simply don't know.
		Response Value capture will be used to contribute to the cost of the Station. The NSW Government will levy a charge on new developments built in the vicinity of the new Woollahra station, indicatively set at $15,000 per new dwelling. This is based on the amount levied in Pyrmont under the same mechanism. The final charge per dwelling and boundaries of where it will apply will be determined through the rezoning process.
26	62-63	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: If it is the same as the firefighters and it is 5 per cent for the nurses, what's the impact on the budget? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: We can take that on notice and give you a costing on that. But as Ms Livingstone said, the commission is dealing not merely with its wage fixing principles but the application of its wage fixing principles to the particulars of each case, and the particulars of the nurses' case are different to the particulars of the FBEU case.
		Response I am advised this question is more appropriately directed to the Minister for Health.
27	66-67	The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Can I ask you about Glebe Island. Has any modelling been done in relation to the impact of removing Glebe Island as a working port? There is a review being done, as I understand.

QoN #	Transcript page #	Question
		MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: The Cabinet Office has coordinated that work. I think it's a question best directed to them. They've engaged with a whole range of agencies, including Treasury. They've also engaged, of course, with the Port Authority. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: To the extent that they've engaged with Treasury, what does Treasury see as the impact of removing Glebe Island as an active working port or some sort of hybrid model? The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Is it Treasury's view that Port Kembla is a viable alternative to Glebe Island? MICHAEL COUTTS-TROTTER: I would need to take that on notice.
		Response This question is more appropriately directed to the Minister for Transport.
28	69	DONNA AWAD: I can probably answer some of the questions I took on notice earlier, if that's okay. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: Yes, by all means. DONNA AWAD: Firstly, the first concession to come back to government is the Cross City Tunnel, but it's coming back in December 2035. I was only a few years off. The Hon. DAMIEN TUDEHOPE: It's only a few. That's okay. DONNA AWAD: In terms of the number of meetings the negotiation team has had with the concessionaires this year, 17 of them happened after last budget estimates. In terms of steering committees, of all the steering committees we've held this year so far, 10 of those have happened after the last budget estimates. The CHAIR: Are there any more? GERALDINE CARTER: I can add one question on notice about ESL and improved land value. No, the team hasn't collected improved land values at this stage. The Hon. CHRIS RATH: Do we know when that process might be completed? GERALDINE CARTER: My understanding is that the data is quite complex and costly to collect. Until they're ready to progress to the next stage, they won't progress that work. The CHAIR: Thank you to all our public officials for your attendance.
		Response Please refer to responses provided by Ms Awad and Ms Carter on page 69 of the transcript.