



BUDGET ESTIMATES 2025–26

Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Heritage Portfolios

Portfolio Committee No. 7 – Planning and Environment

Answers to Supplementary Questions

Hearing: 29 August 2025

Climate Change, Energy, the Environment, Heritage Portfolio

Questions from Dr Amanda Cohn MLC

Wood heaters

1	The EPA are conducting local government behavioural change research to support the move away from wood heaters. What are the details of this research?
(a)	What is the implementation timeline of the research findings?
(b)	Is there publicly available information about the research?
i.	If so, where?

Answer

1	The NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) commissioned research to develop, test and recommend behaviour change communications concepts aimed at increasing the awareness of wood smoke health impacts and driving behaviour change.
(a)	The research is underway and the EPA is reviewing the results. The EPA will assess options for applying the research, including considering how it can apply the research to the wood smoke educational resources that are already available on its website. A timeline for this has not been settled.
(b)	No.
i.	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 1 (b).

Veolia

2	The EPA has recently varied an existing pollution reduction program attached to the Woodlawn Landfill Environment Protection Licence in response to elevated salinity, nutrients, TDS and PFAS confirmed at Allianoyonyiga Creek, Crisps Creek and Mulwaree River. In addition, Veolia has previously breached their environment protection license at the Woodlawn Eco Precinct. Veolia are the proponents of an energy -from-waste incinerator. Is Veolia required to comply with EPA regulation of its existing activities before approval of its proposed incinerator?
---	--

Answer

2	Consistent with proposals being assessed on their merits, compliance with existing statutory instruments is not a prerequisite to the IPC determining Veolia's planning proposal.
---	---

Questions from the Opposition

CLIMATE CHANGE & ENERGY

Questions to Minister Sharpe

3	On Page 58 of Transgrid's <i>Meeting System Strength Requirements in NSW PACR</i> , it is stated: "Transgrid expects regulations to be made by the NSW Government that expressly override Transgrid's obligations under the NER in relation to the system strength for the first 5.84 GW of IBR within Central West Orana REZ." When did the Minister first become aware that Transgrid was seeking release from its system strength obligations for part of CWO REZ? Who communicated this to you?
4	Does the Minister believe that the recent amendments to the <i>Electricity Infrastructure Investment (EII) Act</i> have achieved the effect of this regulation change anticipated by Transgrid?
5	On page 62 of Transgrid's PACR, it is stated: "Network synchronous condensers are assumed to be available to be in-service from March 2029. This is considered the earliest credible timing and assumes fast progression through regulatory and procurement processes." Can the minister clarify whether the government's efforts to "move them as quickly as possible" is expected to be able to meet this timeline?
6	Has Transgrid at any time since 2020 approached the Government seeking \$700 million, or any other financial support, for system strength or related projects? If so, when, how much, and what was the Government's response?
7	During Budget Estimates, the Minister said "There's a need for five synchronous condensers. We're trying to move them as quickly as possible." Can the minister confirm which five synchronous condensers these are? (Relative to the locations, sizes outline in the map from Transgrid's PACR)
8	Does the Minister accept that the <i>Electricity Infrastructure Investment Amendment (Priority Network Projects) Bill 2025</i> was necessary to allow orders to be placed for synchronous condensers?
9	Can the Minister confirm that the Project Assessment Conclusions Report for System Strength in NSW — now under dispute — was the intended mechanism by which costs for system strength infrastructure would ultimately be recovered from consumers?
10	Was the Minister made aware of any correspondence from the Australian Energy Regulator on the 30th or 31st of July that indicated a heightened risk of objections being raised to Transgrid's PACR?

11	It has been reported that multiple small businesses across the Riverina report they have not been paid, or have faced months-long delays in being paid, for work on Transgrid's \$3.6 billion EnergyConnect project in The Weekly Times by Nikki Reynolds on 26 August 2025. Will the government ensure that contractors are paid promptly, rather than being passed back and forth between Transgrid and their contractor Elecnor?
12	On 8th of January 2025, Transgrid released an update confirming that they had entered into a new "fixed price contract with Elecnor" after Elecnor had previously left the project at a project cost approximately \$1.5 billion higher than originally anticipated, and approved by the regulator. On the 10th of January, an AER official wrote to a representative of Transgrid regarding PEC saying "it would be good if we could get more information on how much the overspend is and how much is intended to be included in the reopener [sic] as previous meetings noted that Transgrid was not intending to include all of the PEC overspend in the reopener."(FOI 1008087). Is the government aware of how much of the Project Energy Connect overspend is, and how much Transgrid will be able to recover through the regulatory process, and when this will occur?
13	Will the NSW government guarantee it will not intervene in Project Energy Connect, by declaring this project a priority network project and issuing directions for its completion, thus removing it from the RIT-T framework, through which it has already been assessed?
14	Has the NSW government been in discussion with the Australian Energy Finance Corporation regarding the financial position and credit rating of Transgrid?
15	Has the NSW government been in discussion with the Future Fund regarding the financial position and credit rating of Transgrid?
16	Does the government claim that the completion of Project Energy Connect at the new higher price is in the best interest of consumers?
17	Does the government maintain that the NSW Roadmap is still on track to deliver lower cost electricity to NSW electricity consumers?
18	Can the government explain how Transgrid would be able to fund the completion of Project Energy Connect under fixed price contracts without impairing their financial position in the absence of further financial or regulatory assistance?
19	Has Transgrid indicated to the government, either to the Minister or to EnergyCo, that they would be subject to a credit ratings downgrade, fall into breach of bond covenants, or become insolvent should they be required to

	meet their obligations to provide system security without the passage of recent updates to the EII Act?
20	Did Transgrid ask the NSW government to completely cover the cost of the five synchronous condensers that the minister referred to as needing to be advanced as soon as possible?
21	Does the Minister maintain that the compressed air solution in Broken Hill is in consumers best interests?
22	Has the government received any information which could indicate that Transgrid is currently trading insolvent, or that at some point in the future will become insolvent without receiving cash injections from equity holders, government, or legislative intervention such as the recent amendments to the EII Act?
23	The Minister has said in Estimates that she is “very familiar” with Mr Redman’s repeated warnings that Transgrid cannot invest if it blows its credit rating. Given that knowledge, has your Government investigated Transgrid’s credit rating and solvency and its capacity to meet its NER obligations?
24	Can the government rule out taking an equity position in Transgrid if necessary to secure the timely acquisition of system security equipment?
25	When will the Minister decide whether an extension to Eraring will be necessary?
26	If an extension to Eraring is necessary, will consumers be able to avert expenditure on synchronous condensers and other system security investments that are currently being advanced on the assumption that Eraring will close in 2027?
27	If the Minister makes directions for the procurement of system strength equipment under the updated Electricity Infrastructure Investment act, will this remove those investments from the RIT-T process being advanced by Transgrid for those investments?
28	The Minister has said “I really hope that if there is other legislation that is required, you will support it as necessary.” Is the Minister planning on advancing further legislation to ensure system security is maintained? Is it possible that the previous bill was incomplete, insufficient, or incompatible with other parts of regulation or legislation?

Answer

3	Refer to the answer given to question on notice 39 for the 29 August 2025 hearing for the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage.
---	---

4	No. The recent amendments to the <i>Electricity Infrastructure Investment Act 2020</i> are not related to Transgrid's comments on the Central-West Orana Renewable Energy Zone.
5	Refer to the uncorrected transcript for the 29 August 2025 hearing for the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage at page 44.
6	Transgrid has not asked the Government for \$700 million. The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water and Transgrid have been engaging since March 2024 on how to accelerate procurement of synchronous condensers.
7	The five locations for accelerated procurement of synchronous condensers are: Newcastle, Kemps Creek (in western Sydney), Armidale, Wellington and Darlington Point.
8	Yes, this was one of its primary purposes.
9	The Project Assessment Conclusions Report is not a mechanism to recover costs. It is the final stage in the Regulatory Investment Test for Transmission under the National Electricity Rules.
10	No.
11	Transgrid was privatised by the previous Government and the NSW Government is not involved in these commercial relationships.
12	Project EnergyConnect is proceeding under the National Electricity Rules framework. The Australian Energy Regulator is responsible for determining the revenue for this project.
13	The NSW Government has no plan to intervene in Project EnergyConnect.
14	Yes, the NSW Government has discussed Transgrid's financial position and credit rating with the Clean Energy Finance Corporation.
15	No.
16	The Government has not made claims about Project EnergyConnect's updated cost.
17	Yes.
18	This is a matter for Transgrid.
19	No.

20	No.
21	Transgrid's 2022 Regulatory Investment Test for Transmission found Hydrostor's Silver City project was the best solution to maintain reliability for the Far West region of NSW. Hydrostor's Silver City project was subsequently successful in a competitive tender for Long-Term Energy Service Agreements administered by ASL (formerly AEMO Services) as the NSW Consumer Trustee.
22	No.
23	Yes.
24	Yes.
25	On 23 May 2024, the NSW Government announced an agreement with Origin to operate Eraring power station until at least August 2027 and no longer than April 2029. The timing of Eraring power station's closure within this period is a matter for Origin.
26	New equipment such as synchronous condensers is required to provide system strength as coal-fired power stations retire. If Eraring power station does not close in August 2027 as currently expected, Transgrid may need to offer to contract less system strength services from existing generators.
27	Yes. Transgrid can recover the costs of its investment in system strength infrastructure under either the National Electricity Rules or the <i>Electricity Infrastructure Investment Act 2020</i> . Not both.
28	Yes. The Government plans further legislative amendments to manage system strength in Renewable Energy Zones. These issues have been identified in the Transmission Planning Review. No. The previous Bill was not incomplete, insufficient or incompatible. It did not deal with the matters outlined in the Transmission Planning Review's interim report because they are still the subject of active consideration and the final report had not been developed.

Questions to EnergyCo CEO

29	On Page 58 of Transgrid's <i>Meeting System Strength Requirements in NSW PACR</i>, it is stated: "Transgrid expects regulations to be made by the NSW Government that expressly override Transgrid's obligations under the NER in relation to the system strength for the first 5.84 GW of IBR within Central West Orana REZ." When did EnergyCo first become aware that Transgrid was seeking release from its system strength obligations for part of CWO REZ?
----	---

30	Does EnergyCo believe that the recent amendments to the <i>Electricity Infrastructure Investment (EII) Act</i> have achieved the effect of this regulation change anticipated by Transgrid?
31	Transgrid disclosed in page 28 of its system strength PADR that “in early 2023 EnergyCo informed [Transgrid] that it planned to 'self-remediate' system strength for Stage 1 of the CWO REZ (5.84GW of IBRs) as part of its build, which will be implemented by ACERERZ”. On what date in early 2023 did EnergyCo first inform Transgrid of this decision?
32	Can EnergyCo publicly release the full text of the 24 October 2023 letter to Transgrid which confirmed this arrangement?
33	On page 30 of the Transgrid’s PACR, it is stated in regard to the timing of synchronous condensers for CWO REZ: “The updated timing was provided by EnergyCo in April 2025.” Can EnergyCo clarify what that timing is, and what new information drove the update?
34	Does the update in the timing for these seven CWO REZ synchronous condensers [sic] affect or drive the schedule need for other synchronous condensers outside the CWO REZ?
35	On page 8 of Transgrid’s PACR it is stated about the credible portfolio options: “Portfolio options 1 - 3 rely heavily on gas re-dispatch to meet the need in years 2028/29 and 2029/30. Transgrid's market modelling includes a daily NEM-wide gas constraint (consistent with AEMO's 2024 ISP) and a specific additional pipeline constraint for two NSW gas generators (consistent with GHD advice). However, a comprehensive assessment of gas pipeline capacity and gas supply availability was out of scope for this assessment. As such, modelling may over-estimate the possible re-dispatch of gas, which may result in an underestimate for forecast risks of system strength gaps.” Has the government commissioned modelling which incorporates credible constraints on the redispatch of gas which could find a closer estimate the risk of system strength gaps?
36	Does the government have any credible plans which could close the full extent of probably system strength gaps without the extension of Eraring?
37	Why did EnergyCo determine that ACERERZ, rather than Transgrid, should take on responsibility for synchronous condensers and system strength procurement for the Central-West Orana REZ?
38	How does EnergyCo justify handing this obligation to ACERERZ was in the best interests of consumers, given Transgrid is legally responsible under NER clause S5.1.14?

39	On page 3 of the August 2025 Summary report of the Revenue Determination for the ACERERZ – Main Central West Orana Renewable Energy Zone network projet [sic], it is stated that “In preparing this summary report, we provided ACERERZ and EnergyCo an opportunity to identify information which they claim should not be disclosed. We have considered the requirements of clause 53(6) of the EII Regulation in our decision to publish this summary report.” Can EnergyCo clarify which information they claimed should not be disclosed in the summary report, and why it should not be disclosed?
40	Is there any precedent for the full Revenue Determination to be withheld from the public?
41	Can the government explain why the “Return on capital” column in table 7.1 of the Summary Report is populated entirely with zeros, when it would be expected that the owner-operator of the infrastructure would receive some return on capital?
42	Under what powers of the <i>Electricity Infrastructure Investment Act 2020</i> , as in force prior to the August 2025 amendments, did EnergyCo authorise ACERERZ to procure and contract for seven synchronous condensers?
43	If ACERERZ fails to deliver or maintain the synchronous condensers, who is ultimately accountable to consumers – ACERERZ, Transgrid, or the Minister?
44	What rate of return does EnergyCo expect ACERERZ to receive for synchronous condenser investments, and how does this compare with Transgrid’s regulated WACC under the AER’s Rate of Return Instrument?
45	In the Revenue Determination for ACERERZ CWO REZ project, the rate of return, capital cost build-up, CEFC loan terms, 35-year revenue schedule, expiry payment and adjustment mechanisms were withheld. The AER notes in page 2 of the Determination the “non-disclosure claims from EnergyCo and ACERERZ” in withholding such information. Why did EnergyCo consider it appropriate to ask the AER to conceal these items from consumers, when households will ultimately fund them, and why should public interest not prevail over ACERERZ’s claims of confidentiality?
46	How much of ACERERZ’s synchronous condenser and system strength costs will be funded by consumer bills versus generator access fees?
47	Why did EnergyCo support splitting system strength procurement across multiple different solutions of different size for the first 5.84GW of CWO REZ (7X240MVA, plus one 1050MVA Transgrid SynCon), with the remainder still to be determined, rather than bulk purchasing larger units through Transgrid to capture economies of scale?

48	In Transgrid's PACR on page 58 it is stated: "Transgrid does not have confirmation on who will remediate IBR beyond the first 5.84 GW within Central West Orana REZ. As such, this PACR assumes that Transgrid is responsible for remediating future IBRs in the REZ". When will EnergyCo determine the approach for the remainder of the ~14GW IBR projected in the CWO REZ?
49	Transgrid stated on page 32 in the system strength PACR that "Transgrid will not commit to the procurement of system strength solutions for New England REZ until EnergyCo's approach has been confirmed." What approach has EnergyCo taken to system strength procurement in New England? If no decision has yet been made, when will EnergyCo decide and publicly announce its approach?
50	What are the driving factors in determining EnergyCo's approach?

Answer

29	EnergyCo informed Transgrid in early 2023 of its intention to provide a centralised system strength solution for Stage 1 of the Central-West Orana Renewable Energy Zone (REZ) through the REZ Network Operator. This was formalised via letter in October 2023. Transgrid, EnergyCo and AEMO have been engaged in joint planning throughout Transgrid's Regulatory Investment Test for Transmission process for the treatment of all REZs. This approach prevents 'doubling up' system strength solutions for the REZ, which reduces the overall costs for consumers while ensuring efficient system strength.
30	The Electricity Infrastructure Investment Amendment (Priority Network Projects) Bill 2025 amendments to the <i>Electricity Infrastructure Investment Act 2020</i> were not proposed to provide the system strength solution for Stage 1 of the Central-West Orana REZ.
31	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 29.
32	The letter sent to Transgrid on 24 October 2023 is provided at Appendix A.
33	The delivery program for Central-West Orana was finalised in April 2025 taking into account the awarded Central-West Orana Access Right Holder projects and ensuring system strength in service dates aligned with their generation commissioning programs.
34	Transgrid's procurement of synchronous condensers is not driven by the schedule or deployment of those being procured in Stage 1 of the Central-West Orana REZ transmission project.

35	No, Transgrid is the System Strength Service Provider for NSW.
36	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) is working with Transgrid to accelerate procurement of synchronous condensers. DCCEEW will continue to work with the Australian Energy Market Operator and Transgrid to identify contingency measures to maintain minimum levels of system strength as coal-fired power stations retire.
37	System strength is most effective and efficient when located close to the generation source, and for Central-West Orana REZ that means directly connected to the REZ Network Infrastructure. The coordinated, centralised approach provided by ACERES as the authorised Network Operator in Central-West Orana REZ provides efficiencies in the design and procurement of system strength, supports stable generation operation, and is in the best interests of energy consumers.
38	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 37.
39	Some figures are undisclosed so the NSW Government can continue to secure the best deals for NSW energy consumers for future REZ procurement processes. These figures are commercial in confidence.
40	In the non-contestable framework, revenue determinations are typically made for a period of five years. The publication requirements under the <i>Electricity Infrastructure Investment Act 2020</i> for the published data for Central-West Orana REZ are in line with what would be published in a full revenue determination for a non-contestable project. The information goes further by providing a schedule of quarterly payments to the network operator for the initial five year period. The publication will be updated every five years consistent with the non-contestable framework.
41	Refer to the answer given to question on notice 41 for the 29 August 2025 hearing for the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage.
42	Under section 63(4) Electricity Infrastructure Investment Act, EnergyCo as the Infrastructure Planner for Central-West Orana REZ recommended to the Consumer Trustee ACERES as the Network Operator and the scope of the Central-West Orana REZ Network Infrastructure. The Consumer Trustee authorised the project, including how system strength is managed, in June 2024.
43	ACERES.

44	ACEREs Weighted Average Cost of Capital is commercial in confidence. Unlike non-contestable projects under the National Electricity Rules, ACEREs was selected via a competitive procurement process.
45	Individual bidders financing assumptions are a feature of their particular structure and this information is commercial-in-confidence to protect future competitive procurement processes and ensure the NSW Government can continue securing the best outcomes for energy consumers.
46	The access fees paid by generators to connect to the Central-West Orana REZ (up to 5.84 gigawatts (GW) of installed nameplate capacity) are set at a level to recover the cost of the synchronous condensers (as the system strength remediation solutions) under the Access Scheme.
47	Under the Central-West Orana REZ Network Connection Agreement, Transgrid has committed to providing a minimum three-phase fault level of 5,943 Megavolt-amperes (MVA) at the Central-West REZ Network Connection Point at Barigan Creek. The Central-West Orana Centralised System Solution provides adequate synchronous condensers (7 x 250 MVA each for a total of 1,750 MVA installed capacity) to support up to 5.84 GW of new Central-West Orana generation (excluding Battery Energy Storage System). Importantly, the currently Authorised Central-West Orana REZ Project does not require Transgrid to provide any System Strength capacity. Transgrid's procurement of system strength is tied to its obligation to maintain this minimum fault level at the system strength nodes across their network.
48	For any REZ Network Infrastructure expansion, or where additional REZ Network Infrastructure connected energy suppliers are proposed beyond the 5.84 GW supported by the Central-West Orana Centralised System Solution, EnergyCo will undertake joint planning with Transgrid in its role as NSW's primary transmission network service provider and system strength service provider. Depending on where the optimised solution is located, implementation could be carried out by either ACEREs or Transgrid.
49	No decision has been made. When a decision is made it will be announced in the appropriate way.
50	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 49.

ENVIRONMENT

Coastal IFOA Protocol Changes

51	Minister, can you confirm whether the recent changes to the greater glider protocol under the Coastal IFOA were formally signed off by both yourself and the Minister for Agriculture, as required under the Forestry Act 2012?
----	---

(a)	If not, on what statutory authority did the EPA act unilaterally to impose new conditions?
52	Do you accept that the EPA's protocol changes have materially reduced the volume of harvestable timber available under existing wood supply agreements?
(a)	If so, why were these changes not brought to Cabinet or jointly approved at ministerial level before being enforced?
(b)	Isn't it the case that the EPA, as a regulator, is tasked with enforcing the CIFOA – not rewriting its balance of environmental and wood supply obligations without ministerial approval?
(c)	Do you believe this sets a precedent for the EPA to unilaterally change protocols with significant economic consequences without elected ministerial oversight?
(d)	Why were industry stakeholders not consulted before these new protocols were imposed, given the clear impact on contractual supply obligations and mill operations?
(e)	Will you commit to tabling the legal advice the EPA relied upon to justify making these changes without ministerial sign-off?
(f)	Minister, are you aware that mills on the South Coast are already operating under capacity because of reduced wood supply, and these changes will worsen that situation?
(g)	What assessment has been made of the job losses caused directly by these EPA-driven changes?
(h)	If it is established that the EPA exceeded its statutory powers in making these changes without ministerial approval, will you review exclusions put in place by [sic] under those new protocols

Answer

51	No.
(a)	An integrated forestry operations approval (IFOA) may apply or adopt protocols that are publicly available and in force from time to time. Any such protocols may include those prepared by the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA).
52	At time of protocol change, the Forestry Corporation of NSW (FCNSW) did not provide quantified impacts to the EPA.

(a)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 52.
(b)	The EPA is tasked with enforcing the Coastal IFOA and may also prepare protocols that are applied or adopted by the Coastal IFOA.
(c)	Refer to the answers to supplementary questions 51 (a) and 52 (b).
(d)	The EPA consulted FCNSW at the time of protocol change.
(e)	No.
(f)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 52.
(g)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 52.
(h)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 51 (a).

Questions to the EPA

53	Can you confirm what statutory trigger or threshold event required the EPA to rewrite the site-specific protocols for greater glider protections under the Coastal IFOA?
54	Were any Penalty Infringement Notices (PINs) or prosecution actions issued against Forestry Corporation in relation to alleged non-compliance with the previous greater glider protocols?
55	If no PINs or prosecutions were issued, what was the regulatory rationale for rewriting these protocols?
56	Isn't it the case that the previous protocols were already enforceable under the CIFOA framework, and changes were therefore discretionary rather than mandatory?
57	Did the EPA seek or obtain joint ministerial approval before issuing these new protocols, given their significant material impact on contracted wood supply?
(a)	If not, why not?
58	Did you provide a briefing to the Minister ahead of those changes?
59	Did you recommend joint ministerial sign off as is required under the Forestry Act for those major protocol changes?
60	If they didn't meet the threshold for joint ministerial sign-off given the significant impact they have had on wood supply, what is your advice on what the threshold is for the EPA to make significant changes to the CIFOA.

Answer

53	Under the <i>Forestry Act 2012</i>, an integrated forestry operations approval (IFOA) may apply or adopt protocols, codes, standards or other instruments that are publicly available and in force from time to time. Any such protocols may include those prepared by the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) (section 69P of the <i>Forestry Act</i>). The EPA can amend protocols that support the IFOA. In 2024, the EPA revoked and replaced Protocol 31 of the Coastal IFOA to reflect the recent threatened species listing of Greater Gliders as an endangered species. As a result of the amendment, the Forestry Corporation of NSW (FCNSW) applied to the EPA for, and the EPA issued, a site-specific biodiversity condition to enable forestry operations in greater glider habitat in accordance with the condition.
54	In August 2025, the EPA commenced prosecutions against FCNSW for alleged non-compliances in Tallaganda State Forest with the Coastal IFOA requirements, including protocols, as in force before the EPA replaced Protocol 31 as referred to in the answer to supplementary question 53.
55	Refer to the answers to supplementary questions 53 and 54.
56	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 53.
57	No. At the time of protocol change, FCNSW did not provide quantified impacts to the EPA.
(a)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 57.
58	No.
59	No. Refer to the answer to supplementary question 57.
60	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 57.

Questions to the Secretary of DCCEE

61	Why did the Department permit the EPA to introduce significant amendments to the CIFOA protocols at a time when the Government has committed to major forestry policy reform, including the new Forestry Industry Roadmap and the establishment of the Great Koala National Park?
62	If there were no penalties or compliance failures necessitating urgent change, what was the justification for fast-tracking new protocols instead of aligning them with these broader policy frameworks?
63	Has the Department undertaken an impact assessment of these changes on wood supply agreements, mill operations, and regional jobs before they were implemented?

Answer

61	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) does not have a role in permitting the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) to amend the Coastal Integrated Forestry Operations Approvals (IFOA) protocols or undertake any regulatory functions. The EPA is an independent regulator. The EPA's regulatory action is informed by the EPA Regulatory framework, EPA Regulatory Policy and the EPA Prosecution Guidelines.
62	It is not clear which Coastal IFOA protocols this question is referring to. The EPA can amend protocols that support IFOAs.
63	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 61.

Procurement Process – Improved Native Forestry Method

64	Minister, what was the procurement process used to appoint the consultant from ANU to develop the Improved Native Forestry Method?
65	Was the engagement subject to a public tender? If not, why was a direct appointment made?
66	What probity advice was sought to justify bypassing a public tender?
67	Which specific exemption under the NSW Procurement Board Directions was relied upon to justify direct sourcing?
68	Will you table the probity documentation?
69	Are you aware that the consultant directly appointed has publicly called for the end of public native forestry? How does the Government reconcile this with the requirement for independence?
70	How can the Government guarantee impartiality when the consultant has published material advocating against the very industry being regulated?
71	Why weren't consultants with alternative or balanced perspectives invited to tender?
72	Can you confirm whether other universities, consultancies, or forestry experts were considered for this engagement?
73	Was any market testing done to determine value for money?
74	Why was there no open process to allow other providers to compete?

75	Will you release the contract and terms of reference in full?
76	Does the Minister accept that commissioning an academic with a predetermined position undermines confidence in the process and suggests the outcome was pre-determined?
77	Why has the Improved Native Forestry Method excluded analysis of substitution effects, such as increased imports of hardwood from countries with weaker environmental standards?
78	Minister, how do you respond to concerns that this appointment process reflects anti-competitive behaviour, a lack of transparency, and poor governance, and risks undermining confidence in both NSW procurement integrity and forest carbon policy?

Answer

64	The Australian National University Enterprise (ANUE) is listed on the NSW Treasury SCM0005 Prequalification Scheme: Performance and Management Services. ANUE was assessed as having the specialist knowledge and expertise, organisational capacity and resources to deliver the scope of works. Following consideration of providers on the NSW prequalification scheme, procurement was via a direct negotiation process. A direct negotiation was made due to the uniqueness of the project and the specialist skills held by ANUE. This process was in accordance with Departmental and Treasury Procurement requirements, and the Independent Commission Against Corruption NSW Direct Negotiations: Guidelines for Managing Risks.
65-68	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 64.
69	All procurement rules and processes have been followed.
70	The final decision on whether to make the Improved Native Forestry Method (INFM) method will be made by the Australian Minister for Climate Change and Energy with advice from the Emissions Reduction Assurance Committee established under the <i>Carbon Credits (Carbon Farming Initiative) Act 2011</i> (Cth).
71-74	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 64.
75	A summary of the contract was disclosed in accordance with the <i>Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009</i> . A copy of the disclosure can be viewed at buy.nsw.gov.au/notices/27B0F2B7-06B5-77A6-71461A1C9734B359/source/etrCN .

76	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 70.
77	The draft INFM method published on the Department’s website sets out how leakage is accounted for.
78	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 69.

Native hardwood supply shortages

79	Minister, on the 19 March 2025 – you stated in in [sic] an answer to question without notice in the house, quote: <i>Pentarch claims that decision is due to shortfalls in supply and that, year to date, the Forestry Corporation has only delivered 63 per cent of its contracted log volume. As I said previously in my answer, that is not a result of the koala hubs or the pending decision relating to the Great Koala National Park. Forestry Corporation has had challenges meeting its contracted log volumes for a number of years due to the 2019-20 bushfires, wet weather, flooding and other factors. From 2021 to 2024 the Koolkhan mill has been receiving less timber than their contracted supply. That lower supply is not a result of any decision regarding the Great Koala National Park.</i>
(a)	Minister, where did you receive your advice that a lack of wood supply to forestry corporation customers on the NSW North Coast and a stand-down of timber workers at the Koohlkhan Mill was due to [sic] exclusively to natural disasters?
(b)	Was it one of your advisors here that provided this advice?
(c)	Minister, do you stand by your previous comments in the house?
(d)	Minister, tabled is one of many letters from Forestry Corporation to its customers describing the exact reasons for the shortfall in delivery of contracted wood to its customers. They include: • the establishment of 106 ‘koala hubs’ in the Great Koala National Park (GKNP) assessment area; • the issuing of Site Specific Biodiversity Conditions (SSBCs) for Southern Greater Gliders; • impacts on hardwood plantation production in relation to unique and special wildlife values under the <i>Plantation and Reafforestation Act 1999</i>; • impacts on native forest production resulting from legal challenges by third parties, contentious areas and forest protests; and • recent Ministerial Direction of 17 December 2024. Minister, in light of this, do you want to correct your statement at all?

Answer

79	
(a)	The advice provided to Parliament did not state that a stand-down of timber workers at the Koohlkhan Mill was exclusively due to natural disasters. The NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) provided analysis regarding recent North Coast timber supply contextualising Koolkhan mill operations, noting that force majeure events (including bushfire and flooding) routinely disrupt timber supply, and have done so before any decision was made on the koala hubs.
(b)	No.
(c)	Yes.
(d)	No. Timber supply volumes are affected by many factors, including weather events. Many north coast harvesting operations have been suspended in previous years due to various flood and fire events, resulting in smaller timber volumes being taken. Regarding the 2024 Greater Glider Site Specific Biodiversity Conditions, the EPA consulted the Forestry Corporation of NSW at the time of protocol change. Mills impacted by the koala hubs and the GKNP are being compensated.

Assessing change in tree composition on state forests

80	Minister, do you have access to briefings from the NSW Natural Resource Commission?
81	Do you believe there is scientific consensus about the independent work done by the NRC and contributors to their projects like the University of Newcastle?
82	Have you received a briefing on the latest work by the NRC who review the Coastal IFOA for the Government – it’s titled “Assessing Change in Tree Composition in State Forests”?
83	Given this work directly affects and overlaps the assessment process for the creation of a Great Koala National Park will it be included as key information in the boundaries and creation of a new national park?

Answer

80	Yes.
----	------

81	The NSW Forest Monitoring Steering Committee and supporting technical working groups provide oversight to the work led by the Natural Resources Commission. The Committee consists of independent experts and relevant NSW agency representatives and that the projects are generally shaped by technical working groups before being endorsed by the Committee.
82	No.
83	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water will consider the information.

INTEGRITY OF THE INFM METHOD

Questions for the Secretary of DCCEE

84	Can the Department explain how the INFM Method can credibly meet the Offset Integrity Standard of <i>Additionality</i> , when the NSW Government has already announced the conversion of up to 176,000 hectares of public native forest into a new National Park in the North East — meaning any carbon abatement would have occurred irrespective of the method?
85	Given that the INFM Method is explicitly inapplicable in Victoria and Western Australia (where native forest harvesting has already ceased) and both Queensland and Tasmania have ruled it out, how can the Department justify its claim that this method meets the Scale criteria of the Offset Integrity Standards? Isn't it simply a boutique mechanism, increasingly limited to a narrow footprint in NSW?
86	Has the Department conducted a quantitative estimate of the maximum carbon abatement the INFM Method could generate <i>within NSW only</i> — particularly factoring in the land to be converted to National Park — and how does that justify continued investment of public resources into progressing this method?
87	Has the Department provided any advice to the Minister that the INFM Method has multiple risks involved and should not proceed due to clear evidence it fails to meet core Offset Integrity Standards, particularly given the simultaneous creation of a large reserve that renders the credited activity redundant?
88	Is the Department aware that under the Offset Integrity Standards, carbon credits must only be issued for emissions reductions that <i>would not have occurred without the project</i> — and how does the Government reconcile that with its public policy to halt harvesting on a growing portion of public forest estate for other reasons, thereby precluding additionality?

89	Can the Department provide transparency around how baseline scenarios will be established under this method, given the widespread decline in native forest harvesting volumes and viability over the last decade in NSW? What evidence can it provide that these baselines won't be artificially inflated to generate non-additional credits?
90	Does the Department concede that, far from promoting new abatement, the method risks shifting harvesting pressure onto private native forests or plantation imports — effectively displacing emissions rather than reducing them — and if so, how can the method meet Australia's international climate credibility requirements?
91	Why is the Department continuing to develop this method when it is now clear that the vast majority of the eligible area will be exempt due to conversion to protected tenure or already unviable forestry operations? Is this a case of policy being driven by ideological opposition to forestry rather than evidence-based carbon abatement?
92	Can the Department confirm whether any internal or external review has been conducted to assess the INFM Method's compatibility with the Offset Integrity Standards — and if so, will that advice be made public?
93	Why is the Department prioritising a method that fails on multiple fronts — additionality, scale, and long-term carbon integrity — instead of supporting scalable plantation expansion methods that store more carbon, provide long-lived products, and meet Australia's timber needs?
94	Will the Department acknowledge that by reserving forests already slated for harvesting cessation — and then attempting to claim carbon credits for it — it risks undermining public confidence in the credibility of the ACCU Scheme, both in NSW and nationally?
95	What modelling has been undertaken on the potential for carbon leakage, including economic and emissions displacement effects, as harvesting pressure moves from public native forests to private landholders or overseas markets? Has the Department quantified these risks?
96	What guardrails has the Department (DCCEW) [sic] put in place to manage the clear conflict on [sic] interest in the National Parks and Wildlife Service continuing to pursue a carbon method — where they will benefit from future conversion of tenure under the method — where it is obvious it does not meet the regulated integrity standards.
97	Have any concerns been raised with the department from within government or from stakeholders about NPWS being the lead agency to oversee this project?

Answer

84	The final creation of the Great Koala National Park is dependent on the successful registration of a carbon project under the Improved Native Forest Management (INFM) method. The Emissions Reduction Assurance Committee (ERAC) established under the <i>Carbon Credits (Carbon Farming Initiative) Act 2011</i> (Cth) will assess the compliance of the methods against the legislated Offsets Integrity Standards.
85	If the INFM method is approved, Australian and state governments can choose whether they wish to use the method.
86	No.
87	No.
88	Yes. The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) is aware of the Offset Integrity Standards. Refer to the answer to supplementary question 84.
89	The draft INFM method available on the Department's website sets out how baselines are proposed to be established. Final rules for baseline establishment will be considered as part of the Australian Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (Australian DCCEEW) and ERAC review process.
90	No.
91	No. The draft INFM method is currently under review by the Australian DCCEEW. If approved, it will offer NSW a significant opportunity to generate high integrity carbon credits.
92	The ERAC will assess the compliance of the INFM method against the legislated Offsets Integrity Standards. DCCEEW publicly exhibited the draft method.
93	If approved, the method will offer NSW a significant opportunity to generate high integrity carbon credits. The Australian DCCEEW prioritised the INFM method for development through its proponent-led process.
94	No, the draft INFM method is currently under review by the Australian DCCEEW and will only be approved if it meets the statutory Offsets Integrity Standards.
95	The draft INFM method published on the Department's website sets out how leakage is accounted for.
96	The ERAC will assess the compliance of the methods against the legislated Offsets Integrity Standards.

97	DCCEEW is developing the method.
----	----------------------------------

Toorale Station

98	Is the “Toorale water management infrastructure operating and maintenance plan June 2022 - June 2024” still the current operating and maintenance plan (OMP) for Toorale Station?
99	In that OMP, the National Parks and Wildlife Service is responsible for managing and operating the works at Toorale. Is that still the case or is the DCCEEW Conservation Programs Heritage and Regulation Group (CPHR) responsible?
100	What is the relationship between the National Parks and Wildlife Service and CPHR Group and what are their respective roles in relation to the management of regulating infrastructure at Toorale?
101	How many CPHR Group staff are based at Toorale Station or in the NPWS Bourke area?
102	Considering the OMP is dated June 2022 to June 2024, and machinery of government changes affecting National Parks and DCCEEW came into effect on 1 January 2024, and the current Intersecting Streams Unregulated River Water Sharing Plan came into effect on 1 July 2024, why is the OMP still not updated?
103	To your knowledge, has DCCEEW or its predecessor agencies ever been issued with a stop work order by NRAR before, at Toorale or anywhere else?
104	Are you aware of complaints about a low flow or now [sic] flow event on the Warrego River downstream of Toorale Station in April 2024?
105	Does that OMP require maintaining instream flow connectivity between the Warrego and Darling rivers as Demand priority 1, and flows to the Western Floodplain as a Demand priority 2?
106	According to the operating and maintenance plan, Toorale operators need to maintain 330 megalitres per day (ML/d) as the “minimum passing flow requirement” at the Louth gauge. According to the Water NSW Water Insights web site it dipped below that on 17 April last year, bottomed out at 297.9 ML/d on 18 April, and didn’t get above 330 ML/d until 5:30 PM on the 19th. What was the cause?

Answer

98	Refer to the answer to question on notice 31 for the 29 August 2025 hearing for the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage.
----	---

99	The National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) manages Toorale and holds the works approvals for Boera, Booka and Homestead structures. NPWS is responsible for operation and maintenance of infrastructure on Toorale. The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation Group (CPHR) is responsible for planning, co-ordinating, communicating, monitoring and reporting on operations during each event in consultation with stakeholders.
100	CPHR and NPWS are part of DCCEEW. Refer to the answer to supplementary question 99.
101	There are no CPHR staff based at Toorale or the NPWS Bourke Area.
102	Refer to the answer to question on notice 31 for the 29 August 2025 hearing for the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage.
103	Refer to the uncorrected transcript for the 29 August 2025 hearing for the Minister for Climate Change, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Environment and Minister for Heritage at page 87.
104	Yes, DCCEEW received a complaint at that time and CPHR staff contacted the complainant to explain the circumstances.
105	The demand priorities in the OMP apply only when a flow event in the Warrego arrives at Boera Dam. Between events, the OMP does not require releases to the Warrego to be made. Since June 2022 until August 2025, under the OMP, the requirement to pass flows up to 900 ML/d until connectivity with the Darling River has been achieved and flows at Louth gauge exceed 330 ML/d. If the flow target at Louth is met and Priority 2 is active, a flow of at least 50 ML/d is maintained through the Boera and Homestead fishways. Under the approval conditions issued on 1 September 2025, a flow rate of up to 1,650 ML/d may be passed through Boera until connectivity with the Darling River is achieved and the flow at Louth gauge exceeds 330 ML/d.
106	On the days mentioned, the works were operated under exceptional circumstances in accordance with approved procedures. This was to allow contractors safe access across the Warrego River to complete infrastructure upgrades on Toorale at Ross Billabong and Booka Dam. This required a temporary halt on releases from Boera to the Warrego.

Native Vegetation Mapping

107	Minister, your own department has acknowledged that the current Draft
-----	---

	Native Vegetation Regulatory (NVR) Map is inaccurate. As awareness of the map grows, so too does evidence of widespread errors. Acknowledging this:
(a)	Minister, how many requests for free NVR map reviews has your department received in the past 12 months?
(b)	What is the total cost of these reviews to the Government?
(c)	In what percentage of cases do reviews result in changes to the NVR map?
(d)	Minister, why are you pursuing legislative changes, such as the proposed amendments to the Land Management Code, before ensuring the maps are accurate?
(e)	What resources have you invested in to ensure satellite imagery is supported by thorough ground-truthing during NVR map reviews?

Answer

107	The map is not inaccurate. The draft NVR Map is 96% accurate for those properties where landholders sought map reviews. Free map reviews will continue to be available for landholders, allowing continuous improvement.
(a)	111.
(b)	In the last 12 months it has cost the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) an estimated \$253,500 to complete map reviews of the NVR Map.
(c)	Since commencement of publication of the Draft NVR Map in October 2022, 8.4% of cases have resulted in map correction. This equates to a 4% change in area of the properties reviewed. The effect of the map reviews statewide has been amendment of 0.03% of the draft NVR Map as a whole.
(d)	This is incorrect, the maps are accurate. Refer to the answer to supplementary question 107.
(e)	DCCEEW is continually improving the NVR Map and offers free property-scale map reviews, which may include on-site assessments.

Regarding land mapped as Category 2 Sensitive Regulated (Pink):

108	Minister, why has the NSW Government not utilised Bionet data to cross-check and validate the accuracy of the CEEC mapping, in addition to conducting on-ground inspections?
109	Minister, regarding properties zoned as Category 2 – Sensitive Regulated Land

	(‘pink’) under the Native Vegetation Regulatory Map:
(a)	What specific steps have been taken to ensure landholders are adequately informed about the basis for this zoning, especially in light of no dedicated onsite flora and fauna surveys?
(b)	Given that affected landholders are not entitled to compensation, how does the NSW Government justify this position when the zoning materially reduces the equity and productive use of their properties?
(c)	Minister, how does the NSW Government plan to address landholder concerns about the potential inaccuracies or lack of comprehensive survey data underpinning these regulatory decisions?
(d)	In the absence of farmers, Minister, what resources have you deployed to protect Category 2 Sensitive Regulated areas from threats such as feral animals, weeds, erosion, and increased fire risk?
(e)	How often is the health of CEEC verified on the ground (through ground truthing) by departmental staff?

Answer

108	BioNet data is used to define and map Critically Endangered Ecological Communities (CEECs).
109	
(a)	The staged release of the draft Native Vegetation Regulatory (NVR) Map was promoted in 82 advertisements in local and regional newspapers (with a combined readership of 937,061). Each regional release was also advertised through local Local Land Services newsletters and key stakeholders informed. The NVR Map has been mentioned more than 30 times on radio, in newspapers and online. The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water’s (DCCEEW’s) NVR Map Review Team has been present at Australian National Field Days, AgQuip and the NSW Farmers Conferences, and has held 10 landholder and five peak body stakeholder workshops (2017), and at least 10 presentations to key stakeholder groups between 2017 and 2025. Four NVR Map Information Sessions have been held with landholders at Cassilis, Walcha, Moree and Walgett during June and July 2025. Planning is underway for information sessions at other locations.
(b)	A select range of allowable activities under the <i>Local Land Services Act 2013</i> (LLS Act) is permitted in Category 2 Sensitive Regulated areas, including sustainable grazing which supports the productive use of such areas.

	Landholders with intact native vegetation can also apply to manage such areas for conservation under agreements with the Biodiversity Conservation Trust. Across NSW, including in Category 2 Sensitive Regulated areas, the Biodiversity Conservation Trust offers conservation agreements that protect biodiversity. Landholders can access three-year grant funding for on-ground conservation activities. In many parts of NSW, landholders can also apply for conservation agreements that come with ongoing annual payments to deliver an agreed conservation management plan.
(c)	Landholders have the option to request a map review if they are concerned about any potential inaccuracy in the mapping of their property on the NVR Map. This is a free service the Department has offered to landholders since the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> commenced in 2017.
(d)	On private rural land, landholders have the same biosecurity obligations (such as pest and weed control) and environmental obligations (such as erosion control to avoid pollution of waterways) on Category 2 sensitive regulated land as they do on the rest of their property. Schedule 5A of the LLS Act outlines the allowable activities that may be applied to manage threats to land mapped as Category 2 Sensitive Regulated land.
(e)	The Threatened Species Scientific Committee determines the listing of a CEEC.

Regarding West Wyalong and Tallimba, where broombush and eucalyptus oil farmers have gone a year without income due to Category 2 Sensitive Regulated (Pink) mapping:

110	Minister, how long is the review of the area’s CEEC status expected to take?
(a)	Why have you not ordered a temporary halt on penalties for Bland Shire farmers so they can resume work while the CEEC status review is underway?
111	A group of more than 40 Bland Shire farmers travelled to NSW Parliament for the ‘Pink Zones’ forum and spoke candidly about the financial and emotional toll this was having on their community. Minister, why did you not attend the forum despite a month’s notice, and why have you decline [sic] all invitations to meet with farmers in West Wyalong?
(a)	Minister, you have previously stated that the Government will not compensate these farmers for lost income. Why not?
112	Farmers have also warned of the rapid spread of parasitic Strangle Vine across Broombush and Blue Mallee plantations, which they say is at an

	epidemic level without active management from farmers. Minister, what resources have you invested in to combat Strangle Vine and protect Broombush and Blue Mallee in the state's south in the absence of farmers?
(a)	Why has Strangle Vine not been reclassified as an Invasive Native Species?

Answer

110	The NSW Threatened Species Scientific Committee's (TSSC) review is expected to commence in 2025.
(a)	Compliance and enforcement with the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> is a matter for the Department.
111	I was not able to attend the forum due to other commitments. I appreciate the ongoing and constructive engagement from the West Wyalong community with both myself and the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW). I last met with landholders online on 25 February 2025, where I committed to reviewing the mapping and requesting the TSSC to review the listing. My office and DCCEEW have had extensive contact with landowners on this issue.
(a)	Landholders adversely impacted by TSSC decisions are not entitled to compensation.
112	Strangle vine is part of the CEEC and is protected as part of the CEEC like broombush and blue mallee. Strangle vine occurs as part of the natural community. In disturbed areas, such as roadsides and harvested areas, it can become more prevalent. Options for landholders to manage strangle vine are available under the <i>Local Land Services Act 2013</i> and are a matter for the Minister for Agriculture.
(a)	This question should be referred to the Minister for Agriculture.

Land Management Code – Education and Consultation

113	Minister, what education, training, or support has the NSW Government provided to ensure that all farmers are adequately informed and equipped to understand the Land Management Code and interpret native vegetation mapping on their properties?
(a)	Where and how has this been conducted?
114	Can the Minister explain why there has been limited on-the-ground validation (ground-truthing) and meaningful consultation with affected landholders and local communities prior to the release of these proposed changes?

115	Minister, how does the NSW Government acknowledge the risk that restricting landowners' ability to manage their land may contribute to the degradation of the very ecosystems the proposed changes claim to protect?
116	Minister, how does the Minister respond to concerns that the introduction of a new invasive native species test will restrict farmers' ability to manage woody vegetation efficiently, potentially leading to delays in treatment, increased compliance costs, and adverse environmental outcomes?

Answer

113 (a)	Regarding assisting landholders to interpret native vegetation mapping on their properties, the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) offers a free Native Vegetation Regulatory (NVR) Map customer service enquiry and property scale map review service for landholders. This has been available since the legislation was introduced in 2017. The DCCEEW website provides detailed information about the NVR Map, land categories, how to access the map and how to use the map viewer. Over 32,500 unique users have accessed the webpages in the last five years. The Draft NVR Map viewer has been accessed by over 68,300 users since commencement of the staged publication in August 2022. DCCEEW's Map Review Team has responded to 1,711 enquiries and provided 767 map explanation reports to landholders. The draft NVR Map was published in five stages from October 2022 to March 2024. Publication was advertised in key regional newspapers and news websites for each stage of release. The DCCEEW NVR Map Customer Service Team provided presentations to key stakeholder groups in 2017 following release of the transitional NVR Map and again before commencement of the draft NVR Map staged release program in 2022. In the last 12 months, the DCCEEW NVR Map Customer Service Team has attended landholder field day events, landholder meetings and NSW Farmers Association landholder' workshops. The Team has provided one on one opportunities for landholders to discuss the NVR Map and to view their mapping or to submit applications for map information packages or map reviews for their landholding. Events have included: • Australia National Field Days – October 2024 • Monaro Reference Group Meeting, Cooma – November 2024 • Upper Snowy Landcare Group – 2024 • NSW Farmers Land Management Workshops at Walgett, Walcha, Moree and Cassilis – July 2025
------------	--

	• NSW Farmers Conference, Sydney – July 2025 • AgQuip 2025, Gunnedah – August 2025. The new Check My Land app was released in June 2025 and has been introduced to landholders at information events since its release. The app uses location services to provide landholders with all land category information relevant to their landholding. The app has been downloaded 1,695 times since release. DCCEEW regularly meets with Local Land Services and provides updates about issues relating to the NVR Map. Regarding landholder guidance on the Land Management Code, this should be referred to the Minister for Agriculture.
114-116	These questions should be referred to the Minister for Agriculture.

Land Management Code – Impact on Agriculture

117	Minister, can you provide details on any discussions or consultations that have taken place between your office and the Minister for Agriculture concerning the proposed changes to the Land Management Code and native vegetation mapping?
118	Minister, how have these discussions addressed the potential impacts on the agriculture industry, including farm productivity, land use, and long-term sustainability?
119	Minister, what is the justification for reducing authorisation periods under the Code from 15 years to 7 or even 3 years?
120	Minister, how does the NSW Government address concerns from farmers who rely on long-term certainty to operate viable and sustainable agricultural businesses?
121	Minister, how has the NSW Government conducted any comprehensive assessment of how these proposed changes will impact the overall management, planning, and viability of farming operations in affected regions?

Answer

117	Discussions and consultations between my office and the Minister for Agriculture’s office are regular and ongoing.
118	Discussions and consultations between my office and the Minister for Agriculture’s office are regular and ongoing. A wide range of land management issues are canvassed. The Government also frequently engages

	with representatives from the agriculture industry.
119-121	These questions should be referred to the Minister for Agriculture.

Land Management Code – Financial Impacts to Landholders

122	Minister, how does the Government anticipate the proposed changes to the Land Management Code will affect land values when farmers decide to sell properties affected by new restrictions?
123	Minister, will the NSW Government consider providing rate relief or other financial concessions where land is effectively "locked up" under the revised Code, rendering it unavailable for productive agricultural use?
124	Minister, for land that is effectively locked up under the revised Land Management Code, how will these changes affect farmers' ability to access, claim, or benefit from carbon credits associated with their land?
125	Minister, what support or guidance will the NSW Government provide to ensure farmers can navigate any new requirements or restrictions relating to carbon credit schemes?
126	Can the Minister explain the rationale for the proposed removal of set-aside discounts, and how the NSW Government expects farmers to respond to having more land effectively locked up in perpetuity, with limited or no productive use?

Answer

122-126	These questions should be referred to the Minister for Agriculture.
---------	---

Sustainable Farming and Re-growth of Vegetation

127	Can the Minister provide details on how the proposed amendments to the Land Management Code will modify existing regrowth management laws and what this means for farmers' ability to manage regrowth vegetation?
128	Minister, how will these changes affect farmers' rights and obligations concerning the clearing, thinning, or treatment of regrowth vegetation on their properties?
129	Minister, will the proposed amendments introduce additional restrictions or compliance burdens that might delay regrowth management, and if so, what measures will the NSW Government implement to minimise adverse effects on farm productivity and environmental health?

130	Minister, how has the NSW Government evaluated how these changes could impact invasive species control, fire risk management, including bushfire mitigation, and the operational costs faced by farmers?
131	Minister, who will be tasked with managing critical environmental threats such as bushfire risk mitigation, feral animal control, and weed infestations within Critically Endangered Ecological Communities (CEECs), especially where private landholders are legally restricted from carrying out such interventions?

Answer

127-131	These questions should be referred to the Minister for Agriculture.
---------	---

HERITAGE

TOD Heritage Scope

132	How many sites within TOD precincts contain heritage items that are excluded from TOD planning controls?
133	What is the total dwelling capacity lost due to these heritage exclusions across all TOD precincts?
134	What is the cost of determining which sites contain excluded heritage items?
(a)	How many site determinations have been disputed or required revision?
135	How many TOD sites contain a mixture of Heritage Conservation Area land and excluded heritage items?
136	What is the average cost of assessment for these mixed sites?
137	How many applications have been withdrawn due to the complexity of mixed heritage constraints?
(a)	What is the average processing time for mixed heritage constraint sites?
138	What is the total number of contributory, neutral, and detracting buildings identified within TOD Heritage Conservation Areas?
139	How many contributory buildings have been approved for demolition since May 2024?
140	How many councils have individually listed contributory buildings to protect them from TOD since March 2023?
141	What is the estimated heritage significance value of contributory buildings approved for demolition?

142	How many council staff across NSW are qualified to assess TOD applications within Heritage Conservation Areas?
(a)	What is the average council processing time for TOD heritage applications since May 2024?
(b)	How many councils have exceeded statutory timeframes for TOD heritage assessments?
(c)	What is the longest processing time recorded for a TOD heritage application?
143	How do council assessment outcomes vary for similar TOD applications in comparable Heritage Conservation Areas?
(a)	What percentage of TOD heritage applications are approved across different councils?
(b)	How many councils have developed additional heritage requirements beyond state requirements?
(c)	What is the cost variation between councils for similar TOD heritage assessments?
144	How many councils have requested additional state funding to build TOD heritage assessment capacity?
(a)	What additional training has been provided to council staff for TOD heritage assessment?
(b)	How many council heritage assessment positions remain vacant across NSW?
(c)	What is the average salary cost for qualified heritage assessment staff?
145	How many heritage professionals in NSW are qualified to provide advice on TOD applications in Heritage Conservation Areas?
(a)	What is the average cost of heritage professional advice for a TOD application?
(b)	What is the average wait time to engage a qualified heritage professional?
(c)	How is the geographic distribution of heritage professionals across metropolitan and regional NSW?
146	How many TOD applications have been delayed pending availability of heritage professional advice?
(a)	What qualifications are required to assess whether developments are "appropriate to context" in Heritage Conservation Areas?

(b)	How many different professional specialties may be required for a single TOD heritage application?
(c)	What is the total professional advice cost for a typical TOD development in a Heritage Conservation Area?
147	What criteria determine when a Heritage Impact Statement is required for TOD applications in Heritage Conservation Areas?
(a)	What percentage of TOD applications in Heritage Conservation Areas have required Heritage Impact Statements since May 2024?
(b)	What is the average cost of preparing a Heritage Impact Statement?
(c)	How many Heritage Impact Statements have been rejected and required revision?
148	Who is qualified to prepare Heritage Impact Statements for TOD applications?
(a)	How many qualified practitioners are available across NSW?
(b)	What is the average preparation time for a Heritage Impact Statement?
(c)	How many TOD applications have been refused due to inadequate Heritage Impact Statements?
149	Since the Department published TOD a heritage guidance document in May 2024, has the average council processing time for Heritage Conservation Area applications decreased?
(a)	What was the average processing time before May 2024 versus after?
(b)	How many councils have formally adopted the May 2024 guidance?
(c)	What was the cost of developing and distributing this guidance?
150	How many clarification requests about TOD heritage processes has the Department received since the May 2024 guidance was published?
(a)	What are the most frequently asked questions about the guidance?
(b)	How many updates or amendments to the guidance have been required?
(c)	How many councils have reported ongoing confusion despite the guidance?
151	How many TOD applications in Heritage Conservation Areas still require Heritage Impact Statements despite the May 2024 guidance stating they "may be required"?

(a)	What percentage of councils continue to routinely request Heritage Impact Statements?
(b)	Has the guidance reduced the variation in Heritage Impact Statement requirements between councils?
152	How many separate guidance documents must applicants consult for TOD applications in Heritage Conservation Areas?
(a)	What is the total page count of all relevant heritage guidance materials?
(b)	How many councils lack current Heritage Conservation Area character statements?
(c)	When were existing Heritage Conservation Area character statements last updated on average?
153	How many pre-application meetings with councils are recommended for TOD applications in Heritage Conservation Areas?
(a)	What is the average cost of pre-application consultation processes?
(b)	How many councils charge fees for pre-application TOD heritage advice?
(c)	What percentage of applications proceed without recommended pre-application engagement?
154	What criteria define "design excellence" for TOD developments in Heritage Conservation Areas?
(a)	Who is qualified to assess design excellence compliance?
(b)	What additional cost does design excellence assessment add per dwelling unit?
(c)	How many design excellence assessments have resulted in application refusal since May 2024?
155	What constitutes an adequate "interpretive approach" for new buildings replacing contributory heritage buildings?
(a)	What additional professional expertise is required to design interpretive approaches?
(b)	How many TOD applications have been required to revise their interpretive approach?
(c)	What is the cost differential between interpretive design and standard apartment design?

156	How many TOD developments have been required to incorporate heritage interpretation elements?
(a)	What is the average cost of heritage interpretation requirements per development?
(b)	How many interpretive approach proposals have been rejected as inadequate?
(c)	What ongoing maintenance costs are associated with heritage interpretation elements?
157	How many TOD applications in Heritage Conservation Areas have failed clause 5.10 LEP assessments since May 2024?
(a)	What are the most common reasons for clause 5.10 assessment failure?
(b)	What additional assessment time does clause 5.10 add to standard TOD processing?
(c)	How many clause 5.10 assessment decisions have been appealed?
158	How do councils interpret "not adversely affected" under clause 5.10 for TOD developments?
(a)	What percentage of councils have consistent interpretation of adverse effect?
(b)	How many TOD applications have been approved despite heritage concerns under clause 5.10?
(c)	What measurable criteria exist for determining adverse heritage impact?
159	How many TOD heritage decisions have been appealed to the Land and Environment Court since May 2024?
(a)	What percentage of appeals have been upheld in favour of heritage protection?
(b)	What is the average cost to applicants of heritage-related TOD appeals?
(c)	What is the average time from council refusal to final appeal determination?
160	How many approved TOD developments in Heritage Conservation Areas have been subject to judicial review?
(a)	What is the success rate of legal challenges to TOD heritage approvals?
(b)	What is the average legal cost for defending TOD heritage decisions?
(c)	How many approved developments have been delayed pending heritage litigation?

161	What legal advice has the government received regarding potential conflicts between TOD SEPP controls and Local Environmental Plan heritage provisions?
(a)	What is the estimated cost of defending heritage-related legal challenges to TOD decisions?
(b)	Has any budget allocation been made for potential court cases?
162	What is the average dwelling yield reduction in Heritage Conservation Areas within TOD precincts compared to non-heritage constrained areas?
(a)	What percentage of original TOD housing targets have been achieved in Heritage Conservation Area precincts?
(b)	How many dwelling units have been lost due to contributory building retention requirements?
(c)	What is the cost per dwelling increase due to heritage requirements in TOD precincts?
163	How many TOD sites have been excluded from development due to heritage significance since May 2024?
(a)	What was the original dwelling capacity of excluded sites?
(b)	What alternative sites have been identified to replace this lost capacity?
(c)	What additional infrastructure cost is involved in developing alternative sites?
164	What percentage of TOD heritage assessment processes utilize digital systems versus manual processes?
(a)	How many separate databases must assessors access for TOD heritage applications?
(b)	What is the average system downtime affecting heritage assessments per month?
(c)	How many assessment steps require manual calculation or measurement?
165	How many heritage assessment criteria were developed before 2010 and remain unchanged?
(a)	What is the average age of guidance documents used for TOD heritage assessment?
(b)	How many heritage databases cannot interface with current planning systems?

Answer

132-144	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
145	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
(a)	Heritage consultants are engaged privately by proponents in confidential commercial arrangements; therefore, the average cost is not known.
(b)	Heritage consultants are engaged by proponents. Therefore, average wait times are not known.
(c)	Heritage consultants are engaged by proponents. Heritage NSW is not aware of a central repository of geographic information.
146-147	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
148	As per the Guidelines for preparing a Statement of Heritage Impact (Department of Planning and Environment 2023) 'an appropriately qualified and experienced heritage professional with expertise relevant to the heritage item. In some cases, a multi-disciplinary team of specialists (such as archaeologists, architects, landscape architects, access consultants and engineers) may need to contribute to its preparation.'
(a)	Please refer to the answer to supplementary question 145.
(b)	Unknown, they are prepared by heritage consultants engaged by proponents.
(c)	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
149-157	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
158 (a-b)	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
(c)	The Material Threshold Policy (Department of Planning and Environment 2022) and Guidelines for preparing a statement of heritage impact (Department of Planning and Environment 2023) provide criteria and detail on how to assess impacts to heritage significance.
159-163	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
164	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.

(a)	Heritage NSW uses two systems for state heritage assessments, the Heritage Management System (which includes the State Heritage Inventory) and the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System. Local heritage matters should be referred to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.
(b)	Heritage NSW routinely plans for system enhancements and production fixes to its Heritage Management System, which may result in a planned system outage. These occur outside of business hours wherever possible to limit impacts to staff and customers. Local heritage matters should be referred to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.
(c)	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
165	In respect to state heritage, the seven current criteria for assessing State heritage significance were developed in 1999 by the Heritage Council of NSW and were gazetted following amendments to the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i>. They promote a standard of practice for those who provide advice, make decisions about, or undertake works to places or objects of heritage significance in NSW. Local councils are not required to use these criteria for assessing significance. Local heritage matters should be referred to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.
(a)	This information is not held by Heritage NSW.
(b)	In respect to State heritage, the Heritage Management System currently integrates with the online Concurrence and Referral service through the NSW Planning Portal. The State Heritage Register curtilage layer is also available via the NSW Planning Portal Spatial Viewer. The Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) is not currently connected with the NSW Planning Portal. Local heritage matters should be referred to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.

Auditor General's Report in State Heritage Assets

166	Have all the recommendations from the 2023 NSW Auditor's Report on Heritage NSW being [sic] implemented? If not, why not?
167	How many State Heritage Register records have been updated since the 2023 audit finding that only 9% had been updated since 2015?
(a)	What budget allocation exists for register updates in 2025-26?
(b)	How many records are targeted for update in 2025-26?

168	What percentage of listed heritage assets now contain physical condition ratings?
(a)	What is the timeline to achieve 100% condition rating coverage?
(b)	What is the annual cost of this program?
169	What percentage of Heritage NSW staff have current conflict of interest declarations?
(a)	What budget allocation exists for improved governance systems?
(b)	What ongoing compliance costs are included in 2025-26?
170	What resources have been allocated to monitor delegated heritage decisions by other government entities?
(a)	What is the annual cost of this monitoring function?
(b)	How many delegated decisions were reviewed in 2024-25?
171	What were Heritage NSW FTE staffing levels in:
(a)	March 2023?
(b)	June 2023?
(c)	June 2024?
(d)	June 2025?
(e)	What is the budgeted FTE level for 2025-26?
172	How many Heritage NSW staff are located in regional NSW offices (excluding Newcastle and Wollongong)?
(a)	What percentage of total workforce does this represent?
(b)	How has this changed since March 2023?
(c)	What is the budget allocation for regional office operations?
173	How many additional FTE positions will be created in 2025-26?
(a)	How many will be based in regional NSW offices?
(b)	What is the budget allocation for staffing increases?
174	What changes have been made to Heritage Council of NSW membership since March 2023?

(a)	What changes have been made to the Heritage Council's committees and advisory bodies, including:
i.	State Heritage Register Committee?
ii.	Approvals Committee?
iii.	Heritage Advisory Panel?
iv.	Technical Advisory Panel?
(b)	What is the annual cost of Heritage Council operations, including all committees and advisory panels?
175	What is the total remuneration package for Heritage Council members and all committee/panel members?
(a)	Have there been changes to member remuneration for the Heritage Council and its committees (State Heritage Register Committee, Approvals Committee, Heritage Advisory Panel, and Technical Advisory Panel) since March 2023?
(b)	What is the annual cost of the new Chairperson position and any committee chair positions?
(c)	What are the specific remuneration arrangements for members of each committee and advisory panel?
176	What recommendations from the Heritage Council and/or its committees have been rejected, knocked back, or not adopted by the Minister since March 2023?
(a)	Provide a comprehensive list of all recommendations from the Heritage Council that were not accepted by the Minister, including:
i.	Date of recommendation
ii.	Nature of the recommendation
iii.	Reason given for rejection/non-adoption
(b)	Provide a detailed breakdown of rejected recommendations from each committee and panel:
i.	State Heritage Register Committee: List all heritage listing recommendations rejected or not proceeded with
ii.	Approvals Committee: List all development approval recommendations overturned or not accepted

iii.	Heritage Advisory Panel: List all policy or strategic recommendations not adopted
iv.	Technical Advisory Panel: List all technical guidance or assessment recommendations rejected
177	Has Heritage NSW conducted heritage needs assessment for regional NSW since March 2023?
(a)	iWhat [sic] were the findings?
(b)	What additional budget allocation is required to address identified needs?
178	What percentage of 2025-26 heritage budget is allocated to regional NSW (excluding Newcastle and Wollongong)?
(a)	What percentage of state-significant heritage items are located in these regions?
(b)	How do these percentages compare to 2024-2025 and 2023-2024?

Answer

166	Yes.
167	Since the 2023 audit finding, seven State Heritage Register items have had major amendments to the listing directed by the Minister. An additional seven State Heritage Register items have been amended to include site specific exemptions. In the 2024–25 financial year, minor amendments to the language of 303 State Heritage Register items occurred.
(a)	There is no specific budget allocation for the amendment of existing State Heritage Register records. This is covered in the existing Heritage NSW budget allocation.
(b)	In the 2025–26 financial year, Heritage NSW has scheduled 25 State Heritage Register items for amendment.
168	Approximately 66% of listings have a physical description value recorded in the Heritage Management System.
(a)	Heritage NSW will continue to work with owners to gather this information.
(b)	There is no specific budget allocation for collating physical condition information. This work is completed in the existing Heritage NSW budget allocation.

169	As at 31 July 2025, 91.5% of Heritage NSW staff have a current Conflict of Interest Declaration. Discrepancies occur due to periods of extended leave from Heritage NSW. Work is underway to finalise remaining declarations.
(a)	Heritage NSW uses the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water's governance systems.
(b)	Compliance is managed in existing Departmental resources.
170	The Heritage Council delegates minor, low value and low risk decision making to a small number of Government agencies who have demonstrated that they have the relevant heritage skill and expertise. The Heritage Council, through Heritage NSW, monitors delegated heritage decisions by other Government entities, as required and in proportion to the risk.
(a)	There is no direct cost attributable to this function. It is a function performed within the existing Heritage NSW budget.
(b)	No delegated decisions undertaken by Government agencies were formally reviewed in 2024–25.
171	Heritage NSW staffing levels:
(a)	127.4 FTE.
(b)	121.4 FTE.
(c)	134.1 FTE.
(d)	149.5 FTE.
(e)	There are no changes to the budget allocation for staffing levels for 2025–26.
172	Heritage NSW has 25 staff based in regional locations, other than Newcastle and Wollongong.
(a)	This represents 16.7% of Heritage NSW employees.
(b)	The number of staff based regionally has increased from March 2023 to August 2025.
(c)	There is no specific budget allocation for regional offices.
173	There is no budget allocation for new ongoing positions at Heritage NSW in 2025–26.
(a)	Not applicable.

(b)	Not applicable.
174	New appointments were made to the Heritage Council to replace outgoing members, as listed below. Members appointed prior to March 2023 who have since left the Heritage Council: • Chair, Frank Howarth – term expired 31 December 2024 • Member, Ian Clarke – term expired 31 December 2024 • Member, Colleen Morris – term expired 19 December 2024 • Member, Robyn Parker – resigned 3 September 2024 • Member, Paul Knight – resigned 3 August 2023 • Member, Daniele Hromek – appointed 1 February 2024 to 31 January 2025 • Observer (NSW Government Architect) Dillon Kombumerri – retired 3 April 2024 New members appointed since March 2023: • Chair, (Gillian) Sally Barnes – appointed 1 January 2025 • Member, Alan Croker – appointed 1 January 2025 • Member, Julian Siu – appointed 1 January 2025 • Member, Lisa Trueman – appointed 1 January 2025 • Member, Steven Meredith – appointed 4 August 2025.
(a)	
i.	Members appointed prior to March 2023 who have since left the committee: • Chair, Robyn Parker – resigned 3 September 2024 • Alternate member, Frank Howarth – term expired 31 December 2024 • Member, Colleen Morris – term expired 19 December 2024 • Member, Paul Knight – resigned 3 August 2023 New members appointed since March 2023: • Member, Vanessa Holtham – appointed 20 February 2025 • Member, Daniele Hromek – appointed 15 April 2025 • Member, Julian Siu – appointed 20 February 2025 • Alternate member, (Gillian) Sally Barnes – appointed 5 February 2025

ii.	Members appointed prior to March 2023 who have since left the committee: • Chair, Ian Clarke – term expired 31 December 2024 • Chair, Dillon Kombumerri – term expired 31 December 2023 • Member, Vanessa Holtham – retired 20 February 2025 • Alternate member, Frank Howarth – term expired 31 December 2024 • Member, Daniele Hromek – moved from Approvals Committee to State Heritage Register Committee 15 Apr 2025 New members appointed since March 2023: • Member, Alan Croker – appointed 20 February 2025 • Alternate member, (Gillian) Sally Barnes – appointed 5 February 2025
iii.	Members appointed prior to March 2023 who have since left the panel: • Chair, Colleen Morris - term expired 19 December 2024 • Member, Paul Ashton – term expired 28 February 2025 • Member, Sheridan Burke – term expired 28 February 2025 • Member, Robert Moore – term expired 28 February 2025 • Member, Matthew Devine – resigned 9 August 2024 • Member, David Nutley – resigned 2 November 2023 • Member, Thomas Bowyer – term expired 31 July 2025 • Member, Gary Waller – term expired 31 July 2025 • Member, Daire Fleming – term expired 31 July 2025 No new members have been appointed since March 2023.
iv.	Members appointed prior to March 2023 who have since left the panel: • Member, Gary Waller – term expired 31 July 2025 • Alternate Member, Daire Fleming – term expired 31 July 2025 • Member, Thomas Bowyer – term expired 31 July 2025 • Member, Sharon Hodgetts – resigned 30 June 2024 • Member, Jacqui Goddard – resigned 30 June 2024 No new members have been appointed since March 2023.
(b)	\$247,265 (2023–24) and \$199,826 (2024–25).
175	\$30,000 per annum for the Chair of the Heritage Council. \$10,000 per annum for members of the Heritage Council. Committee Chairs are Heritage Council members. No additional payment is made.

(a)	Yes. There was redetermination of remuneration for general members of the Heritage Council (from \$7,717 to \$10,000 per annum)
(b)	In addition to the annual stipend, the Heritage Council and Committee Chairs have incurred \$5,019.43 in expenses in the 2024–25 financial year.
(c)	Members of the Heritage Council are remunerated by an annual stipend paid fortnightly. State Heritage Register Committee and the Approvals Committee members (who are not part of the Heritage Council) are paid sitting fees for attendance at meetings: • \$350 per day or \$175 for half day Chair sitting fees • \$220 per day or \$110 for half day Member sitting fees. Heritage Advisory Panel and Technical Advisory Panel members are not paid.
176	
(a) i-iii.	Since March 2023, the Minister has refused seven recommendations from the Heritage Council for State Heritage Register listing. It is important to note that four of these were antiquated recommendations that had been held back from final decision by previous Governments and were all several years old. See Table at Appendix B for further details.
(b)	
i.	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 176 (a).
ii.	The Approvals Committee does not make recommendations to the Minister.
iii.	The Heritage Advisory Panel does not make recommendations to the Minister.
iv.	The Technical Advisory Panel does not make recommendations to the Minister.
177 (a-b)	No needs assessment specific to regional NSW has been undertaken. Consultation feedback from the draft Heritage Strategy, completed in July 2025, identified broad support for more funding for heritage across NSW. This will be considered as part of the final Heritage Strategy.
178	This information is not available. Heritage NSW's budget is not allocated by region.
(a)	Of the 1,805 items listed on the State Heritage Register as of 11 September 2025, 766 (42%) are located in regional areas excluding Greater Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong.

(b)	In the 2023–24 financial year, nine new State Heritage Register listings were located in regional areas, excluding Greater Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong. In the 2024–25 financial year, four new State Heritage Register listings were located in regional areas, excluding Greater Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong.
-----	---

Section 170 Heritage & Conservation Registers

179	How many NSW Government agencies have current s170 Heritage and Conservation Registers?
(a)	What was the compliance rate since March 2023, March 2024, June 2025?
(b)	How many agencies are non-compliant?
(c)	Please provide a list of all agencies that are non-compliant as of June 2025.
180	Is there a specific budget allocation [sic] exists for Heritage NSW to monitor s170 register compliance?
(a)	Is there a specific Team that exists within Heritage NSW to monitor s170 register compliance? If so, what is there [sic] FTE staff profile?
(b)	What enforcement actions have been taken since March 2023?
(c)	What penalties have been applied for non-compliance?
181	What is the total value of heritage assets recorded in government agency s170 registers?
(a)	What percentage have current conservation management plans?
(b)	What percentage have funded maintenance schedules?

Answer

179	Twenty-one (21) government instrumentalities, as defined by the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> , have current Heritage and Conservation Registers.
(a)	Heritage NSW does not hold point-in-time data for these dates.
(b)	Heritage NSW works with agencies to clarify their statutory requirements, but it is up to the agency to determine how they meet the requirements.
(c)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 179 (b).
180	Heritage NSW does not have a specific budget allocation for monitoring

	section 170 compliance. It is covered within the existing budget allocation.
(a)	No. Section 170 compliance is managed within the broader compliance and enforcement function.
(b)	Since March 2023, Heritage NSW has not undertaken any formal litigation or prosecution actions specifically for non-compliance with section 170 listed assets.
(c)	There are no penalty provisions under the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> for non-compliance with section 170, Heritage and Conservation Register.
181	Heritage NSW does not collect this information.
(a)	Conservation Management Plans (CMPs) are a matter for the asset owner. The Heritage Council does not endorse CMPs.
(b)	Heritage NSW does not have this information. Responsibility for maintenance planning and funding rests with the asset holder.

Heritage Act & Planning System Interaction

182	What budget has been allocated to improve Heritage Act and Environmental Planning & Assessment Act integration?
(a)	How many development applications since March 2023 have been subject to both Heritage Act and TOD planning controls?
(b)	What is the average assessment cost for these dual assessments?
183	What budget allocation exists for developing heritage guidance materials for councils?
(a)	How many guidance documents have been produced since March 2023?
(b)	What is the timeline for completion of remaining guidance materials?
184	How many heritage-related planning appeals have been lodged since March 2023?
(a)	How many involved conflicts between heritage protection and housing supply requirements?
(b)	What was the success rate for heritage protection arguments?

Answer

182	There is no specific budget allocated to improve <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> and <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> integration. The Heritage
-----	---

	Strategy that is under development is considering how to improve the alignment between the heritage and planning systems.
(a)	This information is not held by the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water.
(b)	The Heritage NSW fees schedule is available on the Department's website: www.environment.nsw.gov.au/topics/heritage/apply-for-heritage-approvals-and-permits . The fees for other application types will need to be referred to the consent authority.
183	Heritage NSW develops a range of guidance materials intended for a broad audience, which includes local councils, practitioners, and the wider community. There is no budget allocation specifically for developing guidance materials for local councils.
(a)	Fourteen (14) guidance documents have been produced or revised since 2023.
(b)	Heritage NSW manages a rolling program for developing and reviewing its guidance materials. This ensures the information is relevant and fit for purpose.
184 (a-b)	Heritage NSW does not oversee planning appeals. That is the responsibility of the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure.

Heritage Tourism & Economic Outcomes

185	What is the 2025-26 budget allocation for heritage tourism initiatives?
(a)	How is this allocated between regional NSW (excluding Newcastle and Wollongong) and metropolitan areas?
(b)	What is the projected return on investment for each region?
186	What performance indicators measure heritage tourism success?
(a)	What baseline economic data exists?
(b)	What improvement targets have been established for 2025-26?
187	What budget allocation exists for Heritage NSW-Destination NSW partnerships
(a)	What shared funding arrangements are in place?
(b)	What measurable outcomes have been achieved since March 2023?

188	What percentage of recommendations made by the Heritage Council for listing items on the State Heritage Register to the Minister were assessed within the statutory timeframe in 2024-25? Please provide a list of every decision and the number of days between the Council's recommendation and the Minister's decision.
(a)	How does this compare to 2023-24 performance? Please provide a list of every decision and the number of days between the Council's recommendation and the Minister's decision.
(b)	What is the current performance for 2025-26? Please provide a list of every decision and the number of days between the Council's recommendation and the Minister's decision.
189	What is the current average heritage application assessment cost?
(a)	How has this changed since March 2023?
(b)	What cost reduction targets exist for 2025-26?
190	How many heritage applications are currently in the assessment backlog?
(a)	What is the total estimated value of developments affected by assessment delays?
(b)	What additional resources are allocated to reduce backlog in 2025-26?
191	What percentage of heritage decisions made under delegation have been subject to quality assurance review?
(a)	How many decisions have been found to be inconsistent with Heritage Council expectations?
(b)	What corrective actions have been implemented?

Answer

185	Heritage NSW does not have a specific budget for heritage tourism.
(a)	Not applicable.
(b)	Not applicable.
186 (a-b)	Objective 3 of the draft Heritage Strategy is to realise the benefits of heritage. This is anticipated to consider the tourism benefits of heritage, including to Regional NSW. Tourism Australia collects Heritage and Cultural tourism data for NSW, which includes overall visitation and spending by domestic visitors to NSW.

187 (a-b)	Destination NSW and Heritage NSW work together on a range of issues, however there is no specific budget allocation.				
188	100% (18) of recommendations to list were assessed within the statutory timeframe.				
	Project	Date of recommendation	Date Minister received	Date Minister signed	No. of days
	Toganmain Woolshed Complex	3/09/2024	15/11/2024	27/11/2024	12
	Art Gallery of NSW	3/09/2024	14/10/2024	25/10/2024	11
	Mount Kembla Mine Disaster Site and Associated Places	5/11/2024	4/12/2024	17/12/2024	13
	AMP Building (former)	5/11/2024	4/12/2024	17/12/2024	13
	Gosford Courthouse and Police Station (former)	3/12/2024	10/02/2025	18/02/2025	8
	Woolley Townhouse	3/12/2024	21/05/2025	3/06/2025	13*
	Berry's Bay Precinct	3/12/2024	14/03/2025	24/03/2025	10
	Chelmsford Bridge and Leura Cascades Reserve	3/12/2024	29/04/2025	4/05/2025	5
	Ballast Reserve	3/12/2024	18/03/2025	31/03/2025	13
	The Imperial Hotel	3/12/2024	27/02/2025	12/03/2025	13
	Newcastle Ocean Baths	4/02/2025	27/02/2025	12/03/2025	13
	Ithaca Gardens	4/02/2025	17/06/2025	19/06/2025	2
	Lady Gowrie Child Centre	4/03/2025	30/04/2025	4/05/2025	4
	Walter McGrath House	4/03/2025	20/05/2025	22/05/2025	2
	Transport House	6/05/2025	20/08/2025	21/08/2025	1
	Balls Head Reserve	6/05/2025	16/07/2025	17/07/2025	1

	Yurulbin Park	6/05/2025	15/07/2025	17/07/2025	2
	Abercrombie Bridge	6/05/2025	19/08/2025	26/08/2025	7
	* Indicates decision to refer matter to the Independent Planning Commission (IPC). Decision on whether to direct the listing is anticipated following IPC review.				
(a)	88% (15) of recommendations to list were assessed within the statutory timeframe.				
	Project	Date of recommendation	Date Minister received	Date Minister signed	No. of days
	Manilla Railway Viaduct and Underbridge	4/07/2023	8/09/2023	19/09/2023	11
	Sydney Croquet Clubhouse, its Collections, Lawns and Grounds	4/07/2023	9/11/2023	19/11/2023	10
	Bouddi Farm	29/08/2023	9/11/2023	19/11/2023	10
	Nan Tien Temple	3/10/2023	12/03/2024	25/03/2024	13
	Ravensworth Homestead Complex and Setting	21/11/2023	29/11/2023	Under consideration	666
	Victoria Pass and Berghofers Pass	4/12/2023	26/02/2024	6/03/2024	9
	Wellington Town Common	4/12/2023	26/02/2024	6/03/2024	9
	Greenway	4/12/2023	6/12/2024	18/12/2024	12
	Fitz Roy Iron Works Precinct (and moveable heritage)	6/02/2024	14/05/2024	28/05/2024	14
	Hayden Orpheum Picture Palace	6/02/2024	16/05/2024	25/05/2024	9
	Kwong War Chong Building	5/03/2024	30/05/2024	9/06/2024	10

	Transport House, Redfern (former) / The Performance Space (former)	2/04/2024	28/05/2024	3/06/2024	6
	Gooribal Cultural Landscape	2/04/2024	19/06/2024	27/06/2024	8
	Captain Moonlite and James Nesbitt's Graves	7/05/2024	19/06/2024	27/06/2024	8
	Cooma Gaol	7/05/2024	19/06/2024	2/07/2024	13
	Warringah Civic Centre Precinct	4/06/2024	9/12/2024	18/12/2024	9
	Elsie Refuge	4/06/2024	16/08/2024	29/08/2024	13
	Kameruka Golf Course	3/10/2023	11/12/2023	12/02/2024	63
(b)	No listing decisions have been made following the recommendation of the Heritage Council in the 2025–26 financial year.				
189	Heritage NSW application fee schedules are available on the Department's website: www.environment.nsw.gov.au/topics/heritage/apply-for-heritage-approvals-and-permits. Fees relating to other heritage assessments should be sourced from the relevant consent authority.				
(a)	There has been no change to Heritage NSW's application fee schedule since March 2023.				
(b)	There is no cost reduction target for heritage assessments under the <i>Heritage Act 1997</i> .				
190	There is no heritage assessment backlog for Heritage NSW.				
(a-b)	In 2024–25, Heritage NSW has exceeded 90% on time performance targets across all assessment types.				
191	Heritage NSW has internal review processes that ensure all assessments are reviewed before a delegate makes a decision. The Heritage Council determines heritage assessments that are deemed to be more complex.				
(a)	Heritage NSW provides the Heritage Council with appropriate oversight in accordance with agreed practices.				

(b)	Not applicable.
-----	-----------------

Ministerial Conduct and Compliance questions

192	Can the Minister confirm compliance with the Grants Administration Guide across all portfolios since March 2023?
(a)	Have all grant decisions been documented in accordance with the Guide's requirements?
(b)	Have all grant assessment processes followed the mandatory procedures outlined in the Guide?
(c)	Can you table all internal compliance reviews conducted since March 2023?
193	Have all grants administered by the Minister's offices been subject to appropriate probity measures as required by the Grants Administration Guide?
(a)	How many grants have been assessed by independent probity advisors since March 2023?
(b)	What is the total cost of external probity advice across all portfolios since March 2023?
(c)	Can you table all probity reports and advice received?
194	Have all conflict of interest declarations been completed for grants processes involving the Minister or her staff since March 2023?
(a)	How many conflict of interest situations have been identified and managed?
(b)	Can you table all conflict of interest registers maintained by the Minister's offices?
(c)	What processes are in place to monitor ongoing conflicts of interest?
195	What probity and conduct training have the Minister and ministerial staff completed since March 2023?
(a)	Can you provide details of all training courses, dates, and participants?
(b)	What is the total cost of probity training across the Minister's offices?
(c)	How frequently is refresher training conducted?
196	Have all ministerial staff completed mandatory ethics and conduct training?
(a)	Can you table training completion records for all staff since March 2023?

(b)	What disciplinary or corrective actions have been taken for non-compliance with conduct requirements?
(c)	How many staff have been reminded of their obligations under the Ministerial Code of Conduct?
197	Will the Minister table all records of ministerial vehicle usage since March 2023?
(a)	Can you provide details of all official and private use of ministerial vehicles?
(b)	What is the total cost of ministerial vehicle usage including fuel, maintenance, and driver costs?
(c)	How many occasions has the ministerial vehicle been used for non-official purposes?
198	Can you table all travel expenses claimed by the Minister and her staff since March 2023?
(a)	What is the total cost of domestic and international travel?
(b)	How many family members have accompanied the Minister on official travel?
(c)	What processes exist to approve and monitor travel expenses?
199	Can the Minister confirm that all dealings, decisions, and conduct have been above board and ethical since March 2023?
(a)	Have any complaints or concerns been raised about ministerial conduct?
(b)	What processes exist for reporting and investigating conduct concerns?
(c)	Can you confirm that no disciplinary actions or corrective measures have been required?

Answer

192-196	The Grants Administration Guide provides guidance in relation to grant administration obligations in accordance with the Premier’s Memorandum M2024-03 Grants Administration Guide and the <i>Government Sector Finance Act 2018</i>. Further information is available on the website (https://arp.nsw.gov.au/m2024-03-grants-administration-guide). All Ministers' offices and Government agencies are expected to comply with their obligations under the Grants Administration Guide. Grants administered in my portfolios are routinely assessed for compliance with the requirements
---------	--

	of the guide. Additionally, all Ministers are expected to comply with their obligations under the NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct (Ministerial Code) at all times. Among other matters, the Ministerial Code requires Ministers to identify, avoid and manage conflicts of interest. All Ministerial staff are required to comply with the NSW Office Holder's Staff Code of Conduct, including obligations to take reasonable steps to avoid, and in all cases disclose, any actual or potential conflicts of interest (real or apparent). The Cabinet Office also provide guidance, advice, training and support on these obligations for Ministers' offices.
197 (a-c)	Ministerial vehicle use is managed in accordance with the Ministers' Office Handbook. Further information and a copy of Ministers' Office Handbook can be found on the Premier's Department website (www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/premiers-department/ministers-office-handbook).
198 (a-c)	Ministerial travel is managed in accordance with the Ministers' Office Handbook. Premier and Ministers' domestic travel information is published on the Premier's Department's website (www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/premiers-department/access-to-information/premier-and-ministers-domestic-travel). Ministerial overseas travel information is published on the Premier's Department's website (www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/premiers-department/access-to-information/ministerial-overseas-travel-information).
199 (a-c)	All Ministers are expected to comply with their obligations under the NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct (Ministerial Code) at all times. The Ministerial Code sets the ethical standards of behaviour required of Ministers and establishes practices and procedures to assist with compliance. Among other matters, the Ministerial Code requires Ministers to: • disclose their pecuniary interests and those of their immediate family members to the Premier • seek rulings from the Premier if they wish to hold shares, directorships, other business interests or engage in secondary employment (known as 'prohibited interests') • identify, avoid, disclose and manage conflicts of interest • disclose gifts and hospitality with a market value over \$500. A substantial breach of the Ministerial Code (including a knowing breach of

	any provision of the Schedule) may constitute corrupt conduct for the purposes of the <i>Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988</i> .
--	---

CFMEU meetings

200	Since 28 March 2023, have you met with the Construction, Forestry and Maritime Employees Union (CFMEU) that was not disclosed in accordance with the Premier’s Memorandum M2015-05 Publication of Ministerial Diaries and Release of Overseas Travel Information?
-----	---

Answer

200	In accordance with the Premier’s Memorandum M2015-05 Publication of Ministerial Diaries and Release of Overseas Travel Information, all Ministers publish extracts from their diaries, summarising details of scheduled meetings held with stakeholders, external organisations, third-party lobbyists and individuals. Ministers are not required to disclose details of the following meetings: • meetings involving Ministers, ministerial staff, parliamentarians or government officials (whether from NSW or other jurisdictions) • meetings that are strictly personal, electorate or party political • social or public functions or events • meetings held overseas (which must be disclosed in accordance with regulation 6(1)(b) of the Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2018 and Attachment B to the Premier’s Memorandum), and • matters for which there is an overriding public interest against disclosure. Ministers’ diary disclosures are published quarterly on The Cabinet Office’s website (https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/cabinet-office/access-to-information/ministers-diary-disclosures).
-----	---

ETU meetings

201	Since 28 March 2023, have you met with the Electrical Trades Union (ETU) that was not disclosed in accordance with the Premier’s Memorandum M2015-05 Publication of Ministerial Diaries and Release of Overseas Travel Information?
-----	---

Answer

201	In accordance with the Premier’s Memorandum M2015-05 Publication of Ministerial Diaries and Release of Overseas Travel Information, all Ministers publish extracts from their diaries, summarising details of scheduled meetings held with stakeholders, external organisations, third-party lobbyists and individuals. Ministers are not required to disclose details of the following meetings:
-----	--

	- meetings involving Ministers, ministerial staff, parliamentarians or government officials (whether from NSW or other jurisdictions) - meetings that are strictly personal, electorate or party political - social or public functions or events - meetings held overseas (which must be disclosed in accordance with regulation 6(1)(b) of the Government Information (Public Access) Regulation 2018 and Attachment B to the Premier's Memorandum), and - matters for which there is an overriding public interest against disclosure. Ministers' diary disclosures are published quarterly on The Cabinet Office's website (https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/cabinet-office/access-to-information/ministers-diary-disclosures).
--	--

Ministerial disclosures to The Cabinet Office

202	On what date did you last update/make a ministerial disclosure to the Premier and the Secretary of The Cabinet Office?
-----	--

Answer

202	The Ministerial Code of Conduct (Ministerial Code) requires Ministers to make certain disclosures to the Premier and the Secretary of The Cabinet Office. I comply with my obligations under the Ministerial Code.
-----	--

Department(s)/Agency(s) Employees

203	In relation to redundancies, will this be made available in your respective Department(s)/Agency(s) Annual Reports?
-----	---

Answer

203	Information about any redundancies within agencies is published in the agency annual reports. Published annual reports can be accessed on agency websites.
-----	--

Department(s)/Agency(s) Annual Reports

204	Do you have plans to print the 2024-25 annual report(s) for each department / agency in your portfolio?
(a)	If yes, what is the budgeted expenditure for printing for each department / agency?

Answer

204 (a)	Annual reports should be prepared in accordance with the Treasury Policy and Guidelines – Framework for Financial and Annual Reporting (TPG25-10).
------------	--

State Records Act

205	Have you and your ministerial office had training and/or a briefing about the State Records Act from State Records NSW and/or The Cabinet Office and/or Premier's Department?
(a)	If yes, when?

Answer

205	The Ministers' Office Handbook provides guidance in relation to recordkeeping obligations under the <i>State Records Act 1998</i> .
(a)	The Cabinet Office also provides guidance, advice, training and support on these obligations for Ministers' offices. Further information is available on State Records NSW's website (www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/dciths/state-records-nsw). All Ministers' offices are expected to comply with their obligations under the <i>State Records Act 1998</i> .

Department(s)/Agency(s) Gifts and Hospitality Register

206	Does your portfolio department(s)/agency(s) have a gifts and/or hospitality register?
(a)	If yes, is it available online?
i,	If yes, what is the website URL?

Answer

206	Yes.
(a)	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water's (DCCEEW's) gifts, benefits and hospitality register is available online. The NSW Environment Protection Authority and Taronga Conservation Society Australia maintain separate registers, which are not available online.
i.	The DCCEEW gifts, benefits and hospitality register is available at: www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/dcceew/information-access-governance-and-feedback/gifts-benefits-and-hospitality-register .

Ministerial staff disclosure of gifts and/or hospitality

207	Does your ministerial office keep a register of gifts and/or hospitality for staff to make disclosures?
(a)	If yes, what is the website URL?

208	Have any staff members in your office been the recipient of any free hospitality?
(a)	What was the total value of the hospitality received?
(b)	Are these gifts of hospitality declared?

Answer

207 (a)	All Ministerial staff are required to comply with the Gifts, Hospitality and Benefits Policy for Office Holder Staff attached to the Ministers' Office Handbook and available on the NSW Government website.
208 (a-b)	All Ministerial staff are required to comply with their disclosure obligations under the Gifts, Hospitality and Benefits Policy for Office Holder Staff and I expect them to do so. A breach of the Policy may be a breach of the Office Holder's Staff Code of Conduct. The Policy includes disclosure obligations for Ministerial staff in respect of gifts, hospitality and benefits over \$150. If a Ministerial staff member is required by their role to accompany their Office Holder at an event that the Office Holder is attending as the State's representative, or where the Office Holder has asked the staff member to attend, then attendance at that event would not constitute a gift or benefit for the purposes of the Policy.

Ministerial Code of Conduct

209	Since 28 March 2023, have you breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct?
(a)	If yes, what was the breach?

Answer

209 (a)	All Ministers are expected to comply with their obligations under the NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct (Ministerial Code) at all times. The Ministerial Code sets the ethical standards of behaviour required of Ministers and establishes practices and procedures to assist with compliance. Among other matters, the Ministerial Code requires Ministers to: • disclose their pecuniary interests and those of their immediate family members to the Premier • seek rulings from the Premier if they wish to hold shares, directorships, other business interests or engage in secondary employment (known as 'prohibited interests')
------------	--

	• identify, avoid, disclose and manage conflicts of interest • disclose gifts and hospitality with a market value over \$500. A substantial breach of the Ministerial Code (including a knowing breach of any provision of the Schedule) may constitute corrupt conduct for the purposes of the <i>Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988</i>.
--	---

Senior Executive Drivers

210	As at 1 August 2025, how many senior executives in your portfolio department(s) / agency(s) have a driver?
-----	--

Answer

210	None.
-----	-------

GIPA Act - Disclosure Log & Ministerial Offices

211	Does your Ministerial Office have a disclosure log in accordance with the Government Information (Public Access Act) 2009?
(a)	If yes, what is the URL?

Answer

211 (a)	The Ministerial Office disclosure log is available on the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water website.
------------	--

GIPA Act - Disclosure Log & Departments/Agencies

212	What is the website URL for the Government Information (Public Access Act) 2009 disclosure log each of your portfolio department(s) / agency(s)?
-----	--

Answer

212	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water disclosure log is located at: www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/dcceew/information-access-governance-and-feedback/disclosure-log. The NSW Environment Protection Authority disclosure log is located at: www.epa.nsw.gov.au/About-us/Access-to-information/disclosure-log. The Taronga Conservation Society Australia disclosure log is located at: taronga.org.au/about/governance/obtaining-information.
-----	--

TikTok

213	Are you on TikTok?
-----	--------------------

(a)	If yes, do you access TikTok from a NSW Government device?
-----	--

Answer

213 (a)	The Circular DCS-2025-01 Cyber Security NSW Directive - Restricted Applications List advises how NSW Government agencies are required to appropriately manage risks to NSW Government information on government-issued devices, or personal devices that are used for government business.
------------	--

Signal

214	Are you on Signal?
(a)	If yes, do you access Signal from a NSW Government device?
(b)	If yes, does Signal comply with the State Records Act?

Answer

214 (a-b)	Like the former Coalition Government, the NSW Government uses a range of digital systems and communications that have been approved for use and may be utilised where there is a valid business requirement. This has been established practice under successive governments. State records are a vital public asset, and access to Government information is essential to maintaining public trust in government. I comply with my obligations under the <i>State Records Act 1998</i>.
--------------	--

Training

215	Since 28 March 2023, have you had training from an external stakeholder that included an invoice and payment paid for using your ministerial budget?
(a)	If yes, what is the description of training?
(b)	If yes, how much?

Answer

215 (a-b)	Ministers have undertaken a program of Ministerial induction training. Ministers have undertaken training on the Respectful Workplace Policy. Members of Parliament are provided with a Skills Development Allowance that may be used in a manner consistent with the Parliamentary Remuneration Tribunal Annual Determination. Ministerial Office Budgets are managed in accordance with the Ministers' Office Handbook.
--------------	---

Parliamentary Secretary & Ministerial Vehicle

216	Has your Parliamentary Secretary ever used a Ministerial driver from the pool?
(a)	If yes, why?

Answer

216 (a)	The Ministers' Office Handbook provides that the Premier's Department transport services may be used by Parliamentary Secretaries for official business trips in connection with their duties as Parliamentary Secretaries, with costs paid from the Ministers' office budget.
------------	--

Media releases and statements

217	Are all the ministerial media releases and statements issued by you publicly available at https://www.nsw.gov.au/ministerial-releases ?
(a)	If no, why?

Answer

217 (a)	The Department of Customer Service is responsible for managing www.nsw.gov.au/media-releases and the publication of media releases.
------------	--

Overseas Travel

218	As Minister, do you approve overseas travel for public servants from your portfolio department(s)/agency(s)?
-----	--

Answer

218	The NSW Government Travel and Transport Policy provides a framework for NSW Government travelling employees and covers official air and land travel by public officials using public money. Section 2.1 of that Policy sets out approvals required in relation to overseas travel. Further information in relation to the Policy can be found here: www.info.buy.nsw.gov.au/policy-library/policies/travel-and-transport-policy. Treasury Policy and Guidelines – Framework for Financial and Annual Reporting (TPG25-10) requires agencies to include information on overseas visits by officers and employees in agency annual reports.
-----	--

Data Breaches

219	Does your portfolio department(s)/agency(s) keep a register of data breaches in accordance with the Privacy and Personal Information Protection (PPIP) Act?
(a)	If yes, what is the website?

Answer

219	Yes.
(a)	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water register is available at: www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/dcceew/information-access-governance-and-feedback. The NSW Environment Protection Authority register is available at: www.epa.nsw.gov.au/About-us/Contact-us/Website-service-standards/privacy. The Taronga Conservation Society Australia register is available at: taronga.org.au/about-taronga/publications/tarongas-data-breach-policy.

Discretionary Fund

220	As Minister, so [sic] you have a discretionary fund?
(a)	If yes, what department(s) / agency(s) administer it?
(b)	If yes, what is the website URL detailing expenditure?

Answer

220	No.
(a)	Not applicable.
(b)	Not applicable.

Airline Lounges

221	Are you a member of the Qantas Chairmans Lounge?
222	Are you a member of the Virgin Beyond Lounge?

Answer

221	The Constitution (Disclosures by Members) Regulation 1983 (Regulation) sets out Members' obligations to disclose relevant pecuniary and other interests in periodic returns to Parliament. The Legislative Assembly Standing Committee on Parliamentary Privilege and Ethics Report on Review of the Code of Conduct, Aspects of Disclosure of Interests, and Related Issues (December 2010) notes that: "Advice has been received from the Crown Solicitor that use of the Chairman's Lounge by invitation is not a "gift" for the purposes of clause 10 of the Regulation, as it does not involve disposition of property. However, when the membership leads to an upgrade valued at more than \$250, it becomes
-----	--

	disclosable as a contribution to travel, and should be reported under clause 11 of the Regulation.” Clause 16 of the Regulation allows a Member to, at their discretion, disclose any direct or indirect benefit, advantage or liability, whether pecuniary or not. Relevant disclosures have been made to The Cabinet Office and to the NSW Parliament.
222	The Constitution (Disclosures by Members) Regulation 1983 (Regulation) sets out Members’ obligations to disclose relevant pecuniary and other interests in periodic returns to Parliament. The Legislative Assembly Standing Committee on Parliamentary Privilege and Ethics Report on Review of the Code of Conduct, Aspects of Disclosure of Interests, and Related Issues (December 2010) notes that: “Advice has been received from the Crown Solicitor that use of the Chairman's Lounge by invitation is not a "gift" for the purposes of clause 10 of the Regulation, as it does not involve disposition of property. However, when the membership leads to an upgrade valued at more than \$250, it becomes disclosable as a contribution to travel, and should be reported under clause 11 of the Regulation.” Clause 16 of the Regulation allows a Member to, at their discretion, disclose any direct or indirect benefit, advantage or liability, whether pecuniary or not. Relevant disclosures have been made to The Cabinet Office and to the NSW Parliament.

Ministerial Overseas Travel

223	Since 28 March 2023, have you formally applied to the Premier to travel overseas?
(a)	If yes, was this application accepted?

Answer

223 (a)	Ministerial overseas travel information is published online. https://www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/premiers-department/access-to-information/ministerial-overseas-travel-information.
------------	---

Private Jet Charter

224	Have you travelled on a private jet charter in your Ministerial capacity?
(a)	If yes, was this value for money for taxpayers?

Answer

224 (a)	Premier and Ministers’ domestic travel information is published on the Premier’s Department’s website at: www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/premiers-department/access-to-information/premier-and-ministers-domestic-travel .
------------	--

Ministerial Office renovations

225	Since 28 March 2023, has your Ministerial Office at 52 Martin Place been renovated?
(a)	If yes, how much was the expenditure?

Answer

225 (a)	Leasehold improvements for Ministerial Offices are reported within the Premier’s Department annual reports.
------------	---

Conflict of Interest

226	Since 28 March 2023, have you formally written to the Premier with a conflict of interest?
(a)	If yes, why?

Answer

226 (a)	All Ministers are expected to comply with their obligations under the NSW Ministerial Code of Conduct (Ministerial Code) at all times. The Ministerial Code sets the ethical standards of behaviour required of Ministers and establishes practices and procedures to assist with compliance. Among other matters, the Ministerial Code requires Ministers to: • disclose their pecuniary interests and those of their immediate family members to the Premier • seek rulings from the Premier if they wish to hold shares, directorships, other business interests or engage in secondary employment (known as ‘prohibited interests’) • identify, avoid, disclose and manage conflicts of interest • disclose gifts and hospitality with a market value over \$500. A substantial breach of the Ministerial Code (including a knowing breach of any provision of the Schedule) may constitute corrupt conduct for the purposes of the <i>Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988</i>.
------------	---

Questions from Ms Sue Higginson MLC

CLIMATE CHANGE

Guide for Large Emitters

227	Do you think the Guide for Large Emitters has changed the way that new coal expansions are assessed and determined?
(a)	If yes, how would you describe those changes?
(b)	What impact do you think the Guide has had to date on the assessment and/or determination of new coal expansions?
228	What is NSW EPA’s responsibility - as lead climate regulator in NSW - in a situation where a proposed new coal-mine expansion is found by the EPA to be incompatible with meeting legislated climate targets?
229	Would the NSW EPA have a responsibility to clearly state in advice to either NSW DPHI or the NSW IPC that the NSW EPA objects to the project going ahead?

Answer

227	Yes.
(a)	Proposals emitting more than 25,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions per annum are providing more information about their greenhouse gas emissions. More proposals are now considering ways to avoid greenhouse gas emissions and increase mitigation measures. For example, the revised Hunter Valley Operations proposal claims to reduce around 11.5 million tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions compared with what was proposed in the original Environmental Impact Statement and Response to Submissions report. The NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has not yet finalised its assessment of the revised proposal.
(b)	Since the EPA finalised the Guide for Large Emitters in January 2025, the EPA and the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure are in a stronger position to require proponents to provide clear details about: • emissions • mitigation measures • emissions reduction goals. Decision makers are better informed about the climate change impacts of proposals when making consent determinations. Where greenhouse gas assessments do not have clear details on emissions,

	mitigation measures and emission reduction goals, the EPA requests additional greenhouse gas information during the assessment stage of the project.
228	The EPA provides advice into the planning process to ensure that when determining development applications, planning consent authorities are informed about the climate change impacts of proposed new projects and modifications. The EPA is not a planning authority and does not approve planning proposals.
229	The EPA is not a planning authority and does not approve planning proposals. Planning authorities, such as the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces, the Independent Planning Commission, and local government, are responsible for determining planning applications in accordance with the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>. The EPA, in its advisory role to the planning process, does not object nor support state significant development applications. However, the EPA reviews the greenhouse gas information and provides advice to planning authorities on whether the greenhouse gas assessment for large projects is prepared consistent with the Guide for Large Emitters.

Bowdens Mine

230	Will you commit to meeting with the Mudgee community with regard to the lead mining exclusion zone?
231	Will you work with other relevant Ministers and genuinely consider making the Mudgee region a lead mining exclusion zone?
232	Recent Local Land Service mapping around the proposed Bowdens mine and its proposed transmission route has mapped numerous greater gliders there. Your department has responsibility to advise on major developments, and it would make sense that you would be required to look at their assessments for the transmission line. Have you done that yet?
233	Are you satisfied that the proponent of the development has done a comprehensive analysis of the impacts of the transmission line area?
(a)	In your view, is a desktop analysis sufficient?
(b)	The desktop analysis done by the proponent makes no mention of greater gliders, in contradiction with the Local Land Services maps. Will you be raising this issue with the proponent?
234	Have the assessments for this mine not been updated to reflect current statutory requirements?

(a)	If yes, when?
(b)	If not, why not?
235	The original EIS assessment for the mine was done in 2020 and undertaken before the greater glider was declared endangered and found no greater gliders in or near the mine site. The Department of Planning has advised advocates that they need to help Planning to alert them of any aspect of the project that needs updating. Are environmental assessments the job of your Department or of the community?
236	Have you been asked by the Department of Planning to ensure that its assessments of the greater glider and any other endangered or vulnerable species declared since the original assessments are up to date?
(a)	If so, on what date?
237	Given that a Department of Planning brief for Secretary Fishburn states that the Bowdens lead mine application will “include a high-level assessment of the powerline as offsite enabling infrastructure, along with updated statutory consideration”, are you satisfied this process has occurred?
(a)	In this case, what do you consider to be a high-level assessment?
(b)	Does the assessment incorporate an updated statutory consideration?

Answer

230	I am happy to consider a meeting with the relevant community group. The NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) is committed to meeting with stakeholders to discuss matters which are of concern to them. Requests to meet with the EPA can be arranged by emailing engagement@epa.nsw.gov.au.
231	I work with other Ministers regularly and consistently across a range of portfolio issues and will continue to do so. I understand that the Mudgee community group has already written to myself and other Ministers about this issue.
232	Questions about the planning and assessment process for the Bowdens Silver transmission line should be referred to the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI), the lead agency for assessment requirements under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>. The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water and the EPA are responsible for reviewing assessment documents referred from DPHI.

233-237	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 232.
---------	--

Redbank Proposal

238	Are you aware that the 'Restart of Redbank Power Station' proposal currently before the Independent Planning Commission is seeking approval to burn native vegetation obtained via land clearing to produce energy?
239	Are you aware that the NSW Labor policy platform states 'Labor recognises that burning timber and cleared vegetation for electricity is not carbon neutral and is neither clean or renewable energy, and therefore forms no part of a credible strategy for reducing greenhouse emissions'?
(a)	Is the Redbank proposal consistent with this?
240	What is Labor's timeline for implementing your policy to 'introduce legislation to prohibit the burning of any forests and cleared vegetation for electricity'?
(a)	Will this commitment be fulfilled by the end of the term?

Answer

238	Yes. However, since submitting this question, the Redbank proposal has been declined by the IPC.
239	Yes.
(a)	The Redbank proposal has been refused.
240 (a)	There is no current timeline.

Closing the Gap

241	Have you read the Jumbunna Report into Closing the Gap?
242	What is your response to recommendation 8b, which posits that climate change impacts on First Nations communities should be included in the National Agreement on closing the gap?
(a)	Do you support this recommendation?
(b)	What steps have you taken to support this recommendation?

Answer

241	I am aware of the Jumbunna Report into Closing the Gap.
242 (a-b)	The formal response to the report is being facilitated by National Joint Council, the National governance forum for Closing the Gap. This question should be referred to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Treaty who is representing the NSW Government at this forum.

ACCUs

243	How many submissions have you received against proposed changes to the application of ACCUs under the Improved Native Forest Management scheme?
(a)	How many submissions have you received in favour?
(b)	Were any of those submissions from fossil fuel corporations or lobbyists?
244	Can you rule out generating any ACCUs from the proposed 176,000 hectares of Great Koala National park that have already been promised protection?
(a)	If not, why not?
243	Have you done any modelling on how many carbon credits could be generated from areas originally proposed within the 176,000 hectares of Great Koala National Park?
(a)	Has any modelling been provided to the coal, oil or gas industry?
(b)	Have you had any conversations with lobbyists or donors from this industry about changes to ACCUs?

Answer

243	3,325 submissions were received. The submissions were analysed to inform amendments and improvements to the draft method. The proportion 'for' and 'against' the proposed method was not quantified.
(a)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 243.
(b)	No.
244	No.
(a)	The final creation of the park is dependent on the successful registration of a carbon project under the Improved Native Forest Management Method, which is currently moving through Australian Government assessment processes. The project will identify the 176,000 hectares as a carbon protection area.

245	Yes.
(a)	No.
(b)	No.

ENVIRONMENT

Koala Strategy

246	Where is the Review of the NSW Koala Strategy up to?
247	By what date will we know the outcomes of the Review?
248	How much of the 190 million dollar NSW Koala Strategy funding envelope to 2026 is still unspent?
(a)	What amount for each of the 4 Pillars have remaining funds available?

Answer

246	The Government is developing a NSW Nature Strategy in line with the commitments in the NSW Plan for Nature, to guide actions to protect, restore and enhance ecosystems and landscapes across NSW. The Government is building on its 2024 review of the NSW Koala Strategy within this context and is examining the current approach to koala conservation and to identify future conservation priorities.														
247	The current NSW Koala Strategy ends in mid-2026. It is expected the outcomes of the review will be known at that time.														
248	\$21,398,441														
(a)	<table><tr><th></th><th>Budget for 2025–26 to spend</th></tr><tr><td>Pillar 1 – Koala habitat conservation</td><td>\$9,628,253</td></tr><tr><td>Pillar 2 – Supporting local communities to conserve koalas</td><td>\$2,002,751</td></tr><tr><td>Pillar 3 – Improving the safety and health of koalas</td><td>\$4,903,974</td></tr><tr><td>Pillar 4 – Building our knowledge of koalas</td><td>\$3,639,085</td></tr><tr><td>Project management and administration costs</td><td>\$1,224,378</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>\$21,398,441</td></tr></table>		Budget for 2025–26 to spend	Pillar 1 – Koala habitat conservation	\$9,628,253	Pillar 2 – Supporting local communities to conserve koalas	\$2,002,751	Pillar 3 – Improving the safety and health of koalas	\$4,903,974	Pillar 4 – Building our knowledge of koalas	\$3,639,085	Project management and administration costs	\$1,224,378		\$21,398,441
	Budget for 2025–26 to spend														
Pillar 1 – Koala habitat conservation	\$9,628,253														
Pillar 2 – Supporting local communities to conserve koalas	\$2,002,751														
Pillar 3 – Improving the safety and health of koalas	\$4,903,974														
Pillar 4 – Building our knowledge of koalas	\$3,639,085														
Project management and administration costs	\$1,224,378														
	\$21,398,441														

NSW State of the Environment Report

249	Why does the NSW State of the Environment Report not support Local Government Area-Scale breakdowns?
(a)	Will you commit to ensuring this occurs?
250	How can you justify an eight-month delay in the tabling of the 2024 State of the Environment Report?
251	What specific steps have you taken to address the 2024 Report’s finding that 36 new species have been added to the threatened species list since 2020 and a 5% increase in the number of animal species threatened with extinction have been added?
252	What specific steps have you taken to address:
(a)	significant losses to woody and non-woody native vegetation?
(b)	increasing rates of soil acidification?
(b)	plummeting levels of organic carbon in our soil?

Answer

249	The NSW State of the Environment report covers the matters required by the <i>Protection of the Environment Administration Act 1991</i> and reports on these on a statewide basis.
(a)	No, the report will continue to meet the requirements of the <i>Protection of the Environment Administration Act 1991</i> . The 2024 and 2021 online reports include map viewers which have functionality to view geospatial data sets at finer levels of detail, however these datasets are not always aligned to local government areas due to differences in data collection and analysis.
250	There was not a delay in tabling the report. As has been noted on the record several times, section 10 of the <i>Protection of the Environment Administration Act 1991</i> requires the NSW Environment Protection Authority to make a report on the state of the environment every three years. There is no statutory timeframe for the tabling of the report. While the first report was due by 31 October 1993, subsequent reports have typically been finalised by the end of the calendar year and tabled in Parliament in the following year.
251	To address the decline of threatened species, the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) is delivering targeted programs, such as the Saving our Species program and the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service Threatened Species Framework. The Saving our Species Program requires that newly listed threatened species

	have a conservation strategy developed within two years of listing. Conservation strategies outline actions to secure the species from extinction. Identified management actions can then be funded to support species recovery and minimise extinction risk. The Government is currently reviewing our biodiversity conservation programs and fulfilling the commitments in the NSW Plan for Nature, including amending relevant legislation to put nature on a path to recovery.
252	
(a)	The NSW Plan for Nature commits to an integrated package of changes to the land management framework, to support the Government's commitment to stop excess land clearing. This includes amendments to strengthen protections related to clearing under the <i>Land Management (Native Vegetation) Code 2018</i> and reduce unallocated clearing. Responsibility for changes to the framework, including the recent proposed amendments to the Code, sits with the Minister for Agriculture. The Government has engaged the Natural Resources Commission to provide independent advice on strengthening key elements of the land management framework, including the management of native grasslands and non-woody groundcover. Importantly, the Government has requested the Natural Resources Commission establish an independent Advisory Panel made up of farming, environment, First Nations and scientific representatives. This large body of work will make recommendations to the Government on how to protect and restore biodiversity and ecosystem functions in regional landscapes while also enhancing value and support for landholders. This advice will help shape our reforms and guide implementation of the NSW Plan for Nature. DCCEEW is working closely with the Commission and Local Land Services to ensure this work remains aligned with the plan's objectives.
(b-c)	These questions should be referred to the Minister for Agriculture.

Budget Allocation for Environment

253	How can you justify underspending on environment protection by \$446 million?
(a)	Will you commit to restoring this funding in the next budget?
254	Why is this budget allocation for environment protection the lowest it has been since the newly-formatted budget papers commenced in 2016?
255	How is a lower budget allocation for environment protection under Labor than when the Coalition left office consistent with the Minns Labor Government's commitment to better environmental protections?

Answer

253	There is no reduction of funding.
(a)	The Environmental Protection Line Table 7A in the 2025–26 budget papers is a whole of government table based on the Commonwealth Australian Bureau of Statistics COFOG code. These codes are used for reporting to the Commonwealth. The Agency Expense Summary table in Budget Papers 4 (2025–26) and Budget Paper 2 (2024–25) is the more informative picture of the Minister’s Portfolio budget. A 2024–25 budget to 2025–26 budget comparison using these tables shows a \$14.20 million increase for the Department and the Environmental Agencies in the network.
254	This is incorrect. The budget for the Department and the Environmental Agencies in 2015–16 in Budget Paper 3 was lower than the current budget.
255	This is an incorrect statement.

National Parks Estate Plan

256	What is the timeline for the development and publication of the new establishment plan?
257	Will NSW reach the national target of 30% by 2030 across a comprehensive, adequate and representative range of landscapes?
258	What is the current CAR % achieved, with the recent additions to the National Parks estate?
259	What was the CAR % achieved in:
(a)	2020?
(b)	2021?
(c)	2022?
(d)	2023?
(e)	2024?
(f)	2025?

Answer

256	Before the next election.
-----	---------------------------

257	The 30% by 2030 (30 by 30) target is a national target agreed by Environment Ministers in June 2024 and set out in Australia's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). Environment Ministers have agreed the NBSAP and the <i>National Roadmap for Protecting and Conserving 30% of Australia's Land by 2030</i> will guide the contribution of the Australian, state and territory governments towards achieving the 30 by 30 target, in the context of their individual circumstances and priorities. NSW has a strong track record of investing in its network of public and private protected areas and is well placed to contribute to the National target.
258	As of 1 September 2025, 7,673,388 hectares – representing 9.57% of NSW – are reserved under the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i> (NPW Act). An additional 775,000 hectares have been acquired and pending reservation. Once gazetted, the total national protected area will exceed 8.4 million hectares, or 10.5% of the State. As of 1 July 2025, 590,148 hectares – representing 0.74 % of NSW – are protected under in-perpetuity private land conservation agreements.
259	
(a)	In 2020: 7,446,718 hectares – representing 9.29% of NSW – were reserved under the NPW Act. 312,529 hectares – representing 0.39 % of NSW – were protected under in-perpetuity private land conservation agreements.
(b)	2021: 7,564,201 hectares – representing 9.44% of NSW – were reserved under the NPW Act. 348,200 hectares – representing 0.43% of NSW – were protected under in-perpetuity private land conservation agreements.
(c)	2022: 7,630,701 hectares – representing 9.52% of NSW – were reserved under the NPW Act. 409,051 hectares – representing 0.59% of NSW – were protected under in-perpetuity private land conservation agreements.
(d)	2023: 7,633,886 hectares - representing 9.52% of NSW – were reserved

	under the NPW Act. • 516,280 hectares - representing 0.64% of NSW – were protected under in-perpetuity private land conservation agreements.
(e)	2024: • 7,671,677 hectares – representing 9.57% of NSW – were reserved under the NPW Act. • 564,829 hectares – representing 0.7% of NSW – were protected under in-perpetuity private land conservation agreements.
(f)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 258.

WIRES Review

260	Can you please provide an update on the review of the Wildlife Rehabilitation Sector?
261	Are you concerned about a disconnect between the POCTAA legislation and the NSW Codes of Practice (which wildlife carers operate under).
262	Can you please describe the way in which the following considerations will be included in the review:
(a)	Whether the POCTA Act is suitable for use in prosecuting cases against wildlife rescuers who care for already compromised wildlife?
(b)	How referrals by WIRES to RSPCA for actions against wildlife volunteers can be given more oversight?
(c)	The connection between WIRES and the RSPCA?
(d)	How to mitigate bias in cases where RSPCA coordinate raids and prosecutions?
(e)	Stand alone legislation providing for matters relating to wildlife care, rescue and rehabilitation in NSW?

Answer

260	The Wildlife Rehabilitation Sector Review, led by the Parliamentary Secretary for the Environment, Ms Trish Doyle MP, will advise me of opportunities to improve support to the wildlife rehabilitation sector with a report due in October 2025. The terms of reference and progress of the review are available at: www.environment.nsw.gov.au/topics/animals-and-plants/native-animals/rehabilitating-native-animals/wildlife-rehabilitation-sector-strategy.
-----	---

	A report summarising the outcomes of the consultations to date is available at: www.environment.nsw.gov.au/publications/stakeholder-insights-wildlife-rehabilitation-summary-report-nsw-roundtables .
261	Wildlife rehabilitation is a licensed activity under the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> (BC Act). The role of the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water in wildlife rehabilitation is to set consistent standards of operation and establish a framework for delivery of wildlife rehabilitation services. Codes of practice establish the minimum requirements for rescue, rehabilitation and release of animals in care. The <i>Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979</i> (POCTA Act) is administered by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. Organisations authorised to enforce the POCTA Act can investigate cruelty to any animal, including wildlife in the possession of an individual authorised by a licence granted under the BC Act.
262 (a-e)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 260.

Lost City Environmental Assessment

263	Did the National Parks and Wildlife Service construct the Lost City Walking Track using swamp offset payments made by Centennial Springvale?
(a)	How much was spent on its construction?
(b)	How much was spent on its ancillary works?
264	In accordance with the Biodiversity Offset Scheme, will the National Parks and Wildlife Service now pay offset compensation for its removal of threatened plant species?
(a)	Will offset compensation be paid for clearing an easement through a nationally endangered shrub swamp
(b)	Will offset compensation be paid for clearing of native vegetation that was undertaken in association with the construction of the Lost City Walking Track completed at the end of 2024?
265	If the National Parks and Wildlife Service did not pay or will not pay offset compensation, why is it that Centennial Springvale is required to pay \$2 million per swamp for 'greater than negligible environmental consequences' when the National Parks and Wildlife Service does not even publicly exhibit its potentially damaging activities unless there is an 'increased risk of local extinction' to threatened species populations and endangered communities?
266	Is not the clearing of a nationally endangered shrub swamp, possibly paid for

	by swamp damage offset payments, a controversial action to take during reserve establishment?
(a)	Did this action not require public exhibition of the Review of Environmental Factors for the extension of the Lost City Walking Track?
267	Is the National Parks and Wildlife Service constructing the Pagoda Walk during 2025/26, using swamp offset payments made by Centennial Springvale?
268	In accordance with the Biodiversity Offset Scheme, will the National Parks and Wildlife Service pay offset compensation for the removal of threatened species, endangered ecological communities and clearing of native vegetation associated with the construction of the Pagoda Walk due for completion in 2025/26?
269	Does any part of the Pagoda Walk pass through nationally endangered shrubs or hanging swamps?
(a)	Is this not a controversial action to take during reserve establishment?
(b)	Does this action not require public exhibition of the Review of Environmental Factors for proposed extension of the Pagoda Walk?
270	Will you require the public exhibition of Review of Environmental Factors for visitor facilities in national parks and reserves where a proposed activity is likely to cause 'greater than negligible environmental consequences' to threatened species, endangered communities or other important heritage values, such as geodiversity?
271	Why has the Minns government continued to ignore the recommendations made by independent consultants, AUSTECO Environmental Consulting, commissioned by the EPA following the 2019/20 fires?
(a)	Will you commit to adopting the recommendation to "protect all unburnt and lightly burned areas from logging for 20-120 years"
(b)	Will you commit to adopting the recommendation to "protect 50% of the least burnt area of every logging compartment across the entire landscape"
(c)	Will you commit to adopting the recommendation to "develop new conditions that ensure permanent protection of large forest patches across regions and landscapes that capture and include fire refuges...old growth and link all retained forest patches larger than 5 hectares in size in a network of permanent wildlife corridors"?

Answer

263	No.
-----	-----

(a)	\$1.18 million.
(b)	Total capital expenditure for the Lost City Walking Track, Lost City Lookout and associated visitor facilities totalled \$1.8 million.
264	No significant impacts were identified in the Lost City Walking Track Review of Environmental Factors (REF) or Biodiversity Assessment Report. As such, entry to the Biodiversity Offset Scheme is not required. The REF was prepared by independent, suitably qualified ecologists. Mitigation measures included track re-alignments, revisions to construction methodology, translocation of threatened species and additional surveys to confirm impacts would not be significant in accordance with the 5-Part Test of Significance.
(a)	No. An easement was not cleared through endangered shrub swamp.
(b)	No. Entry to the Biodiversity Offset Scheme is not required as no significant impacts were identified in the REF.
265	The Centennial Springvale Coal Mine, including its surface infrastructure within mining leases, has been assessed under Part 4 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> as State Significant Development. Different rules apply for Part 4 assessments, which trigger entry to the Biodiversity Offset Scheme. The National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) can opt in to the Biodiversity Offset Scheme where significant impacts are identified in a REF under a Part 5 assessment. However, avoiding impacts with reasonable mitigations remains the key priority.
266	NPWS has not proposed, nor would it endorse, any development that would significantly impact an endangered ecological community, including the Newnes Plateau Shrub Swamp. Mapping of Plant Community Types for the Lost City Walking Track was completed as part of the Biodiversity Assessment Report by an independent ecologist. There were no impacts on shrub swamps, and the work was not paid for by offset payments.
(a)	There are no exhibition requirements under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> for exhibition of REF unless the proposal involves significant impacts on biodiversity, requiring it to be accompanied by a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report or Species Impact Statement. The Lost City Walking Track REF did not meet the triggers for public exhibition, as no significant impacts on biodiversity or other environmental factors were identified, there had been previous consultation conducted as part of the exhibition of the Gardens of Stone State Conservation Area master plan, and NPWS is the proponent.

267	No. The Gardens of Stone Pagoda Walk will be wholly funded by the Gardens of Stone State Conservation Area visitor infrastructure capital works program.
268	No. Refer to the answer to supplementary question 269.
269	The first section of the Pagoda Walk includes the conversion of a heavily eroded informal trail bike trail to a sustainable walking track, enhancing the protection and rehabilitation of Broad Swamp, which contains vegetation that is listed as an endangered ecological community. No significant impacts were identified in the REF, which was prepared by an independent ecologist. As such, a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report or Species Impact Statement is not required. The REF is now publicly available on the NSW Planning Portal. The track alignment does not intersect with any other hanging swamps or nationally endangered species or communities.
(a)	No.
(b)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 266 (a). However, all REFs associated with the Pagoda Walk were published and are available on the NSW Planning Portal.
270	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 266 (a).
271 (a-c)	The Forestry Industry Action Plan will consider issues of environmental sustainability and timber harvesting. The Independent Forestry Panel-led consultation on the Plan has now concluded and the Panel will report to the NSW Government on how best to balance sustainable timber supply and its environmental commitments. During this consultation, the NSW Environment Protection Authority provided the Panel with relevant materials for consideration, including the AUSTECO report reviewing the Coastal Integrated Forestry Operations Approval mitigation conditions for timber harvesting.

Koala Translocations

272	On what precise date did you become aware that 54% of koalas translocated from the Upper Nepean to South East Forest had died?
(a)	What steps did you take in response to becoming aware of this?
(b)	When did the Department first become aware of this?
273	On what precise date did you become aware that 3 koalas translocated in the Northern Rivers Region had died?

(a)	What steps did you take in response to becoming aware of this?
(b)	When did the Department first become aware of this?
274	On what date did koala translocations halt in New South Wales?
275	What scientific evidence do you have that koala translocations are an appropriate method of habitat management?

Answer

272	My office was first advised of the death of two animals on 4 April 2025.
(a)	At that time, my office was provided a brief that advised: • The project team would undertake veterinary health checks of the remaining koalas and continue daily monitoring. • Post-mortems would be performed. • The project team would investigate the outcomes of the translocation in collaboration with researchers and veterinarians. • The project team would investigate a potential relationship between the koala deaths and adverse weather, as the mortalities occurred soon after a high rainfall event. The team would also consider other factors such as the impact of diet, nutrition and gut microbiome. • The project had been placed on hold while a project review is undertaken. • The project had been conducted in accordance with the Department's Translocation Operational Policy. • The National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) will report the adverse event to the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water Animal Ethics Committee and NPWS Wildlife Licensing Team. • NPWS will inform key stakeholders.
(b)	The Department first became aware of the death of two animals on 4 April 2025.
273	The Department was aware of the koala deaths on 4 September 2024 and my office was advised shortly thereafter.
(a)	NPWS advised it would examine causes of the koala mortalities and undertake a review of the translocation project risk assessment to investigate the potential for further mitigation measures prior to translocation of any further koalas. NPWS also advised that the project team would continue to assess other potential recipient sites in nearby protected areas.
(b)	See answer to supplementary question 273.

274	Planning for koala translocations continues, however further translocation of koalas will not proceed until the review into the South East Forest National Park project is complete and any lessons learned are incorporated.
275	Under the NSW Koala Strategy, translocations are undertaken to re-establish populations that have become locally extinct (reintroduction) and/or to increase the size, health and genetic diversity of existing populations (reinforcement). They are not undertaken for habitat management.

ENERGY

Decarbonisation Road Map

276	Given your Departmental website states that the government “will consult publicly with all interested stakeholders in 2025 to develop the gas decarbonisation roadmap.” Can you clarify when this will begin?
277	Will you consider incentives like those that the Victorian Govt has just announced for food processing etc, to help those industrial sectors which are most easy to electrify?
278	Are you going to set targets for gas demand reduction, as Vic and ACT have done? If so, how will you be arriving at those?
(a)	If not, why not, it’s obviously best practice.
279	In regard to industrial gas demand reduction work that feds are doing, how will NSW align with that work?
(a)	Is the NSW government pursuing a similar strategy for disaggregating industrial gas use into industry sub-sectors?
(b)	Given the Federal timeline for Industry Sector Plans is due September 2025, will public consultation occur later this year?
280	Given the NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water are carrying out public consultation on important draft regulatory changes relating to gas supply and pipeline projects in NSW, including two proposed guidelines one on the Authority to Survey and the other on Compulsory Acquisition for pipeline projects, would you please confirm that you will not permit Santos to invoke the Authority to Survey along the Queensland Hunter Gas Pipeline Route while the two guidelines and draft amendments to regulations are under public consultation and not yet in place?
281	The Government has consulted on a Renewable Fuel Scheme for large energy users which if finalised could support alternatives to natural gas. What is the status of this renewable fuels strategy?

Answer

276	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 354.
277	Issues relating to the electrification of households and small businesses will be considered as part of the Government’s electrification and energy efficiency reforms.
278 (a)	See NSW Consumer Energy Strategy, Action 3.
279	My Department works in partnership with the Commonwealth through interjurisdictional working groups and the Energy and Climate Change Ministerial Council.
(a)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 279.
(b)	This is a matter for the Commonwealth.
280	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) is consulting stakeholders on draft guidelines for Authority to Survey. These guidelines are intended to clarify the administrative processes and expectations of the Department, proponents, and landholders in relation to an Authority to Survey. Santos has an existing Authority to Survey along the Hunter Gas Pipeline route. This consultation does not change the rights already granted to Santos under its Authority to Survey. Santos has advised DCCEEW it does not intend to invoke its Authority to Survey while DCCEEW is consulting stakeholders on the draft guidelines. Santos continues to engage landholders on negotiated agreements to access lands for survey work.
281	In August 2024, the NSW Government announced it was developing a Renewable Fuel Strategy. The Strategy is expected to be finalised in 2025.

HERITAGE

AHIP Orders

282	How many cultural sites have been destroyed in New South Wales since you became the Minister?
283	How many Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit Applications were made last financial year?
(a)	How many were granted?

(b)	How many were refused?
-----	------------------------

Answer

282	The Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water’s role is to assess and determine Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permits (AHIP) under the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i>. AHIPs are issued for a variety of reasons, including with conditions to protect Aboriginal sites and values. Permit conditions and any site impacts are informed by Aboriginal community consultation via Registered Aboriginal Parties in the assessment process.
283	In the 2024–25 financial year, Heritage NSW received 223 applications. This included: • 153 AHIPs • 53 Variations • 12 Surrenders • 5 Transfers.
(a)	In the 2024–25 financial year, Heritage NSW issued: • 133 AHIPs • 49 Variations • 12 Surrenders • 5 Transfers.
(b)	In the 2024–25 financial year, no applications were refused. • Of the 153 new AHIP applications received: ○ 6 were withdrawn ○ 10 were not accepted. • Of the 53 Variation applications received: ○ 3 were withdrawn ○ 1 was not accepted. An application may be “not accepted” if it is incomplete, or needs further information before it can be assessed.

Northern Rivers Cultural Heritage

284	Are you aware of South Sea Islander Graves destroyed during the construction of the Tweed Valley Hospital?
(a)	If so, what steps have you taken to protect cultural heritage?

285	Are you aware of the development proposal for the Cudgen Connection development's Cultural Heritage Advice Report, "Whilst it does not formally form part of the proposal the use of the 'environmental parklands' outside the northern boundary of Lot 6 is the ACH feature of the development. This area is mapped as a known burial site and any development or use of the area should therefore be contemplated only with extreme caution,"?
(a)	What steps are you taking to protect South Sea Islander heritage with relation to this development?
286	What steps has the Minister taken to ensure the repatriation of the Aboriginal Breastplate belonging to Jack Kibbeen, the man who named the Northern Rivers town of Wollongbar?

Answer

284	Heritage NSW is not aware of South Sea Islander graves being destroyed during the construction of the Tweed Valley Hospital. No information has been reported to Heritage NSW.
(a)	Heritage NSW will seek further information.
285	Heritage NSW has had no role in the Planning Proposal.
(a)	There is no role for Heritage NSW. The Tweed Shire Council Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan provides protection for this site. Further information should be obtained from Tweed Shire Council.
286	The Jack Kapeen Breastplate is currently in the possession of a private collector. Heritage NSW is in contact with descendants of Jack Kapeen to assist them with their efforts to repatriate the breast plate. Heritage NSW will continue to work with the Kapeen family to support them in their goals of taking possession of and caring for their ancestor's heritage.

Private Native Forestry

287	How many compliance checks of Private Native Forestry operations have been conducted since 1 March 2023?
(a)	When were these checks conducted?
(b)	What were the outcomes of these checks?
288	How many Private Native Forestry operations have been and are being investigated for breaches of approvals since 1 March 2023?
(a)	When were they investigated?

(b)	What were the outcomes of these investigations?
-----	---

Answer

287	75 inspections undertaken.
(a)	Between 1 March 2023 and 9 September 2025.
(b)	7 formal warnings. 3 Official Cautions. 5 Penalty Notices. 1 Clean Up Notice. 1 Prevention Notice. Prosecutions for 11 offences (all prosecutions presently before the court).
288	62 cases created.
(a)	Between 1 March 2023 and 9 September 2025.
(b)	7 formal warnings. 3 Official Cautions. 5 Penalty Notices. 1 Clean Up Notice. 1 Prevention Notice. Prosecutions for 11 offences (all prosecutions presently before the court).

Questions from Ms Abigail Boyd MLC

Rooftop PV uptake

289	A recent report by the Nature Conservation Council on jurisdictions’ energy transition progress found that bolstering uptake of rooftop PV in NSW can reduce the need for as much investment in large scale generation and storage capacity and transmission infrastructure, particularly in the short term. Given that rooftop PV uptake in NSW is below the national average, what is the Minister doing to ensure that we not only meet our targets for rooftop PV installations, but also accelerate uptake of rooftop solar beyond this?
-----	---

Answer

289	The NSW Government is delivering a number of initiatives to help more NSW
-----	---

	households get access to these technologies. NSW has developed and launched the Solar for apartment residents grant to fund 50% of the cost of a PV system on eligible apartment buildings and other multi-unit dwellings in NSW. This will help residents, including renters, to reduce their energy bills and greenhouse gas emissions. A total of \$25 million in grant funding is available, with up to \$150,000 per project. The Solar for Apartment Residents grant program has already approved 33 applications with \$1.2 million in grants awarded. This covers 534 apartments with over 1,100 kilowatts of solar to be installed. The independent assessment committee is assessing a further 106 applications. Under the \$175 million Social Housing Energy Performance Initiative, over 2,700 solar systems have been installed onto social housing properties up to 30 June 2025. As a key initiative under the Consumer Energy Strategy, the Home Energy Saver Program aims to help households cut their energy bills, ease cost-of-living pressures, reduce emissions, and improve grid reliability, with \$238.9 million in funding committed over four years. The program will provide incentives to help eligible households invest in energy-saving technologies, like solar, and energy efficiency upgrades. The NSW Government is currently finalising the detailed program design.
--	---

Community batteries and Energy Security Corporation

290	The Federal Government has funded the roll out of 400 Community batteries across the nation, which involves giving funding to Distributed Network Service Providers (DNSPs). The NSW Energy Security Corporation has an investment mandate that includes community batteries as a potential for project funding. However there is a lack of transparency, consumer protections or consistency in terms of how much consumers can save, whether they will need to pay a membership fee, and who benefits. Does the government have plans to investigate introducing regulations and/or standards to ensure government-funded community batteries are transparent, consumer-centric and come with strict standards for DNSPs, to ensure communities get the benefits?
291	Community batteries have not been proven to be an economic use of government investment. They cost on average \$1,400 per kWh to install (plus co-contributions from DNSPs) whereas a behind-the-meter household battery costs about \$900 to \$1,300 per kWh to install, and even less with the federal rebate. Even after the DNSPs receive government funding, they are recovering further costs from consumers via monthly membership fees. How will the \$1 billion allocated for the Energy Security Corporation address these issues and ensure that it is consumers who benefit, and not the DNSP's profits?

292	Utilising existing transmission infrastructure within the local distribution network is a great way to save on costs and reduce the risk of delays for renewable energy projects. NSW's cities and towns have plenty of existing underutilised rooftop space including on large commercial and industrial buildings. How is the Energy Security Corporation being tasked to fund this low cost, quick to roll-out renewable energy capacity?
293	The focus of the Consumer Energy Strategy is on accessibility to cheaper, cleaner renewable energy for households who are locked out. How will the funding for the Energy Security Corporation serve the interests of these households, as opposed to that of big businesses?
294	Businesses can already access rebates for joining a Virtual Power Plant (VPP). How will the Energy Security Corporation invest in VPPs without doubling up on benefits to big businesses as opposed to households (and small businesses)?

Answer

290	The NSW Government's Consumer Energy Strategy commits to investigate options to support household and small business access to community batteries.
291	All Energy Security Corporation (ESC) investment decisions are guided by its mandate to: • accelerate private sector investments in clean energy projects in NSW that improve the reliability, security and sustainability of electricity supply • support NSW to achieve the targets for reducing net greenhouse gas emissions under the <i>Climate Change (Net Zero Future) Act 2023</i> • complement other Government initiatives relating to clean energy technologies and partner with the private sector to finance clean energy technologies • achieve a Government-mandated rate of return through a portfolio approach. By applying this framework, the ESC invests only where it delivers a clear public benefit, helping keep the lights on, maintaining system security and ensuring communities across NSW share in the benefits of the transition.
292	The ESC was established to accelerate investment in large-scale storage and enabling infrastructure to support a reliable and secure electricity system for NSW. As set out in its Investment Mandate, the ESC may invest in clean energy technologies across generation, storage and end-use equipment located on the customer side of the electricity meter including, but not limited to, virtual

	power plants. This allows the ESC to invest in businesses, platforms or projects that deliver behind-the-meter solutions like rooftop solar. Any such investment would need to meet its mandated minimum investment threshold of \$25 million.
293	The ESC is a clean energy investor with a clear public mandate: to accelerate investment in large-scale storage and enabling infrastructure so NSW households and businesses can continue to rely on a secure, affordable and reliable electricity system as coal retires. ESC funding is directed to projects that help keep the lights on and ensure communities across the State share the benefits as more renewables come online. Every investment opportunity undergoes rigorous screening and due diligence to make sure projects are viable and deliver genuine value for the people of NSW. The ESC complements broader NSW and Australian Government initiatives by focusing on large-scale system-wide investments, while other programs provide direct support to households in the transition to renewables.
294	The ESC's role is to invest in projects that deliver on its mandate while also providing a clear benefit to NSW electricity customers. The ESC's focus is on making the system more reliable and sustainable, and every investment is tested against these objectives. The ESC applies public funds carefully. Where concessional finance is used, it is only provided at the minimum level necessary to make a project viable.

Coal ash

295	Can you please provide an update on the status of the government's implementation of recommendations from the NSW Parliamentary Inquiry into costs for remediation of sites containing coal ash repositories, including data completed or expected to be completed and reasons for any deviation between what was recommended and what has been or is intended to be implemented?
-----	--

Answer

295	The NSW Government supported 13 of the 16 recommendations from the 2019 Coal ash dams inquiry. All 13 supported recommendations are complete as at September 2025. Recommendation 1: That the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and Dams Safety NSW establish a Memorandum of Understanding by 30 June 2021 in relation to the management and remediation of coal ash dams.
-----	---

- The EPA and Dams Safety NSW have established a Memorandum of Understanding, with a set review period of every two years (or after a dam failure, or as otherwise agreed).

Recommendation 2: That the EPA establish air and groundwater monitoring sites surrounding all power stations and coal ash dams, and that current, real time and historical data of these and other existing monitoring sites be published on the EPA’s website by 1 July 2022.

- The EPA has published links to all air and water monitoring currently undertaken on its website at www.epa.nsw.gov.au/Working-together/Community-engagement/Regulation-of-power-stations/Monitoring-data. This includes monitoring undertaken at the coal-fired power stations (including continuous air emissions monitoring) as well as broader environmental monitoring initiatives currently undertaken by the EPA and other NSW Government agencies.

Recommendation 3: That the EPA conduct and publish a study of surface and groundwater around all coal fired power stations and associated coal ash dams, and their potential impacts on the surrounding environment, by the end of 2022.

- The EPA commissioned an independent investigation into the health of Lake Macquarie near coal ash repositories as part of the NSW Government’s response to the Parliamentary Inquiry. The assessment report can be found on the EPA website at: www.epa.nsw.gov.au/Working-together/Community-engagement/Regulation-of-power-stations/Coal-ash-dams/Monitoring-environmental-condition-Lake-Macquarie/Results.
- Also, all raw data from the project is available on the datasets.seed.nsw.gov.au/dataset/lake-macquarie-surface-water-and-sediment-quality-in-the-vicinity-of-coal-ash-repositories.

Recommendation 4: That the EPA publish, in real time, breaches of environment protection legislation.

- Details of notices, orders, prosecutions, mandatory audits, pollution studies and pollution reduction programs that have been issued in response to breaches of environmental legislation are already available on the public register. However, the EPA is committed to continuous improvement in how it communicates with the public and will undertake to publish, in real time, breaches of environment protection legislation.

Recommendation 5: That Dams Safety NSW publish on its website in a timely manner, where practicable, all ash dam assessments and responses undertaken by Dams Safety NSW or submitted to it by power station operators from time to time.

- This should be referred to the Minister for Water for details on

	implementation and data. Recommendation 6: That NSW Health immediately undertake an epidemiological assessment of the health of residents near coal ash dams to establish the health impacts of coal ash and publish by 31 December 2022. • While the EPA is not the lead for this recommendation, the EPA is supporting NSW Health’s human health risk assessment in the Lake Macquarie area. • NSW Health has been conducting a human health risk assessment to address any potential exposures to chemicals derived from air emissions and coal ash dams in the Lake Macquarie area. NSW Health has collated data for the human health risk assessment from various stakeholders including the EPA. • The EPA is also represented on the steering committee that is assisting the New South Wales Coal Ash and Health Community Advisory Committee which supports the NSW Health-led investigation into potential health impacts of coal ash. Recommendation 7: That the EPA commission a comprehensive and independent assessment of the environmental impacts of coal ash dams to provide a better understanding of the issues and to inform best-practice remediation. • This recommendation relates to work in recommendation 3. Recommendation 10: That Transport for NSW review its procurement practices to, where feasible, mandate the use of recycled coal ash in government-funded transport infrastructure projects. • This should be referred to the Minister for Transport for details on implementation and data. Recommendation 12: That Transport for NSW review the construction standards for roads, with a view to ensuring that local government trials the use of coal ash in its road construction. • This should be referred to the Minister for Transport for details on implementation and data. Recommendation 13: That the NSW Government partner with the Ash Development Association of Australia (ADAA) and other interested parties, and support feasibility studies and pilot projects to assess and demonstrate commercial viability of new industries, such as transformation of coal ash into lightweight aggregate or other higher value-add products. • The NSW Government has partnered with SmartCrete Co-operative Research Centre to carry out research to demonstrate the effectiveness and durability of lower emissions concrete, with the aim to update low
--	---

	carbon concrete specifications which can be applied by local and State Government bodies. • The EPA entered a memorandum of understanding with the ADAA to support delivery of the EPA's coal combustion product program. • The EPA has partnered with the ADAA to deliver a coal combustion product scoping study to support the NSW Government and industry to gain a better understanding of coal combustion product resource supply and applications. • The EPA is developing a new regulatory measure to help drive end-market demand for coal ash and other recoverable resources. The proposed Sustainable Construction Protection of the Environment Policy (PEP) aims to ensure public infrastructure proposals in NSW prioritise the use of low-carbon and recycled materials, such as coal ash in concrete. • Public exhibition of the draft PEP closed on 2 April 2025 and the EPA is considering whether changes are needed in response to stakeholder feedback. Recommendation 14: That the EPA ensure that the quantity of coal ash stored and produced, and the destination and purpose of coal ash reused, is publicly reported. • Through environment protection licence conditions, the EPA has required the operators of Mount Piper, Eraring, Bayswater and Vales Point power stations to monitor and report on the quantities of coal ash generated, stored and re-used. The EPA has required publication of an annual coal ash monitoring report to be made publicly available on each power stations' website by no later than 31 October each year. Recommendation 15: That the NSW Government promote circular economy principles when dealing with coal ash waste and promoting reuse, including facilitating consultation between regulatory bodies, electricity generators and key stakeholders in recycling, local government and construction sectors. • This recommendation has been progressed through actions on a combination of other relevant recommendations, including for example, recommendation 13. • Additionally, the Waste and Sustainable Materials Strategy 2041 signals the priority the NSW Government is placing on closing and reinforcing resource 'loops' in production processes and economic activity, while reducing carbon emissions. The Strategy will also support industry to promote and trial the innovative use of low carbon recycled material through the Carbon Recycling and Abatement Fund. Recommendation 16: That NSW Treasury immediately publish on its website
--	--

	the baseline environmental studies conducted for each operating power station to improve transparency in terms of the NSW Government's liabilities for remediation at these sites. This information can be found at www.nsw.gov.au/departments-and-agencies/nsw-treasury/documents-library/environmental-baseline-studies-for-operating-coal-fired-power-stations.
--	---

Information available re energy rebates

296	The consumer energy space can be difficult to understand and navigate. With so many different schemes and rebates on offer, what are you doing to ensure people in the community can easily access information about energy rebates available to them?
297	Electricity pricing can be difficult for the average consumer to understand, which makes it easy for retailers to overcharge. What are you doing to advocate at a federal level for a fairer and more equitable energy system, including preventing customers from being overcharged by providers?

Answer

296	The NSW Social Programs for Energy Code requires energy retailers to communicate information about the Energy Social Programs to customers. This includes retailers providing information about energy rebates to customers when they enter into a contract with an energy retailer and providing information about the programs on customer bills. The NSW Government is implementing a communication strategy to improve awareness and uptake of the Energy Social Programs. Activities in the strategy include: - Providing plain English and translated factsheets and application forms for people with low literacy levels or from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. - Coordinated community outreach activities, including collaboration with stakeholders such as the Energy and Water Ombudsman NSW. These include 'Bring your Bills' events in regional areas and other events targeted at eligible and hard-to-reach customers. - Partner toolkits to support delivery partners and other stakeholders to deliver information about the Energy Social Programs. - Direct communication with customers through reminders, newsletters and social media channels. This includes inclusion of information in Service NSW newsletters to all Service NSW customer account holders.
297	The Australian Energy Regulator's Better Bills Guideline is now in place to

	help households and small businesses understand their energy use and costs, and to find the best energy deal available to them. The Guideline requires retailers to include a ‘better offer’ statement on the front page of their bill, and use plain, clear language in their bills. The NSW Government continues to engage with the Australian Government to explore additional consumer protections. Most recently, Energy Ministers agreed to the approach for Better Energy Customer Experiences (BECE). Through BECE, steps will be taken to ensure the frameworks that support customers to engage with the energy market are suitable and effective, considering how people’s use of electricity and gas is changing. The primary focus will be the National Energy Customer Framework, given it is the primary national regulatory framework providing energy specific protections to consumers. Under the Consumer Energy Strategy, the NSW Government is also advocating for improvements to the Energy Made Easy website to include solar export charges, demand tariffs and other new types of tariffs that emerge, to help customers better understand the changing energy market. Additionally, the Government will also introduce new rules to increase transparency about new and emerging energy products and services.
--	---

Regional equity access to rebates and schemes

298	The NSW Government’s Energy Saving scheme (ESS) & Peak Demand Reduction scheme (PDRS) aim to encourage energy efficiency to reduce costs and satisfy peak demand while minimising the need for expensive upgrades to the electricity grid. What is the government doing to ensure people living in regional areas are able to equitably access rebates and schemes?
(a)	Is any work being done to increase transparency, for example by advising providers to report the price of Energy Savings Certificates (ESCs) and Peak Reduction Certificates (PRC) on which the rebates have been calculated?
(b)	Is any work being done to set clear standards and specifications for installers?
(c)	Is any work being done to clarify information around terms of rebates and participation in schemes?
(d)	Is any work being done to provide a system whereby customers can fulfil the requirements (such as a date stamped photo of the installation and a letter signed by the installer that the system fulfils all the stated requirements) for customers unable to access full and fair rebates from local installers?
(e)	Is any work being done to review the method of calculating ESC and PRC, where the reverse cycle system replaces radiant heaters that are expected to consume 4 times as much electricity as an efficient reverse cycle system?

Answer

298	To help make access to the schemes easier, the scheme website is now directly connecting consumers with installers who provide scheme discounts, through third-party lead generators like Energy Matters and Solar Quotes. This feature is currently available for hot water systems, air conditioners and virtual power plants. Installers typically include the scheme incentives as part of their quote. Additionally, the \$25 million Safeguard Acceleration Program provides market stimulus designed to encourage Accredited Certificate Providers to establish services in underserved technologies and regional areas.
(a)	Accredited Certificate Providers and their suppliers can package their services in different ways. Customers are encouraged to obtain multiple quotes to ensure they receive the most competitive offer.
(b)	Under the Energy Security Safeguard, installers are required to meet all necessary standards associated with the work they carry out. The Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART), the scheme regulator, inspects installations and shares data with the Building Commission, which undertakes its own inspections against the necessary standards.
(c)	Accredited Certificate Providers are required to provide potential customers with a scheme factsheet provided by IPART (the scheme administrator). The factsheet provides guidance on the upgrade or installation, and an overview of the schemes. The consumer is then required to sign a nomination form to allow the creation of certificates.
(d)	Accredited Certificate Providers operate under a robust regulatory framework and work under strict compliance regulations administered by the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal. This framework is designed to ensure that installations are credible, products are approved, and genuine energy savings are achieved. The scheme cannot facilitate customers directly creating certificates, however, the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water is continuing to work on improving the accessibility of the incentives under the scheme.
(e)	Incentives are already available through the scheme for installing efficient air-conditioners, regardless of the type of existing heating or cooling product that they are replacing.

Home Energy Saver Program

299	In the Consumer Energy Strategy, there is an action scheduled for delivery in 2025 for “designing and delivering a new \$238.9 million Home Energy Saver program to help customers cut their energy bills and reduce their emissions”.
-----	--

	This action makes up about 82% of the overall Consumer Energy strategy funding, however the details of it are not clear. What exactly is the Minister's plan with this program?
300	Can you please break down the allocation of the \$238.9 million to implement the Home Energy Saver program, including any funds spent so far as well as plans for implementation?
301	Through the Home Energy Saver program, how will the government progress household electrification and improve energy efficiency for those who need it most?
(a)	How does the government plan to reach hard to electrify households, including low income households, regional households and renters?

Answer

299	The Home Energy Saver Program undertook consultation and is in the program design and preparation for procurement phase. The program will provide incentives to help eligible households invest in energy-saving technologies and energy efficiency upgrades.
300	The allocation and implementation plans are currently being finalised as part of the program design and preparation for procurement.
301 (a)	This will be finalised as part of the program design.

Consumer Energy Strategy

302	What is the reason for the delay with implementing actions in the strategy?
303	In response to questions on notice received in July 2025, the Minister confirmed that as of 30 June 2025, only \$7.27 million of the allocated \$290 million has been spent on Strategy implementation. Given it has been nearly a full year since the strategy was launched and the \$290 million was announced, can you please explain why only such a small amount has been spent?
(a)	Can you please provide a breakdown of where the \$7.27 million was spent?
304	The Consumer Energy Strategy includes uptake targets as well as new funding programs. Can the Minister please report on progress made to date towards the following targets, and whether the government is on track to meet these targets?
(a)	3,400 MW of virtual power plant participation by 2035 and 10,000 MW by 2050?

(b)	One million solar and battery homes by 2035?
(c)	Energy saving upgrades made to 24,000 social homes by March 2027?
i.	How many of these social homes have had solar panels or a battery installed?
305	The Consumer Energy Strategy also commits to investigate introducing minimum energy efficiency performance standards for rental housing in 2025, which Victoria and the ACT have already achieved. Can the Minister please give an update on how this is tracking?
(a)	Can the Minister confirm whether minimum energy efficiency performance standards will be introduced as part of the transition to mandatory disclosure of Nationwide House Energy Rating Scheme (NatHERS) home energy ratings?
(b)	When will the government take action to require retrofitting whenever a tenanted property is sold, a new tenancy agreement is signed or a major renovation is undertaken?
306	The Consumer Energy Strategy commits to supporting the introduction of national smart EV charging standards and vehicle to grid standards in NSW. Can the Minister please provide an update on this?
(a)	How is Vehicle-to-grid (V2G) adoption tracking, and how is the NSW Government encouraging adoption through regulation and standards?

Answer

302	There has been no delay in implementing the Consumer Energy Strategy. As of 8 September 2025, all actions are underway, with 13 actions completed.
303	Funding has been profiled to initially enable completion of detailed program design for new programs and activities. Additional expenditure will occur in 2025–26 and 2026–27 as new grant programs and projects are implemented.
(a)	As of 30 June 2025: • \$3.22 million has been spent on labour and employee costs • \$2.42 million has been spent on operating expenditure • \$1.39 million has been spent on grants and subsidies • \$0.25 million has been spent on capital expenditure.
304	
(a)	The NSW Government is currently collecting data from energy retailers and virtual power plant (VPP) service providers to report on VPP participation and determine whether it is on track to meet its VPP targets.

(b)	Current data shows the NSW Government is on track to meet targets for household and small business battery and solar access. As of 30 June 2025, the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) estimates that around 110,000 homes in NSW have both solar and battery systems installed.
(c)	As of 30 June 2025, over 8,000 homes had been upgraded under the Social Housing Energy Performance Initiative.
i.	Over 2,700 social housing homes have received solar panels. No batteries have been installed under this program to date as it is not an eligible upgrade under the Federation Funding Agreement for this program.
305	The investigation into implementing minimum energy efficiency rental standards is underway. The NSW Government will share more information about opportunities for consultation and announcements when it is available. The Government is also supporting the development of a national framework for minimum energy efficiency standards in rented homes, in collaboration with the Australian Government and other states and territories.
(a)	The investigation into implementing minimum energy efficiency rental standards will be considered separately from the transition to mandatory disclosure of home energy ratings.
(b)	Timing for property retrofits to meet any potential standards will be considered as part of the policy investigation into minimum energy efficiency rental standards.
306	The NSW Government is working with other states and territories to achieve nationally consistent smart charging and vehicle to grid standards through implementation of the National Consumer Energy Resources Roadmap.
(a)	The NSW Government is currently gathering data on Vehicle-to-grid adoption and will continue to support uptake through implementation of the National Consumer Energy Resources Roadmap.

Vales Point pollution rules

307	Can the EPA please confirm whether Vales Point power station has stayed within Group 5 nitrogen oxide limits under Clean Air regulations since its exemption expired in October 2024?
308	Mr Beaman confirmed in the March 2025 Budget Estimates hearing that if Vales Point power station remains open beyond 2029, it would have to achieve Group 6 limits or apply for an exemption. However, EPA legal advice released under GIPA EPA 1038 indicates that Vales Point will not transition to Group 6

	under Clean Air regulations. Could the EPA please clarify which is true?
(a)	If in fact Vales Point is not required to comply with Group 6, can the Minister please explain how the government will address this loophole to ensure all coal power stations are required to meet the same Group 6 standards?

Answer

307	Yes.
308	Vales Point power station transitioned to Group 5 emission standards under the Protection of the Environment Operations (Clean Air) Regulation 2022 (Clean Air Regulation) before 16 December 2022. The Clean Air Regulation does not require activities or plant that have transitioned to Group 5 before 16 December 2022 to transition to Group 6. This was clarified following the March 2025 Budget Estimates hearing.
(a)	The NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) regulates all coal-fired power stations through environment protection licences. These licences contain conditions for coal-fired power stations to continuously reduce their emissions, regardless of the legislated limits. The EPA will continue to progress improvements to air emissions for all operating coal-fired power stations until their closure.

Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap

309	What is the reason for the delay in introducing a Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap?
-----	--

Answer

309	There has been no delay.
-----	--------------------------

Energy Accounts Payment Assistance (EAPA) review

310	When will the review into EAPA rebates be finalised?
(a)	When will a report be published?

Answer

310	The NSW Government publicly consulted on draft findings and recommendations from the Energy Accounts Payment Assistance (EAPA) review. Following consultation feedback, the NSW Government has progressively implemented some of the proposed reforms. The NSW Government is considering reforms that require changes to the NSW Social Programs for Energy Code.
-----	--

(a)	Changes to the NSW Social Programs for Energy Code to implement the remaining EAPA reforms will be undertaken in 2026 following stakeholder consultation.
-----	---

Power station contamination

311	Can the Minister please explain why residents of Budgewoi, Buff Point, Halekulani, San Remo, Doyalson and Lake Munmorah and other suburbs and settlements close to the Significantly Contaminated Land on the former Colongra/Munmorah power station site have not received information about the contamination?
(a)	Has the Minister liaised with NSW Health and the Health Minister regarding this significantly contaminated land and importance of informing surrounding residents to take precautionary measures such as not using bore or groundwater?
312	Can the Minister provide an update on the timeframe and process to be used for decontamination of the site at Colongra/Munmorah?
313	Are employees at the Waratah Super Battery being fully informed of the risks of PFAS exposure?

Answer

311	Generator Property Management are responsible for remediating contamination at the former Munmorah power station. The NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) declared parts of the former power station as contaminated in May 2024 for hydrocarbons and PFAS. Generator Property Management are remediating the site under a Voluntary Management Proposal (VMP), which is an enforceable proposal. The VMP contains a requirement for the preparation of a Community Consultation and Stakeholder Management Plan to provide coordinated and consistent messaging for ongoing communication and engagement with the local community and other identified stakeholders. The plan identifies local community groups, industry and regulatory stakeholders for future communication. Generator Property Management has also established a Community Consultation Group to provide and obtain feedback directly from community representatives who have an ongoing interest and commitment to the outcomes of the VMP. In May 2025, Future Sooner and other community groups received an email update from the EPA regarding the VMP remediation process, at the former Munmorah power station site. Generator Property Management also keep the broader community informed through their website:
-----	--

	https://gpmco.com.au/environment/
(a)	This is an EPA operational matter. The EPA understands that the groundwater contamination remains confined to the site and residential properties are not being impacted by the plume.
312	Remediation at the former Munmorah power station is a two-phase approach; Phase 1 is currently underway. Phase 1 involves further characterisation of contamination to refine the conceptual site model and confirm the appropriate remedial approach. Phase 1 is required to be completed by 30 December 2026, including lodgement of any relevant development applications. The VMP with the schedule of works for Phase 1 is available on the Generator Property Management's website.
313	The Waratah Super Battery project was assessed and approved by the then Department of Planning and Environment in 2023. The assessment included contamination at the site. Any matters relating to work health and safety should be referred to the Minister for Work Health and Safety.

Renewable Energy Zones (REZ)

314	At the recent hearings for the Inquiry into the Impact of Renewable Energy Zones (REZ) on rural and regional communities and industries in New South Wales, the Committee heard concerns about a lack of trusted information in communities to help them navigate renewable energy development in their regions. Does the Minister agree that there is a need for better information to be made available in communities to support them to navigate and secure ongoing benefit from renewable energy?
(a)	Does the Minister agree that a lack of information is contributing to poor social licence for renewable energy development within communities?
(b)	Several community groups and organisations working on the renewable energy transition within REZ advocated for the implementation of Local Energy Hubs as a solution to this issue. Has the Minister considered the Local Energy Hubs proposal to address information gaps and barriers to social licence around renewable energy?
i.	If yes, has the Minister considered a role for the NSW government in funding or co-funding Local Energy Hubs in key areas hosting renewable energy infrastructure?
315	In relation to the recently announced ACEREZ/ EnergyCo Community Information Centre in Mudgee , what is the NSW government doing to ensure the information provided by the centre is independent and trusted by the community?

(a)	What other actions is the NSW government taking to address barriers to social licence within the Central West-Orana and other REZ, particularly relating to generation projects?
316	What role does the NSW government see for EnergyCo in holistically supporting communities with active outreach and information on the energy transition above and beyond transmission infrastructure?

Answer

314	The NSW Government is using a broad range of engagement methods to communicate with regional communities. This includes community information meetings and pop-ups, one-to-one meetings with a broad range of stakeholders and on-the-ground engagement teams across NSW providing information to people where they work and live. EnergyCo is committed to continually updating its website with accessible information about the Renewable Energy Zones (REZs). This includes an interactive map that shows renewable energy projects in various stages of planning. Other Electricity Infrastructure Roadmap entities have also provided a wealth of information, including the Renewable Energy Planning Framework, which supports communities with guides and templates to help them navigate through the renewable energy transition. EnergyCo has also supported the development of two practical guides – the NSW Renewable Energy and Transmission Landholder Guide and the Agrivoltaics Handbook. EnergyCo has established local presences in all REZs. In the Central-West Orana REZ, the Community Information Centre is at 30-32 Church Street in Mudgee and EnergyCo has an office at Level 1, 168 Brisbane Street in Dubbo.
(a)	Social licence is about more than information. EnergyCo has engaged various parties such as network operators to deliver the REZs, and they hold social licence targets that they are assessed against. EnergyCo has established local presences in all of the REZs. For all projects, EnergyCo representatives engage with communities and landholders by meeting communities including through local markets, farmers markets and events.
(b)	The Government is committed to providing information at a local level to communities affected by the energy transition in NSW and we are also supportive of efforts by community organisations to engage with regional communities. EnergyCo has established local presences in all the REZs to engage with regional communities.

i.	I am advised that earlier this year the Renewable Energy Alliance and the Community Power Agency asked the Australian Government for funding for 50 local energy hubs across the country.
315	All materials disseminated by EnergyCo or ACEREZ in any of their channels, including the Community Information Centre, go through a rigorous approval process to ensure they are factual and accurate. Information by independent third parties is also available at the Community Information Centre, for example, guides produced with NSW Farmers.
(a)	The Community and Employment Benefit Program delivers tangible benefits and contributes to the long-term prosperity of regions hosting new energy infrastructure by funding community-led initiatives, public infrastructure, skills, employment and First Nation projects. On 15 July 2024, I launched the Program in the Central-West Orana REZ through four grant streams totalling \$70.5 million and, on 11 April 2025, announced over \$60 million of approved projects (with more to be announced in the coming months). The Program will launch next in the South West and Hunter Central Coast REZs, given their delivery timeframe, project maturity and announced access schemes.
316	EnergyCo plays a key role in supporting communities by building a strong regional presence that not only supports the delivery of REZs but also provides channels for community engagement beyond transmission infrastructure. This includes early and ongoing engagement with communities to ensure local voices shape project outcomes, and the establishment of the Community Employment Benefit Program, which will invest millions of dollars into REZ communities to deliver regional improvements and significant legacy infrastructure and services.

Coal royalties

317	What percentage of state coal royalties is being delivered to coal reliant communities to transition through the Future Jobs for Investment Fund and the Royalties for Rejuvenation fund?
(a)	How will these statewide programs be split between the four coal communities?

Answer

317 (a)	These questions should be referred to the Minister for Natural Resources.
------------	---

Undergrounding of powerlines

318	As NSW electrifies, communities are becoming increasingly reliant on a stable electricity grid. Blackouts are likely to continue where street trees and trees on private land are overhanging power lines, particularly with the increased severity of weather events. What action is the NSW government taking to ensure energy companies prioritise undergrounding of powerlines, in order to protect the network and to allow for increased urban forest canopy?
-----	---

Answer

318	I am advised the three NSW electricity distributors are taking actions to improve resilience to severe weather events and limit outages that can have significant impacts on the community. For example, Essential Energy is installing Stand Alone Power Systems in locations where it can increase power supply reliability and resilience and reduce operating costs for customers. The other two distributors were privatised by the previous government and information is available on their websites.
-----	--

Energy transition

319	What is the NSW government doing to support state and local government owned buildings and fleets to decarbonise and transition to renewable energy?
(a)	Does the NSW government intend to mandate that all State and Local Government buildings and fleets be powered by renewables by 2030?
i.	If not, why not?
320	How much funding is the NSW government allocating to ensure that new builds are being built to climate resilient and energy independent and efficient standards?
321	When will the NSW government "draw a line under" coal and gas project approvals, and stop approving new projects or extensions?
322	Given that gas exploration is banned in NSW waters, what is the NSW government doing to advocate for a ban on gas exploration in federal waters and other states' waters as an urgent priority?

Answer

319	The Government has produced the Net Zero Government Operations Policy, which sets targets to support renewable energy and transition the Government's vehicle fleet.
(a)	No.

i.	The NSW Government has set whole-of-government emissions reduction targets to allow agencies flexibility to reduce their emissions based on their unique emissions profiles and operational considerations.
320	The NSW Government has a range of programs to support new and existing buildings to become more energy efficient and resilient to climate change. These programs compliment building standards. More information is available online.
321	This question should be referred to the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces.
322	The NSW Government has made very clear it does not support gas exploration or extraction off the coast of NSW.

Questions from Ms Cate Faehrmann MLC

ENVIRONMENT

NSW Environmental Water

323	Has the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) been receiving general correspondence from the community and industry groups calling for water for the environment to be metered to the same standard as irrigation water?
(a)	If so, was this communication from a specific sector or industry group, or stakeholders in water management?
(b)	Would you categorise the groups or individuals who have been making calls for water for the environment to be metered as being from the irrigated agricultural community?
(c)	Did DCCEEW receive a specific piece of communication regarding the requirement of water for the environment to be metered that triggered DCCEEW to seek legal advice on the matter?
i.	If so, who sent this correspondence?
324	Have you sought any legal advice on different ways in which environmental watering could be undertaken in compliance with the regulations and water sharing plans?
325	What legal advice, if any, do you have on the implications of lapsed Water Sharing Plans on the delivery of environmental water?

326	Has the Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR) threatened prosecution if any environmental watering proceeds?
327	Has NRAR made you or the Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation division of your Department aware of the Memorandum of Litigation Involving Government Authorities?
(a)	If so, when?
328	What processes have been put in place to prevent or detect borrowing against unused environmental water accounts to underwrite general security allocations owned by other water users?

Answer

323	No.
(a)	Not applicable.
(b)	Not applicable.
(c)	Not applicable.
i.	Not applicable.
324	Yes.
325	This information is subject to legal privilege and cannot be provided.
326	No correspondence has been received from the Natural Resources Access Regulator on the actions it would take should environmental water deliveries proceed.
327 (a)	No.
328	This question should be referred to the Minister for Water.

ICAC Referral

329	Has the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) notified you, the Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation (CPHR) division or any individuals in CPHR about a referral to ICAC from the member for Barwon?
-----	---

Answer

329	No.
-----	-----

Broken Hill lead contamination

330	When were you first briefed on Mark Taylor's report "Environmental Lead Risks at Broken Hill, New South Wales, Australia: Sources, Exposures and Forward Solution"?
(a)	Who else attended the meeting at the time of your first briefing on the report?
(b)	Were you briefed on the report and plans for its release on subsequent occasions? If so, please provide details of each briefing, including timing and attendees.
331	Mark Taylor's report, "Environmental Lead Risks at Broken Hill, New South Wales, Australia: Sources, Exposures and Forward Solution", included a recommendation to "Determine and set an acceptable trigger value for Pb in deposited dust and introduce environmental licensing regulations limiting Pb in deposited dust". What, if any, steps have the EPA undertaken to act on this recommendation?
(a)	Please detail any work that has been done or is underway to identify a trigger value for lead in deposited dust.
(b)	Please detail any environmental licensing regulation changes that have been or are being progressed to limit lead in deposited dust.
(c)	Please document any changes made to the environmental licences for the lead mines in Broken Hill to limit lead in deposited dust.
332	Mark Taylor's report, "Environmental Lead Risks at Broken Hill, New South Wales, Australia: Sources, Exposures and Forward Solution", included a recommendation to "Continue dust deposition monitoring and continue to investigate ways to mitigate dust deposition". What has been done to progress this recommendation?
(a)	Please detail any work undertaken to monitor dust deposition in Broken Hill, since the publication of the report.
(b)	Please detail any work undertaken to investigate ways to mitigate dust deposition, since the publication of the report. Please include details of:
i.	All mitigation methods investigated
ii.	The methodology used
iii.	The effectiveness of each mitigation method in reducing dust deposition.
333	Please describe all air quality monitoring activities being undertaken and/or analysed by NSW EPA in Broken Hill between 2020 to the present date.

(a)	Does the EPA currently have funding to conduct and/or analyse air monitoring in Broken Hill? If so, please provide details of the total amount of funding, the activities it covers and the period it covers.
334	What roles and/or responsibilities does the EPA have in relation to the remediation of contaminated sites?
(a)	Please outline all remediation activities that the EPA have undertaken in relation to the remediation or abatement of lead contamination in Broken Hill since 2020. For each activity please describe:
i.	The site where remediation or abatement occurred
ii.	The time period when remediation or abatement activities took place
iii.	The remediation or abatement method used
iv.	The lead contamination levels before and after abatement.

Answer

330	I was notified about the report around September 2023.
(a)	Senior staff from the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and Ministerial Advisers.
(b)	No. I was told it was being released when I was briefed about it and I supported this.
331	The Premier's Department is leading a whole-of-government response to address environmental lead in Broken Hill and this recommendation is being considered as part of this work.
(a)	The Premier's Department is leading a whole-of-government response to address environmental lead in Broken Hill.
(b)	Recommendation 6 of the 2023 Parliamentary inquiry into the <i>Current and potential impacts of gold, silver, lead and zinc mining on human health, land, air and water quality in New South Wales</i> asked the Minister for Climate Change to instruct the EPA to review the clean air regulations and licensing made under the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i>, to examine whether licence conditions or regulatory requirements are best placed to manage the impacts of metals emitted from mines. The NSW Government committed that the EPA would provide advice to the Minister for Climate Change following its review. The EPA is carrying out its review.

(c)	Copies of all environment protection licences and their variations are available on the EPA's public register at www.epa.nsw.gov.au/Licensing-and-Regulation/Public-registers. The mines in Broken Hill hold licence numbers 2683, 2688 and 12559.
332	The EPA has continued to monitor lead levels in air and dust. There are seven dust deposition monitoring locations in Broken Hill. The data is analysed by the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW).
(a)	In collaboration with DCCEEW, the EPA's Broken Hill Environmental Lead Program (BHELP) operates seven dust monitoring locations to gather data on lead in dust and air.
(b) i-iii.	The Premier's Department is leading a whole-of-government response to address environmental lead in Broken Hill. The EPA has been working with all land managers and mines across the line of load to minimise and control dust emissions. This includes conducting regular site inspections and requiring the land managers and mines to implement improvements in dust suppression techniques being used, including increased suppressant coverage, minimising drop heights, increased cleaning of drainage lines, increased water cart usage, implementation of additional controls in dry windy weather and regular cleaning of sedimentation ponds. The EPA has also been reviewing the mines dust management plans and ensuring commitments made in the plans are being implemented on site. Where warranted, pollution reduction programs have been imposed on environment protection licences to enhance dust mitigation and controls measures. These changes can be found on the EPA's public register at www.epa.nsw.gov.au/Licensing-and-Regulation/Public-registers. The EPA is working with DCCEEW scientists to investigate options for ambient air and dust trigger values for lead.
333	The EPA, in collaboration with DCCEEW, operates seven dust monitoring locations to gather data on lead in dust and air.
(a)	The BHELP supports community dust monitoring activities.
334	The EPA examines and responds to information it receives about land contamination and regulates significantly contaminated land under the <i>Contaminated Land Management Act 1997</i>. The EPA also administers the NSW Accredited Site Auditor Scheme, makes or approves guidelines for investigating and remediating contaminated land, and manages a public record under the Contaminated Land Management Act.

(a) i-iv.	No declarations have been made under the Contaminated Land Management Act in Broken Hill. Since 2015, BHELP has supported ongoing home remediation, community dust monitoring, education and awareness activities, and policy development. Under the home remediation program, 178 homes in Broken Hill have been remediated since 2015. For privacy reasons, specific addresses have not been supplied.
--------------	--

Bowdens Silver Mines

335	The EPA recommended that Bowdens be required to prepare an air quality management plan as part of their conditions of consent. What, if any, role will the EPA play in assessing the adequacy of this plan?
336	Should Bowdens Silver Mines be approved by the Independent Planning Commissioner. what roles and/or responsibilities,. if any, would the EPA have in relation to:
(a)	The development of a remediation strategy for any lead contaminated sites that may occur as a result of mining activities?
(b)	The remediation of lead contaminated sites that may occur as a result of mining activities?

Answer

335	The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure consent conditions require the proponent to consult with agencies including the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) prior to submitting the management plan. The EPA will review and provide comment on the adequacy of the management plan.
336	
(a)	The EPA could use its regulatory powers under the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i> (POEO Act) to require the development of such a strategy should it be warranted.
(b)	The EPA could utilise its regulatory powers under the POEO Act to require the remediation of contaminated sites. The EPA can also regulate contaminated land under the <i>Contaminated Land Management Act 1997</i>.

Peabody Metropolitan Coal Mine

337	Since the determination of the Environment Protection Authority v
-----	---

	Metropolitan Collieries Pty Ltd [2025] case in March this year, what, if any, actions have the EPA taken to ensure that Peabody is now acting in accordance with its environmental licence and not committing offences under the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997?
(a)	Please provide details of any compliance or enforcement activities undertaken at the Peabody metropolitan site.
(b)	Please provide details of any monitoring for potential pollution in the vicinity of the mine, including Royal National Park.

Answer

337	The NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has undertaken a series of actions since March 2025 as part of its regulatory activities to assess compliance against the licence and environmental legislation. These actions include: • Inspections to assess dust controls, water management infrastructure, sedimentation dam management, receiving water quality and groundwater remediation works. • Issuing licence conditions in March 2025 requiring the implementation of works to reduce groundwater infiltration across the premises which had been contributing pollutants to Camp Gully Creek. These works were completed in late June 2025 and were inspected by the EPA in July 2025. • Overseeing Metropolitan Collieries’ progress against licence conditions requiring improvements to wastewater treatment plant discharges. This includes report review and response as well as meetings with the company. The most recent meeting was 18 August 2025. • Reviewing and responding to submitted management plans. Reviewing water quality monitoring through the real time monitoring system along Camp Gully Creek. This monitoring system was installed under a licence condition.
(a)	The EPA inspections and licence oversight has not identified any non-compliances at Metropolitan Collieries since March 2025.
(b)	The EPA requires ongoing water quality monitoring in Camp Gully Creek to support further assessment and improvement works in relation to premises water discharges and groundwater seepage. This includes the real time monitoring system in Camp Gully Creek which can be accessed at https://peabody.ghost.site/ .

PFAS contamination in the Belubula River and surrounding areas

338	What, if any, protocols do the EPA have in place for testing foam for PFAS?
339	Has the EPA undertaken any total oxidisable precursor assay (TOPA) testing as a part of any of the surface water or ground water sampling activities undertaken in the Belubula River and nearby sites since May 2024?
(a)	Does the EPA have any plans to introduce TOPA testing in future sampling efforts, to detect PFAS precursor compounds?
340	Has the EPA undertaken any human health and/or environmental risk assessments to assess the risks associated with PFAS contaminated foam?
(a)	Please confirm whether the EPA has undertaken any assessment of the potential risks to fish from consuming PFAS contaminated foam. If yes, please provide details of the assessment and all results arising from the assessment.
(b)	Please confirm whether the EPA has undertaken any assessment of the potential risks to cattle from consuming PFAS contaminated foam. If yes, please provide details of the assessment and all results arising from the assessment.
341	Please provide an explanation of why it took almost eight months to release findings from fish testing conducted in the Belubula River and surrounding waterways in January 2025.
(a)	Please provide an explanation for why a warning to the community about the risks of eating contaminated fish was not issued until August 2025, despite testing of fish occurring in January 2025.
(b)	Has the NSW Government done anything to address the likely sources of contamination in fish in these rivers?
342	Has the EPA undertaken an assessment of the potential risks to human health from consuming PFAS contaminated water?
(a)	If so, please provide details of how this assessment was undertaken and the outcomes of the assessment.
(b)	Please provide a copy of all results arising from such an assessment.
343	Has the EPA undertaken an assessment of the potential risks to human health from consuming PFAS contaminated fish in excess of the recommended amounts?
(a)	If so, please provide details of how this assessment was undertaken and the outcomes of the assessment.

(b)	Please provide a copy of any reports arising from such an assessment.
344	The EPA conducted surface water sampling in the Belubula River and a number of nearby sites in May, Aug, Oct and Dec 2024. On every occasion, the EPA detected PFOS levels that exceeded ecological water quality guidelines for multiple sites.
(a)	What has the EPA done to address this issue?
(b)	Please provide details of any activities that have been undertaken by the EPA to clean up PFAS contamination in the Belubula River and surrounding areas between May 2024 and the present date, please include details of:
i.	The time period the activity was undertaken
ii.	The location of the clean-up work
iii.	The methods used to clean-up the contamination
iv.	The PFAS levels at the site before and after clean-up.
345	The December 2024 report on surface water testing on the Belubula River and nearby sites identifies a number of potential contamination sources. Have any of the potential sources of PFOS contamination had changes made to their licence conditions?
(a)	Or have any other changes been made, to limit potential contamination?
346	Reports for surface water testing in the Belubula River and nearby sites between May and December 2024 indicate that for each surface water sampling event the EPA have analysed samples against livestock and irrigation water quality guidelines and ecological water quality guidelines, but never against Australian drinking water guidelines. Why is that?
347	How far downstream on the Belubula River or surrounding or connected waterways has the EPA conducted testing of PFAS contamination?
(a)	What is the EPA's understanding of how far PFOS contamination might be travelling?
i.	What evidence is the EPA using to inform this understanding?
348	Please provide an explanation of why the Australian Livestock Drinking Water Guidelines do not include a reference level for PFOS.
(a)	Does the EPA have a position on what a safe level for PFOS would be for livestock drinking water?

349	Please provide an explanation of why the Australian Irrigation Guidelines do not include a reference level for PFOS.
(a)	Does the EPA have a position on what a safe level for PFOS would be for irrigation water?
350	Why hasn't the EPA tested the volume of flows to determine the absolute load of PFOS at sites - volume of flow X nanograms per litre of water
351	PFOS is known to be widely used by the metallurgic mining industry to separate ores from flocculant and it is also known to be used in water for fracking operations. Does the EPA know whether Newmont's Cadia mine uses PFOS in its operations?
(a)	Has the EPA taken any steps to prevent Cadia mine from using PFOS in its mining operations (e.g. are there any conditions on their licence to prevent use)?
352	In May 2024, an EPA media release stated the EPA is "considering revising air emissions limits on the Cadia mine licence." Has this occurred?

Answer

338	All sampling and testing is carried out in accordance with the PFAS National Environmental Management Plan (NEMP) 3.0, which is available at: www.dcceew.gov.au/environment/protection/publications/pfas-nemp-3 .
339	No.
(a)	The NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) is seeking the advice of the NSW PFAS Expert Panel regarding the introduction of total oxidisable precursor assay testing.
340	No.
(a)	The EPA is seeking the advice of the NSW PFAS Expert Panel regarding potential risks to fish from consuming PFAS contaminated foam.
(b)	The EPA is seeking the advice of the NSW PFAS Expert Panel regarding potential risks to cattle from consuming PFAS contaminated foam.
341	The testing and interpretation process for biota samples take significantly longer than chemical testing of water. Once biota are caught, the biota samples require processing to enable testing at the laboratory. Once testing is complete and results are available, a health risk assessment is undertaken. The test results and the risk assessment are then considered by the NSW Government PFAS Technical Advisory Group. If required, precautionary advice is drafted and published.

(a)	The EPA is committed to ensuring the community is provided with accurate information. The EPA coordinated the collection and testing of biota samples and subsequent risk assessment and precautionary dietary advice prepared by the NSW Government PFAS Technical Advisory Group. This process was not completed until August 2025, and the community were informed soon afterwards.
(b)	Yes. In December 2024, the EPA imposed new licence conditions on the environment protection licence of Cadia Valley Operations, which includes new conditions requiring PFAS surface and groundwater monitoring on- and off- site. In addition, in March 2025, the EPA imposed new conditions on the environment protection licences of Cadia Valley Operations, Australian Native Landscapes (Blayney) and Blayney Landfill, requiring each site to undertake detailed site investigations to identify any potential sources of PFAS and assess any potential on and offsite impacts. These licence changes are reflected on the EPA's public register on its website.
342 (a-b)	No. NSW Health recommends that surface water from farm dams, rivers and creeks should not be used for drinking, cooking or personal hygiene (including cleaning teeth and bathing) without testing and appropriate treatment
343 (a-b)	No.
344	
(a)	Refer to the answer to supplementary question 341 (b).
(b) i-iv.	No PFAS clean-up activities have been undertaken in the Belubula River and surrounding areas.
345 (a)	Yes. Refer to the answer to supplementary question 341 (b).
346	The <i>Australian Drinking Water Guidelines</i> do not apply.
347	As of August 2025, the furthest downstream that the EPA has sampled for PFAS is at the Belubula River at Cucumber weir, Canowindra.
(a)	PFOS concentrations at this site were comparable with ambient PFOS concentrations in similar environments (EPA Victoria publication 2049, <i>Summary of PFAS concentrations detected in the environment in Victoria</i> , October 2022).
i.	www.epa.vic.gov.au/epa-science-report-summary-pfas-concentrations-detected-environment .

348	This question should be directed to the Australian Government Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water as the publisher of the Livestock Drinking Water Guidelines. The EPA understands these guidelines are under review.
(a)	No. The EPA seeks advice from the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development through the PFAS Technical Advisory Group and Expert Panel regarding livestock.
349	This question should be directed to the Australian Government Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water as the publisher of the Water Quality for Irrigation and General Water Uses Guidelines. The EPA understands these guidelines are under review at present.
(a)	No. The EPA seeks advice from the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development through the PFAS Technical Advisory Group and Expert Panel regarding irrigation.
350	The EPA monitors PFAS, and requires monitoring for PFAS, in accordance with the PFAS NEMP 3.0 which assesses PFAS based on concentrations. PFAS concentration levels help identify PFAS sources and are used to assess human exposure risks.
351	No. Refer to the answer to supplementary question 351 (a).
(a)	Since May 2024, the EPA has conducted a sampling program to investigate and understand potential sources of PFAS detections in the Belubula River. In response to the findings of the sampling program, the EPA varied the environment protection licences of several facilities in the area, including Cadia Holdings Pty Limited (Cadia), requiring them to conduct an <i>“Investigation of PFAS use and occurrence”</i>. This condition requires Cadia to identify all potential sources of PFAS which may have been used, stored or disposed of at the mine and assess potential risks to human health and the environment from such products.
352	No. Air emission limits will continue to be reviewed within statutory timeframes.

NSW Guide for Large Emitters

353	How will the new guide for large emitters affect the planning process for mining approvals or modifications?
-----	--

Answer

353	The <i>NSW Guide for Large Emitters</i> supports proponents to consider climate change in the NSW planning process. The guide requires proponents of
-----	--

	proposals with large projected greenhouse gas emissions to assess their emissions and mitigation opportunities. This enables the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and planning authorities to receive consistent information about a proposed development's greenhouse gas emissions and implications for NSW's emission reduction trajectories. As explained in the Guide, the EPA expects proponents of coal mining proposals to make substantial efforts to follow the mitigation hierarchy and to set ambitious emissions reduction goals that build on the facility's Australian Government's Safeguard Mechanism baseline (where relevant). These goals should be comparable to NSW interim and long-term legislated emissions reduction goals. If the project emissions trajectory and goals do not align with the overall NSW net zero legislated targets and emissions trajectory, the proponent must demonstrate why the alternative emission reduction trajectory is appropriate and provide supporting evidence.
--	---

Gas Decarbonisation Roadmap

354	Has the gas decarbonisation roadmap consultation started? If not, when will it start?
(a)	What will the consultation involve?

Answer

354	No. Consultation plans are under development.
(a)	Consultation is expected to include public and targeted engagement with key stakeholders.

PFAS in Biosolids

355	The NSW Biosolids Guideline Review was first published in April 2023 and amended in January 2025. Why has it taken so long to go out to consultation on a Draft Biosolids Order and Draft Biosolids exemption?
(a)	What element(s) of the report was amended in January 2025?
356	How many companies (public or private) currently supply biosolids for reuse as a soil amendment in NSW?
(a)	Please list each company.
357	What, if any, oversight does the EPA have of the users of biosolids across NSW?
(a)	Are the users of biosolids more often large corporations or do they also include individuals?

(b)	How are biosolids most typically supplied to an end-user?
358	How feasible would it be for a user of biosolids to test the land to which biosolids are to be applied for contaminants such as PFAS, as would be required by the draft biosolids exemption?

Answer

355	The work that the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) conducted and consulted on in 2023 informed the development of the PFAS National Environmental Management Plan 3.0 (PFAS NEMP). The PFAS NEMP was released on 4 March 2025 and provides nationally agreed guidance on the management of PFAS contamination in the environment, including in resource recovered wastes like biosolids. Once the PFAS NEMP was finalised, the EPA undertook targeted consultation on a new resource recovery order and exemption for biosolids to implement the PFAS NEMP guidance and other management measures to protect the environment including regulatory limits or monitoring for other chemicals of concern. This targeted consultation informed the final draft order and exemption now out for public consultation.
(a)	The ‘<i>NSW Biosolids Guideline Review Threshold derivation for contaminants in biosolids – PFAS, HHCB, triclosan, chlordane and PBDEs</i>’ report was amended in January 2025 following the detection of a minor error in the calculations used to derive thresholds for Polybrominated diphenyl ether (PBDE) Br10. This error was rectified and a new version published.
356	Based on information collated by the EPA in 2023, 48 companies generate or supply biosolids material as a soil amendment in NSW.
(a)	The EPA is aware of the following entities that supply biosolids for re-use or further processing for soil amendment purposes in NSW: 1. Altogether Operations 2. Arkwood Organic Recycling 3. Australian Native Landscapes Pty Ltd 4. Ballina Shire Council 5. Bathurst Regional Council 6. Bega Shire Council 7. Bellingen Shire Council 8. Bettergrow Pty Ltd 9. Biomass Solutions

10. Byron Shire Council
11. Cairncross Waste Management Facility O.R.R.F.
12. Carbon Mate Pty Ltd
13. Central Coast Council
14. Cleanaway Padstow
15. Coffs Harbour City Council
16. Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
17. Eurobodalla Shire Council
18. Goulburn Mulwaree Council
19. Hawkesbury City Council
20. Hunter Water Corporation
21. Kempsey Shire Council
22. Kosciuszko Thredbo Pty Ltd
23. Loop Organics
24. McGeary Bros Engineering
25. Mid-Coast Council
26. Muswellbrook Shire Council
27. Nambucca Valley Council
28. Perisher Blue Pty Limited
29. Port Macquarie-Hastings Council
30. Richmond Valley Council
31. Seventh Day Adventist
32. Shoalhaven City Council
33. Singleton Council
34. Snowy Hydro Limited
35. Snowy Monaro Regional Council
36. South East Waste Recovery Pty Ltd
37. Southern Disposal Services
38. Sydney Water Corporation
39. Tahmoor Coal
40. The Uniting Church in Australia Property Trust
41. Tony Gordon Septic Tank and Grease Trap Cleaning Service
42. Tweed Shire Council

	43. Veolia Environmental Services (Australia) Pty Ltd 44. Veolia Water Australia Pty Ltd 45. Veolia Water Solutions and Technology (Australia) Pty Ltd 46. Wagga Wagga City Council 47. Wingecarribee Shire Council 48. Yass Valley Council
357	The EPA conducts compliance activities. In February 2025, the EPA commenced a compliance campaign to review how biosolids are processed and applied to agricultural land across NSW under its resource recovery orders and resource recovery exemptions. Information gathered during the campaign will help inform future regulatory settings, including for PFAS levels in biosolids and other emerging contaminants.
(a)	Over 50% of the biosolids reused per year are used for agricultural purposes. Although some users are individuals, biosolids are typically managed and land applied by third parties on behalf of the sewage treatment plant operator.
(b)	Biosolids are supplied by truck either directly to land application sites or to a compost facility. Composters may either supply for direct land application or process into compost.
358	The Biosolids Guidelines includes the requirement for soil to be tested prior to biosolids being used in certain circumstances. The draft biosolids exemption also includes a new requirement to test for PFAS and PBDE in biosolids.

2024 State of the Environment report

359	For each of the following key findings in the 2024 State of the Environment, please provide full details of the data relied upon to inform each of the following key findings:
(a)	Most estuaries and coastal swimming sites have water quality that is suitable for swimming, but this varies, especially after heavy rainfall.
(b)	Coastal vegetation and habitats (saltmarsh, mangroves and seagrass) continue to be threatened by coastal development and climate change. While in some locations they are declining, in others coverage has improved due to good management.
(c)	Kelp forest area declined in all sampled locations between 2019 and 2023, from 25% to 60%.
(d)	Despite limited data for assessing statewide trends of coastal fish species, current monitoring of fisheries suggests fish stocks are stable, although some species are under threat.

Answer

359	These are all reported on in more detail and include full refencing of where the data has come from in the Coastal and Marine topic of the online State of the Environment Report.
(a)	Data on coastal swimming sites was obtained from the Beachwatch program, which is all online. More information is available under the ‘Swimming sites’ section of the Report. Data on Estuarine water quality was provided by the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, and visualised in Map W3.3.
(b)	The key finding captures the statuses reported under the Estuarine macrophytes which was informed by data provided by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development, and the pressures reported under ‘Development and recreation’ and ‘Climate change pressures and impacts’.
(c)	Data was provided by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. Detailed information is available under the ‘Kelp and seaweeds’ heading.
(d)	Data was provided by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development, including from its Marine Integrated Monitoring program, with supporting/supplemental data from Status of Australian Fish Stocks Reports and the Statewide BRUV Program. All these reports and data are freely available online.

ENERGY

Energy Savings Scheme

360	Please provide the rates of uptake of the Energy Savings Scheme in relation to heat pumps, pre and post the introduction of the \$200 copayment on heat pump sales.
(a)	Please provide a quarterly breakdown.
361	In June 2025, the Government announced a new ‘compliance blitz’ on the Energy Savings Scheme:
(a)	What is the aim of the compliance blitz?

Answer

360 (a)	The \$200 co-payment for heat pump hot water activities in the Energy Savings Scheme was introduced on 19 June 2024. The number of implementations per quarter in 2024 is:
------------	--

	1. Q1 2024: 7,843 2. Q2 2024: 10,064 3. Q3 2024: 3,784 4. Q4 2024: 1,332. The drop in implementation numbers from Q3 onwards is attributable to a range of factors including low certificate prices in the market, and changes to the calculations for residential heat pump activities.
361 (a)	This question should be referred to the Minister for Building.

ALL

Human health and environmental risk assessments

362	Have any agencies in the Environment, Climate Change, Energy and/or Heritage Portfolios ever engaged EnRisks to conduct human health and/or environmental risk assessments?
(a)	f [sic] yes, how many risk assessments have EnRisks conducted for the Environment, Climate Change, Energy and/or Heritage Portfolios in the 10 years between 2015 and 2025?
i.	Please provide details for each risk assessment, including what the assessment covered, when it was commissioned, when it was finalised and whether it has been publicly released (including a link to the final assessment where available).

Answer

362	Yes.
(a)	11.
i.	1. Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment (HHERA), Application of Alternative Waste Technologies Materials to Agricultural Land, 30 August 2019. Purpose: To assess the human health and ecological risks posed by application to agricultural land of mixed waste organic outputs (MWOO) generated at Alternative Waste Treatment facilities. Commissioned: Initially commissioned 28 September 2018 (interim HHERA). Available at: www.epa.nsw.gov.au/sites/default/files/hhera-mwoo-september-2019.pdf 2. Williamtown PFAS Priority Setting in Chemicals Management and

	Pollution Control Purpose: Numerous expert panel reviews of reports commissioned by the Department of Defence over this period (2015 – 2025). No report provided, only internal advice. Internal advice not released publicly. 3. Review – Boral Cement Berrima Works, Use of Solid Waste Derived Fuels in Kiln 6, Human Health Risk Assessment 19 October 2015 Purpose: To review the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) prepared by SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed use of solid waste derived fuels in Kiln 6 at the Boral Cement Works, Berrima. The report is available on the NSW Planning Portal’s Major Projects Hub at: majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=DA401-11-2002-I-MOD-9%2120190501T073636.652%20GMT. 4. Review – Boral Cement Berrima Works, Use of Solid Waste Derived Fuels in Kiln 6, Human Health Risk Assessment 11 February 2016 Purpose: To review the HHRA prepared by SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd as part of the EIS for the proposed use of solid waste derived fuels in Kiln 6 at the Boral Cement Works, Berrima and revised in response to previous comments by EnRisks provided in October 2015. The report is available on the NSW Planning Portal’s Major Projects Hub at: majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=DA401-11-2002-I-MOD-9%2120190501T073615.683%20GMT. 5. Review – Boral Cement Berrima Works, Use of Solid Waste Derived Fuels in Kiln 6, Human Health Risk Assessment 27 May 2016 Purpose To review the HHRA prepared by SLR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd as part of the EIS for the proposed use of solid waste derived fuels in Kiln 6 at the Boral Cement Works, Berrima and revised in response to previous comments by EnRisks provided in October 2015 and in February 2016 and during a meeting in April 2016. The report was provided to the then Department of Planning. The EPA understands it was published on the Planning Portal, but it does not appear to be available now. 6. Review – Human Health Risk Assessment, Environmental Impact Statement, The Next Generation, Energy from Waste Facility, Honeycomb Drive, Eastern Creek 6 July 2015 Purpose: To review the HHRA (provided as Appendix O of a revised EIS), for the proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Honeycomb Drive, Eastern Creek. The report was prepared by Fichtner Consulting Engineers Limited on behalf of The Next Generation NSW Pty Ltd.
--	--

The report is available on the NSW Planning Portal's Major Projects Hub at: majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=SSD-6236%2120190227T060515.739%20GMT.

7. Human Health Risk Assessment, Environmental Impact Statement, Energy from Waste Facility, Eastern Creek, NSW – Review of Health Risk Related Matters Covered in the EIS 8 March 2017

Purpose: To review the HHRA (provided as Appendix N of a revised EIS published in November 2016), for the proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Honeycomb Drive, Eastern Creek. The report was prepared by AECOM on behalf of The Next Generation NSW Pty Ltd.

The report is available on the NSW Planning Portal's Major Projects Hub at: majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=SSD-6236%2120190227T060125.907%20GMT.

8. Energy from Waste Facility, Eastern Creek, NSW – Review of Health Risk Related Matters Covered in the Proposal 7 March 2018

Purpose: To review the HHRA (provided as Appendix O of a Response to Submissions Report Dated October 2017) for the proposed Energy from Waste Facility, Honeycomb Drive, Eastern Creek. The report was prepared by AECOM on behalf of The Next Generation NSW Pty Ltd.

The report is available on the NSW Planning Portal's Major Projects Hub at: majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=SSD-6236%2120190227T060127.238%20GMT.

9. Independent Health Assessment Report: Respirable Crystalline Silica in the Community, Lynwood Quarry 9 June 2020

Purpose: To conduct a review and undertake a detailed assessment of the risks to human health posed by the potential presence of Respirable Crystalline Silica in dust emitted from the Quarry to residents at existing residential properties adjacent to the Quarry.

The report was released to key members of the public (some references to private resident sampling meaning that it wasn't broadly made available). However, in consultation with the Department of Health, a public fact sheet with advice on silica dust and health was drafted and released.

10. Review Comments and Advice: 32 Page Street, Banksmeadow 9 November 2017

Purpose: To review two letter reports provided to the NSW EPA in relation to off-site vapour risks relevant to the redevelopment works at 32 Page Street in Banksmeadow, NSW to determine whether there is an unacceptable (off-site) risk within the commercial properties along the northern side of Green Street (immediately to the south of the subject site); and whether the potential migration of contaminants from the area with high impact (soil vapour) that was not remediated and left on the site near the southern boundary of 32 Page

	Street, would change (or significantly contribute to) this risk. The public were informed by door knocks and letter drops in consultation with NSW Health. 11. Peer Review of HHRA Koppers Carbon Materials and Chemicals Pty Ltd (June 2018) Purpose: The EPA and Hunter New England Health (Department of Health) jointly commissioned EnRisks to peer review a HHERA that was prepared by AECOM (2018) in relation to benzene from air emissions from the Koppers facility at Mayfield in the Newcastle LGA. This report was not publicly released.
--	--

Appendix A - EnergyCo letter to Transgrid - 24 October 2023

EnergyCo



24 October 2023

[REDACTED]
General Manager of Network Planning
Transgrid
180 Thomas Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Re: Central West Orana REZ: centralised system strength provision

Dear [REDACTED],

EnergyCo is the Infrastructure Planner for NSW's five Renewable Energy Zones (REZs) and two priority transmission infrastructure projects (PTIPs), the Waratah Super Battery Project and the Hunter Transmission Project. EnergyCo's primary statutory function is "to investigate, plan, coordinate and carry out the planning and design" of generation infrastructure and construction and operation of storage and network infrastructure.

The Central-West Orana REZ was formally declared by the Minister for Energy and Environment under section 19(1) of the Electricity Infrastructure Investment Act 2020 (the Act) and published in the NSW Gazette on 5 November 2021, with an intended network capacity of 3 GW. As per the NSW Network Infrastructure Strategy, the network capacity of the Central-West Orana REZ is projected to be increased from 3 GW to 4.5 GW initially under Stage 1, and around 6 GW by 2038 under Stage 2.

EnergyCo as Infrastructure Planner may (in consultation with Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) and the Jurisdictional Planning Body) plan system strength remediation for generators' connection to NSW REZs and procure system strength solutions from a Network Operator.

EnergyCo is planning the provision of centralised system strength for Stage 1 of the Central-West Orana REZ Stage 1 to be delivered by the REZ Network Operator. This remediation of inverter-based resource (IBR) capacity within the REZ has been sized such that the IBR will have no net negative effect on system strength in the wider power system at the time the REZ connects to the power system.

EnergyCo provides the following information to support Transgrid's network planning and RIT-T on Meeting system strength requirements in NSW:

- The Network Operator must provide an initial centralised system strength solution that supports stable operation of access right holders to an aggregate nameplate rating of 5.84 GW.

The Energy Corporation of NSW (EnergyCo) is part of the **Treasury Cluster**

20 Bond Street, Sydney NSW 2000

1800 118 894
energyco.nsw.gov.au

1

- The initial centralised system strength solution will be provided by the equivalent of:
 - 7 x 250 MVA synchronous condensers, with a total fault current contribution under n-1 of between 5,190 MVA and 5,730 MVA at their points of connection to the network (the exact fault current contribution is to be confirmed)
 - Each synchronous condenser is expected to be normally in service, subject to planned maintenance and unplanned outages
 - The synchronous condensers are expected to be commissioned incrementally in advance of the levels of generation to which they correspond
- There is an option to provide an additional 250 MVA synchronous condenser, if required

This information is subject to EnergyCo's submission of an Infrastructure Planner Recommendation Report (IPRR) to AEMO Services as the Consumer Trustee, AEMO Services' authorisation of the IPRR, and a determination by the Australian Energy Regulator under the Transmission Efficiency Test.

This letter is to confirm that Transgrid is not expected to procure system strength for the initial stage of Central-West Orana REZ.

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Title]

Executive Director, Technical Advisory Services.

Appendix B – Table – Recommendations of the Heritage Council and its committees' not proceeded with

Project	Date of recommendation	Date of Minister decision	Nature of recommendation	Reasons for refusal
Kameruka Golf Course	3/10/2023	12/02/2024	State Heritage Register Committee – recommended to list	I make this direction to the Heritage Council for the following reasons, noting that the Heritage Council of NSW considers that the Kameruka Golf Course meets six of the seven State heritage significance criteria (namely (a), (b), (c), (e), (f), and (g)) established under section 4A(3) of the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i>: a) The Heritage Council states that it is the only extant example of a complete penal style golf course in NSW and the oldest golf course in its original design layout in NSW and Australia. However, I am not convinced the elements of the former golf course are strongly present. For example, the material provided to me noted the former golf course has not been used for around 20 years and the course features are only discernible when vegetation cover is minimal. I am not satisfied that the long-term conservation of the Kameruka Golf Course is necessary. b) There are differing opinions as to whether the restoration of the now abandoned Kameruka Golf Course into a viable business venture and community sporting facility is possible. There are differing opinions as to whether SHR listing would allow any reasonable economic uses of the land on which the Kameruka Golf Course is located. I am not satisfied that SHR listing would not render the item incapable of reasonable or economic use. c) I was not provided with sufficient evidence that listing would result in the suffering of actual financial hardship. As such, I am not of the view that listing would cause undue financial hardship to the owner, mortgagee or lessee of the Kameruka Golf Course or the land on which the Kameruka Golf Course is situated.

Project	Date of recommendation	Date of Minister decision	Nature of recommendation	Reasons for refusal
Warringah Civic Centre	6/09/2017	28/03/2024	State Heritage Register Committee – recommended to list	I make this direction to the Heritage Council for the following reasons, noting that the Heritage Council of NSW considers that Warringah Civic Centre Precinct meets six of the seven State heritage significance criteria (namely (a), (b), (f), and (g)) established under section 4A(3) of the Heritage Act 1977 (the Act): a) More than five years have passed since the recommendation was made b) Since the making of the recommendation, there has been a change in the ownership of Warringah Civic Centre Precinct c) Northern Beaches Council, the current owner of the Warringah Civic Centre Precinct, does not support listing in the form that was recommended in 2018 and would like the curtilage to be amended and for public consultation to be redone to canvas current community opinion. d) Noting these matters, it is apparent that the recommendation does not address each of the matters that I am required to consider in making a decision under section 34(1) of the Act. It would not be appropriate to direct the listing based on an out-of-date recommendation, given the change of ownership and the significance of that change to the matters required to be considered by the Heritage Council in its recommendation, being matters to which I must then have regard in making a decision under section 34(1). Consequently, I have decided not to direct the listing of Warringah Civic Centre Precinct on the State Heritage Register. However, as the Heritage Council of NSW considers the Warringah Civic Centre Precinct to be an item of State heritage significance and given the passage of time since the Heritage Council's recommendation, I consider it appropriate to request under section 32(2) of the Act that

Project	Date of recommendation	Date of Minister decision	Nature of recommendation	Reasons for refusal
				the Heritage Council give fresh consideration to the making of a recommendation to list Warringah Civic Centre Precinct on the State Heritage Register.
Warringah Civic Centre	4/06/2024	19/12/2024	State Heritage Register Committee – recommended to list	I make this direction to the Heritage Council for the following reasons, noting that the Heritage Council of NSW considers that the Warringah Civic Centre Precinct meets 5 of the 7 State heritage significance criteria (namely (a), (b), (c), (e), and (g)) established under section 4A(3) of the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i>: a) There are differing opinions as to whether the Warringah Civic Centre Precinct is fit for purpose. There are also differing opinions as to whether State Heritage Register listing would allow reasonable or economic uses of the Warringah Civic Centre Precinct. I am not satisfied at this time that State Heritage Register listing would not render the item incapable of reasonable or economic use. b) I was not provided with sufficient evidence that listing would result in the suffering of actual financial hardship. As such, I am not of the view that listing would cause undue financial hardship to the owner, mortgagee or lessee of the Warringah Civic Centre Precinct. Consequently, I have decided not to direct the listing of Warringah Civic Centre Precinct on the State Heritage Register.
The Maltings	7/03/2018	17/12/2024	State Heritage Register Committee – recommended to list	I make this direction to the Heritage Council for the following reasons, noting that the Heritage Council of NSW considers that The Maltings meets 5 of the 7 State heritage significance criteria (namely (a), (b), (c), (f) and (g)) established under section 4A(3) of the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> (the Act):

Project	Date of recommendation	Date of Minister decision	Nature of recommendation	Reasons for refusal
				• More than 6 years have passed since the recommendation was sent to the former Minister. • Since the making of the recommendation, a Development Application (DA) has been approved for the site and a modification to that DA is being considered. Noting these matters, it is apparent that the recommendation does not address each of the matters that I am required to consider in making a decision under section 34(1) of the Act. It would not be appropriate to direct the listing based on an out-of-date recommendation, being a matter to which I must then have regard in making a decision under section 34(1). Consequently, I have decided not to direct the listing of The Maltings on the State Heritage Register.
Macquarie Homestead Group	7/06/2018	17/12/2024	State Heritage Register Committee – recommended to list	I make this direction to the Heritage Council for the following reasons, noting that the Heritage Council of NSW considers that Macquarie Homestead Group meets 6 of the 7 State heritage significance criteria (namely (a), (b), (c), (e), (f) and (g)) established under section 4A(3) of the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> (the Act): • More than 4 years have passed since the recommendation was sent to the former Minister. • The owner raised an objection to the listing due to circumstances that arose more than a year after the original recommendation. These circumstances were not considered at the time of the Heritage Council's recommendation. Noting these matters, it is apparent that the recommendation does not address each of the matters that I am required to consider in making a decision under section 34(1) of the Act.

Project	Date of recommendation	Date of Minister decision	Nature of recommendation	Reasons for refusal
				It would not be appropriate to direct the listing based on an out-of-date recommendation, being a matter to which I must then have regard in making a decision under section 34(1). Consequently, I have decided not to direct the listing of Macquarie Homestead Group on the State Heritage Register.
Thomas Dick Moveable Photographic Collection	5/02/2020	17/12/2024	State Heritage Register Committee – recommended to list	I make this direction to the Heritage Council for the following reasons, noting that the Heritage Council of NSW considers that the Thomas Dick Photographic Collection (moveable heritage item) meets 5 of the 7 State heritage significance criteria (namely (a), (b), (c), (e) and (f)) established under section 4A(3) of the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> (the Act): • More than 3 years have passed since the recommendation was sent to the former Minister. • Since the making of the recommendation, there has been an objection made by an owner on the basis of the strong protections afforded to moveable heritage items by the <i>Australian Museum Trust Act 1975</i>. • The Thomas Dick Birrpai Photograph Collection is now inscribed on the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's Australian Memory of the World Register, which has given it international recognition as a documentary collection. Noting these matters, it is apparent that the recommendation does not address each of the matters that I am required to consider in making a decision under section 34(1) of the Act. It would not be appropriate to direct the listing based on an out-of-date recommendation, being a matter to which I must then have regard in making a decision under section 34(1).

Project	Date of recommendation	Date of Minister decision	Nature of recommendation	Reasons for refusal
				Consequently, I have decided not to direct the listing of Thomas Dick Photographic Collection (moveable heritage item) on the State Heritage Register.
St Mary's Roman Catholic Cathedral Precinct amendment	5/11/2024	19/12/2024	State Heritage Register Committee – recommended to amend listing (increase curtilage)	I make this direction to the Heritage Council for the following reasons, noting that the Heritage Council of NSW considers that the recommended amended listing curtilage meets 6 of the 7 State heritage significance criteria (namely (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) established under section 4A(3) of the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i>): a) The Heritage Council has recommended the amendment of the existing listing which would expand the curtilage to include archaeological relics, Cathedral House and Cathedral College buildings, and surrounding land and landscaping. I am not convinced that the elements proposed to be included in the amended listing curtilage satisfy the criteria for heritage significance at a state level. I consider that the state significant elements are adequately captured by the existing listing. I am not satisfied that the long-term conservation of many of the elements within the amended curtilage is necessary. b) The existing listing provides protection to Cathedral and Chapter House and protects these significant elements of the site. Archaeological relics are afforded separate protection under the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i>, regardless of whether they are within the curtilage of a State Heritage Register item. c) The amended curtilage includes land currently subject to a development application (D/2023/1153) which is before the Land and Environment Court. d) I was not provided with sufficient evidence that listing would result in the suffering of actual financial hardship. As such, I am

Project	Date of recommendation	Date of Minister decision	Nature of recommendation	Reasons for refusal
				not of the view that listing would cause undue financial hardship to the owner, mortgagee or lessee of the item. Consequently, I have decided not to direct the amendment of the listing of St Mary's Catholic Cathedral and Chapter House on the State Heritage Register.