

---

**From:** Cherie Burton  
**Sent:** Friday, 12 December 2025 12:25 PM  
**To:** PAWC  
**Subject:** LSCA QON

OFFICIAL

**INQUIRY INTO THE INTEGRITY, EFFICACY, AND VALUE FOR MONEY OF THE LOCAL SMALL COMMITMENTS ALLOCATION PROCESS**

**Hearing: 14 November 2025**

**Ms Cherie Burton, Director, Caucus Liaison Unit, Office of the Hon Chris Minns MP**

**Questions taken on notice**

Pages 5-6

**The CHAIR:** Do you still have this document somewhere—the Excel spreadsheet?

**CHERIE BURTON:** Which Excel spreadsheet?

**The CHAIR:** Sorry, the one that was provided to us that you say is two versions of the same document—the versions that were provided to us in the call for papers. There is, from Alison Morgan, an Excel spreadsheet and that is what we have attached in printout form. We also have another one that was provided to us separately, which is again that sort of Excel spreadsheet. As you say, it looks like there are two versions printed off at different times or emailed at different times. Do you have the original document somewhere—that Excel spreadsheet?

**CHERIE BURTON:** Under the call for papers we've submitted everything we have. However, I am happy to take that on notice and Mr Mills and I will go back and have another look. But, as I sit here now, we've submitted all the documents that we have. But, as I said, I'm happy to take it on notice and just go back and have another look.

**The CHAIR:** I'm curious as to where it sits now, because it fell in that weird sort of space between a campaign thing and a government thing. Where does it sit in terms of being able to check the bona fides of that or, from a records management perspective, where does it reside?

**CHERIE BURTON:** I'm happy to go back and have a look. Yes, happy to do that.

**Answer**

**The Government complies with its obligations for orders for the production of documents under Standing Order 52 and also Government Information Public Access (GIPA) requests.**

**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 State Records Act 1998.**

**Page 11**

**The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL:** Sure. We'll let you do that and we can come back to that in the next question. I'll just ask you in the time we've got left, Ms Burton, before you were saying that with the different lists, there were iterations and it was worked on and contact details were put in. I accept that after an election, you've probably got candidates who say, you know, we want to give it to this club but we're not sure who the best person is. But can you explain why, for some of the seats, it wasn't just contact details that were changed significantly between the versions of the list we had? It

was entire new projects added. It was changes from all of the money going to councils to suddenly having a list of eight or nine projects. Wollondilly is the seat that I want to raise. Surely, you can understand that's more than just iterations and contact details being added. Why did that happen in a seat like Wollondilly? Can you explain that?

**CHERIE BURTON:** I can't speak to the individual seats because, as I said before, it was a very busy time. What I can say is that, obviously, as we were going through and collecting details, there would have been corrections or whatever. I'm not aware of any particular seats. We've talked about Sydney but apart from that—and Ryde, I guess.

**The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL:** With Wollondilly—again, it's all in the public documents that we've got—it went from all going to local councils to most of it then going to individual projects, but you have no idea how it went from one to the other.

**CHERIE BURTON:** I can't comment on Wollondilly, so I'd have to take—

**The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL:** Would you take that on notice and maybe explain to us how it was such a dramatic iteration between the original list and the source of truth list that the department's using?

**CHERIE BURTON:** Yes.

### **Answer**

**I refer to my previous evidence, including at page 12 of the transcript of the 14 November 2025 hearing.**

### **Page 19**

**The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL:** Just on those projects, Ms Burton, that changed—and you use Ryde as an example. There was a specific project that was identified—it was the cultural centre, I think—that didn't go ahead for whatever reason, or you said there's other community groups that couldn't take the money. Then the default of what was left over in those seats to make up 400 grand should have gone to local councils. That was the process? Is that right?

**CHERIE BURTON:** It's still a change. You're saying there's no changes. That wasn't true then to the election commitment.

**The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL:** Your point was, if the election commitment wasn't approved on the advice of the department, for whatever reason—proponent wasn't able to do it—then the default was that money then went to councils. That's correct?

**CHERIE BURTON:** That was my understanding, yes.

**The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL:** Why are there examples where it's gone the other way round? I draw you back again to Wollondilly, where the election commitment was \$400,000 to councils, and now approved on the LSCA website are about a dozen community groups that have gotten money. Can you explain that?

**CHERIE BURTON:** I've said that the only real seats that stand out to me, obviously, are Sydney and Ryde, because we had some issues there.

**The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL:** I'm not asking you about those, with respect.

**CHERIE BURTON:** But in relation to—

**The Hon. SARAH MITCHELL:** Can you explain to me why it would have gone the other way?

**CHERIE BURTON:** I'll take it on notice. I'll take that one on notice.

### **Answer**

**I refer to my previous evidence, including at page 12 of the transcript of the 14 November 2025 hearing.**

### **Page 20**

**The Hon. CHRIS RATH:** Ms Burton, just on that then, how do you explain that the list that the department has given us from June 2023—what we call the original list—differs from the July 2023 list—

**CHERIE BURTON:** Like I said—

**The Hon. CHRIS RATH:** Let me just finish—the source of truth document. Surely we should rely on the original June 2023 list rather than the July 2023 list because there are discrepancies in over 20 seats between those two documents.

**CHERIE BURTON:** We've already explained that it was a working document and that things were being updated and it was being worked on for a number of months. You're asserting that—I don't even know what you're asserting, but I said that I don't know specific seats because there was a lot going on at the time. Ninety-three seats, we've been through all of that. I'm happy to take it on notice and have a look. Happy to assist the Committee. As I said, in relation to the list, they were constantly being worked on. Contact details and things were being updated, so I think you just have to be—I'll take it on notice.

**The Hon. CHRIS RATH:** The original list versus the source of truth, as examples—

**CHERIE BURTON:** That's not the original.

**The Hon. CHRIS RATH:** Let me just finish.

**CHERIE BURTON:** It's the same list.

**The Hon. CHRIS RATH:** Let's call it the 23 June list versus the 23 July list. I won't put any adjective to describe it, but the 23 June list versus the 23 July list, the discrepancies are seats like Sydney—which we've spoken about at length. Wollondilly, Murray, Barwon, Orange are discrepancies between that June list and the July list. Do you have any explanation why those seats in particular have changed in that intervening one-month period?

**CHERIE BURTON:** I'd have to take it on notice because I do want to make sure that I look into it. As I've said, it was a process. It was a working document. It was being worked on in relation to checking details, checking commitments and those sorts of things. I can't be specific but I'm happy to take it on notice.

#### **Answer**

**I refer to my previous evidence, including at page 12 of the transcript of the 14 November 2025 hearing.**

OFFICIAL