

BUDGET ESTIMATES 2012
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

Questions from the Hon R Brown MLC:

QUESTION 1

When did the waste levy review begin?

ANSWER

17 January 2012.

QUESTION 2

When is the waste levy review due to be reported to Parliament?

ANSWER

There is no statutory requirement to report the outcomes of the waste levy to Parliament. The NSW Government is currently considering the recommendations from the review.

QUESTION 3

What baseline studies have been done to determine the distribution and numbers of feral animals and weeds in our National Parks? If there have been none – how does the Service determine the success or otherwise of its eradication efforts?

ANSWER

The Department of Primary Industry (DPI) is the lead agency for feral animals and weeds and prepares maps of the distribution of key pest animal and weed species across NSW.

Other more specific baseline studies and surveys are being undertaken for specific pest animal and weed species including wild horses in Kosciuszko National Park and where priority threatened species or endangered ecological communities are being impacted by pest animals and weeds such as the Red Fox and Bitou Bush.

QUESTION 4

How often do national parks get visits from Rangers or other park staff? Is it a fact that some of the more remote parks only get a weekly or monthly visit?

ANSWER

A risk based approach is used to determine the resourcing requirements for each park. National parks with the highest visitation are visited every day. Some of the more remote parks may only be visited by staff on a weekly or lesser basis, however staff are always available to immediately respond to reported incidents such as fires.

QUESTION 5

I note from the Building the Future – Budget Overview Document that \$71 million has been provided to manage pest animals and weeds and improve fire management in National Parks. Can you provide the Committee with a breakdown of how that money will be spent?

ANSWER

Of the \$71 million in recurrent funding, fire management activities have been allocated \$37 million and activities to limit the impact of pest and weeds have been allocated \$34 million. These funds are then allocated across the state at a local level to programs identified as priorities within the reserve fire management strategies and the 14 new regional pest management strategies.

QUESTION 6

I note from the Building for the Future – Budget Overview Document that there is an allocation of \$1 million per week (\$53 million for the year) for programs to deliver energy efficiency and water savings for individuals, families and businesses. How much has been spent so far, and on what programs? How many of these programs are in rural and regional areas?

ANSWER

Program	Expenditure 1 July – 30 Sept 2012	Regional delivery*
Home Power Saver Program	\$3,288,420	Approximately 60%
Energy Efficiency for Small Business	\$1,747,761	Approximately 42%
Energy Saver	\$1,055,194	Approximately 48%.
Energy Efficiency Community Awareness	\$4,015	Approximately 60% of libraries with Save Power kits for loan are located in rural and regional areas.
Energy Efficiency Training Program	\$963,481	Statewide – no statistical information re regional and rural participation available.
Government Energy Efficiency	\$186,712	Approximately 97% of small frontline sites retrofitted to date are located in the Hunter and Illawarra regions. Approximately 60% of the large energy using sites that have been assisted to undertake water and energy efficiency upgrades to date are located in rural and regional areas.
Climate Change Fund Grant projects and programs	\$692,284	Approximately 60%.

Central Coast Water Savings Fund	\$187,000	100%
TOTAL	\$8,124,867	

*Note: rural and regional areas are counted as those local government areas that are not included in the regional council organisations that comprise the Sydney Metropolitan area -- the Northern Sydney Organisation of Councils; Macarthur Regional Organisation of Councils; Shore Regional Organisation of Councils; Southern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils; Sydney Coastal Councils Group; Western Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils.

QUESTION 7

There is an allocation of \$890,000 for the upgrading of the Park and Wildlife Website this year, following on from \$1.2M last year. When will the project be finished and what benefits have there been for the staff and public from this expenditure?

ANSWER

The new visitor website for NSW National Parks is being delivered in a phased approach:

- Phase 1 – Launched 31 May 2012
- Phase 2 – Release planned for mid December 2012

The benefits of the new website for the public include:

- Up-to-date, relevant content on NSW national parks, including inspirational imagery;
- Search engine-optimised content, enabling easy access to visitor information showcasing a range of on-park experiences;
- Online booking capability allowing customers to directly book accommodation, products and services;
- Vastly enhanced online maps;
- Integration of social media with the website, providing access to the customer experience team;
- An online tool assisting visitors to trip plan through a suite of digital initiatives including suggested itineraries, visual galleries, videos and apps;
- A holistic and consistent approach to providing other marketing services to customers; and
- Real time online booking capability, and significantly enhanced capability to manage and report on sales and bookings, including for ticketing, annual passes and accommodation.

QUESTION 8

There is \$6.2M in the budget to “buy land for parks across New South Wales”. What land has already been purchased this year, and at what cost? What other properties are being considered for purchasing to be turned into National Parks?

ANSWER

No land has been purchased as part of the 2012-13 land purchase program and no funds have yet been expended.

They form additions to existing reserves rather than establishing new reserves and represent lands within critical natural corridors (such as the Great Eastern Ranges) and landscapes to

effectively deliver the Government's Green Corridor Reserves program or lands that will enhance park management efficiencies on a financial or practical basis.

QUESTION 9

In the budget Paper Number 3 at page 7-14, under Parks and Wildlife there is an entry relating to "Participation in Discovery community education programs" in which roughly 300,000 people take part each year, and all but two per cent of them are "satisfied". Just what are these programs and why were two percent of people not happy?

ANSWER

The NSW National Parks Discovery Walks, Talks and Tours program, which incorporates Discovery for Schools and Aboriginal Discovery, is a community education program delivered by specialist rangers in national parks and reserves across the state.

Tours are offered for all ages and abilities and range from guided coastal walks and wildlife spotting to rockpool rambles, kayaking tours and school holiday activities for children.

NPWS Discovery tours service a wide range of customers. It is testament to the high quality of the program that the vast majority of people are either satisfied or very satisfied with their Discovery experience despite weather conditions on the day or other externalities associated with outdoor experiences.

QUESTION 10

Budget Paper Number 3 (page 7-15) – under Scientific Services has an entry relating to "ecotoxicological tests undertaken to inform NSW Government responses to impacts of chemicals on plants and animals". What exactly are these tests and why where there a total of 427 in 2010-11, but only 250 for the next two years?

ANSWER

427 was the actual total number of tests performed in 2010-11. 250 is an estimate of the number of tests for the next financial year based on previous averages.

When investigating spills or illegal discharges, samples usually need to be analysed to determine the pollutants, the potential environmental risk and inform on regulatory actions. Ecotoxicological testing provides an assessment of the actual toxic potency of the sample on a range of organisms, including plants and animals (such as worms, crustaceans or larval fish).

The estimated number of samples to be analysed per year is based on typical activity levels from previous years, but actual numbers are driven by unpredictable events. A number of incidents in 2010 -11 and 2011-2012 e.g. a fire at a chemical storage site, waste dumping, waste and fly ash leachate, and water quality investigation around a mine necessitated a number of tests. 100% of tests were done for the EPA.

QUESTION 11

In Budget Paper 3 at Page 7-12, I note that Agreements for Private land in New South Wales to be managed by landholders for conservation outcomes, including wildlife refuges and voluntary conservation now total just over one thousand agreements. How much land is

involved in those agreements, and how much of that land is situated in the western division under western land leases?

ANSWER

As of 30 September 2012 there are:

- 349 Conservation Agreements (CAs) in NSW, covering an area of 141,193 hectares. 5 CAs are on Western Lands Leases covering an area of over 103,764 hectares
 - 670 Wildlife Refuges (WRs) in NSW, covering an area of 1,936,197 hectares. 60 WRs are on Western Lands Leases covering an area of 1,266,306 hectares.
-

QUESTION 12

Budget paper Number 4 lists the value of Agencies Physical Assets, but Environment and Heritage doesn't seem to appear as a separate entity. What is the total value of the agencies "physical assets", including all National Parks and other national Estate land?

ANSWER

The Environment and Heritage Portfolio is an office within the Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPC). DPC owns 1.4% of the State Owned Physical Assets.

QUESTION 13

Exactly what is the Perisher Range Development, which seems to be a project running from 2005 until 2026, and will cost about \$40M, of which about \$900,000 has been allocated for this year?

ANSWER

The Perisher Range Resorts Infrastructure Upgrade Program is a program of municipal works and service provision provided by the NPWS who are the "town council" in Perisher Range Resorts (the resort villages of Perisher, Smiggin Holes and Guthega). This includes provision of water and waste water services, garbage and recycling, roads, oversnow transport services, freight, medical services, post office and public facilities (public shelter, toilets, lighting, signage, walking track, snowshoe and cross country ski trails).

The program was subject to review by the Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal (IPART) in 2006. IPART determined that Perisher Range Resort required \$160million (capital and recurrent) to provide these vital services to NSW's largest and most popular ski resort.

Since 2006 over \$40m has been spent in Perisher on upgrades to water supply head-works, sewerage head-works, construction of concrete village roads, implementing new garbage collection services including a new waste transfer station as well as the costs of operating the resort villages such as snow clearing, snow grooming, cross-country ski trail and snowshoe trail development, grooming and management, running freight, transport, medical and postal services, and provision of street signage and furniture.

This year's program of capital works includes some minor road sealing and stormwater management upgrades and replacement of a sewer rising main.

QUESTION 14

What specific visitor infrastructure improvements in National Parks will be funded by the \$2M allocation in the budget?

ANSWER

A wide range of capital investments in visitor infrastructure improvements are being carried out this year including upgrades to buildings and facilities at Hill End, Scheyville, Hartley, Audley, Greencape, Barrenjoey and Yarragobilly, as well as a wide range of walking track upgrades.

QUESTION 15

How many projects for the private development of tourist/wilderness facilities in NPWS lands have been approved or are currently under consideration?

ANSWER

A project is underway to identify, analyse and prioritise opportunities to deliver improved and sustainable financial returns and visitor-focused outcomes. A methodology has also been developed to assess the most appropriate management arrangements based on defined decision points.

Further work is required to assess the feasibility of each opportunity. At this point 17 potential opportunities have been identified and are at various stages of assessment.

QUESTION 16

Can the Minister provide the Committee with a copy of the new organisational structure for the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, and a list of all premises occupied and the staffing number in each of these premises?

ANSWER

Provided in two separate documents *Q16 premises occupied staff numbers (excel)* & *Q16 NPWS structure (power-point doc)*.

End of questions from the Hon R Brown MLC

Questions from the Hon C Faehrmann MLC:

QUESTION 1

How many staff will be employed under the new OEH structure to specifically undertake work in relation to climate change?

ANSWER

The Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) is currently undergoing a strategic realignment, as announced by the Minister for Environment and Heritage on 17 July 2012. The realignment represents a significant change to the way the NSW Government delivers environmental and heritage services, information, regulation and funding.

Streamlining management and making OEH more accountable will save taxpayers more than \$16 million this financial year with total savings of \$100 million over four years to 2015-16. At least 350 jobs from around 3,000 positions will go from OEH over three years.

As part of the realignment, OEH will be reduced from eight operational areas to six. As such, it is not meaningful to make a comparison between numbers in the previous divisions and expected numbers in the new divisions. Targeted reductions in staff numbers are expected to be drawn from all divisions.

QUESTION 2

How many staff will be employed under the new OEH structure to specifically undertake work on threatened species recovery?

ANSWER

See question 1 above.

QUESTION 3

How many staff will be employed under the new OEH structure to specifically undertake work on biodiversity protection?

ANSWER

See question 1 above.

QUESTION 4

How many staff will be employed under the new OEH structure to specifically undertake work in direction relation to wilderness protection?

ANSWER

See question 1 above.

QUESTION 5

What are OEH plans for deregulating wildlife licensing?

ANSWER

It is the NSW Government's priority to reduce red tape for members of the public for low risk activities such as keeping certain native animals as pets, or rehabilitating sick or injured wildlife. This has the additional benefit of allowing regulatory and compliance efforts to be more focussed on activities linked to issues of high conservation value and/or animal welfare risk.

Some of the reforms to regulatory processes have already resulted in:

- Cheaper and faster access to licences for customers through web based licensing, making it easier for people to comply with regulatory practices;
- More effective compliance assurance through the setting of minimum standards, for example through the release of codes of practice for animal keepers and wildlife rehabilitators;
- Reductions in carbon based emissions and waste, through less use of paper based licences and record books, and increased use of online applications;
- Annual salary savings to Government in excess of \$100,000, which allows existing resources to be focussed on regulation of activities of highest risk.

QUESTION 6

What precisely does reducing effort in biodiversity programs involve?

ANSWER

The Office of Environment and Heritage is currently reviewing its range of biodiversity programs in terms of their alignment with the Government's priorities, delivery of value for the public investment made (addressing efficiency and effectiveness) and complementarity with other parts of government activity. It is expected that this review will identify opportunities to reduce effort in biodiversity programs without compromising environmental outcomes.

QUESTION 7

Will there be less money available for the development and implementation of recovery plans compared to last year and the year before?

ANSWER

No. The NSW Government has provided an additional \$250,000 over the past 18 months to develop plans for 405 species listed in the *Threatened Species Conservation Act*. Furthermore, it has provided an additional \$4.8 million dollars over the next four years (2012/13 – 2015/16) to implement plans. This includes \$1.18 million to implement actions in the recovery plans for the Koala, Brush-tailed Rock Wallaby, Malleefowl and Southern Corroboree Frog.

QUESTION 8

What precisely will be cut to save costs in kangaroo harvesting programs?

ANSWER

Centralisation of licence processing has been undertaken and less than one position will be deleted.

QUESTION 9

How will wilderness and wild river assessments be reduced?

ANSWER

Assessments will continue to be progressed with a small reduction in the resources assigned to the program.

QUESTION 10

How exactly will soil and salinity research be scaled back? What pieces of research will no longer go ahead as the result of budget cuts or how else will the research be curtailed?

ANSWER

OEH is scaling back research on the role of soils in climate change mitigation, and acid-sulfate soils.

QUESTION 11

The budget papers for the Premier and Cabinet indicate that \$71M will be spent managing pest animals and weeds and improving fire management in national parks.

- a) How much of this will be expended in the 2012-13 financial year?
- b) How much has been allocated to on-ground activities versus administrative costs?
- c) How does this compare with on-ground expenditure in the 2011-12 financial year?
- d) How will this be allocated across the state?

ANSWER

- a) It is intended that the entire budget allocated for fire, pests and weeds will be spent this year.
 - b) Approximately 75% is spent on direct staff and operational costs of implementing these programs. 25% of the total budget relates to operational overheads such as insurance, depreciation, salary on-costs, fire management planning and training.
 - c) The budget for 2012-13 has increased by 4.2% since 2011-12.
 - d) The funding is allocated according to the priorities identified within the regional fire, pest and weeds management strategies.
-

QUESTION 12

Have 15 of 65 Area Manager positions been made redundant?

ANSWER

All 66 current Area Manager positions will be removed and 50 new positions created with more strategic roles to better meet the needs of the Government and community.

QUESTION 13

How is removing Area Managers compatible with shifting to a more localised regional service?

ANSWER

The reduction in Areas will see a reduction in senior management positions and will require the new Area Managers to operate at a more strategic level. It is anticipated that there will be no impact on the capacity of NPWS to deliver on-ground conservation works and services to visitors to NSW's national parks and reserves.

QUESTION 14

Are you merging areas that are managed by Area Managers?

ANSWER

Boundary adjustments have been made to almost all the current 66 Areas.

QUESTION 15

Please explain how removing Area Managers is compatible with shifting to a more localised regional service?

ANSWER

The reduction in Areas will see a reduction in senior management positions and will require the new Area Managers to operate at a more strategic level. It is anticipated that there will be no impact on the capacity of NPWS to deliver on-ground conservation works and services to visitors to the NSW national parks and reserves.

QUESTION 16

Can you guarantee that the workload for individual Area Managers and Field Supervisors is not increasing under your Government?

ANSWER

The nature of the work undertaken by certain roles is changing but there is no expectation that the workload will increase.

QUESTION 17

How much did it cost OEH to re-brand the logo from DECCW to OEH, including changes to web sites, signage, stationery and uniforms?

ANSWER

The cost of the change of name from DECCW to OEH is estimated at \$29,650.

QUESTION 18

How much new funding has been allocated to the Tourism and Partnerships Branch of NPWS? a) What is their total allocation in 2012/13?

ANSWER

Within the 2012-13 Budget Papers, the Tourism and Partnership Branch was allocated \$0.9 million in new recurrent funding and \$0.9m capital to meet the one-off costs of the National Parks and Wildlife Service's website upgrade and on-line booking systems. The Branch was allocated a total of \$7 million of recurrent consolidated funds for 2012-13.

QUESTION 19

How much new funding has been allocated to the branch dealing with conservation programs?

a) Has the funding allocation to this branch been reduced in 2012/2013?

b) What is its total allocation to the conservation programs branch in 2012/2013?

ANSWER

New funding is \$1,046,000.

a) No.

b) In 2012/2013, the Conservation Programs Division has an expenditure budget of \$21.6 million.

QUESTION 20

Which functional areas within OEH will be dismantled as a result of budget cuts and 'strategic alignment'?

ANSWER

See question 1 above.

QUESTION 21

Which Executive Director positions will be made redundant under the OEH restructure or 'strategic realignment'?

ANSWER

The following Executive Director and Deputy Chief Executive (Senior Executive Service) positions were deleted effective 22 October 2012:

- Deputy Chief Executive Environment & Heritage Policy & Programs
- Executive Director Policy, Economics & Governance

- Executive Director Corporate Services
-

QUESTION 22

How did the Government determine the 79 national parks that the recreational hunting policy would apply to?

ANSWER

This list of parks and reserves was determined by the Government following discussions with the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

QUESTION 23

Prior to the announcement of the new policy to allow recreational hunters into 79 national parks, what assessments were undertaken of the feral animal problems in each of those national parks to determine whether recreational hunting would be sensible strategy to assist in their control?

ANSWER

The NPWS regional pest management strategies assess and identify the appropriate techniques, including ground shooting, for the control of feral animals. Licensed game hunters will be used to assist with ground shooting.

QUESTION 24

Which national parks will be open for recreational hunting from 27 December 2012?

ANSWER

None. The new legislation commences on that date but a declaration that would allow operations to commence does not take effect until at least 30 days after public notice is given.

QUESTION 25

Will there be analysis before any each national park is declared open to hunting of the specific nature of its feral animal problem and whether recreational hunting will be able to assist a targeted professional pest control program?

ANSWER

Yes.

QUESTION 26

Have you started such analyses for any of the national parks on the list of 79?

ANSWER

NPWS has commenced assessing these parks.

QUESTION 27

Will you be allowing recreational hunters in to shoot specific feral animals according to a scientifically determined strategic feral animal control plan? Or will recreational shooters be allowed in to shoot which ever feral animals they like whenever they like?

ANSWER

On-ground operations and the conditions under which they occur will be informed by NPWS's Regional Pest Management Strategies.

QUESTION 28

What rules will be established to safeguard other recreational users and businesses using National Park estate at the same time as shooting is being carried out?

ANSWER

These rules are currently being developed through a cross-agency working group. Safety is the paramount concern in developing these rules.

QUESTION 29

Will there be public consultation before a national park is declared open to hunting?

ANSWER

Under the legislation, at least 30 days public notice must be given before land is declared.

QUESTION 30

What is the total amount of money allocated to implement the recreational hunting in national parks policy?

- a) Of this amount, how much is:
- i. Staffing costs?
 - ii. Training costs?
 - iii. Signage costs?
 - iv. Publicity costs?
 - v. Other implementation costs?

ANSWER

In 2012/13 the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) has allocated \$100,000 to assist in development of the program rules. The majority of this is expected to be used for salaries of short term project staff developing program materials.

QUESTION 31

What will be the cost of ensuring that recreational shooters are properly certified and trained, and safe to operate?

ANSWER

I have been advised by the Minister for Primary Industries that this will be determined as part of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Game Council and the Office of Environment and Heritage for the management of licensed individuals helping to control pest animals in selected National Parks, nature reserves and State conservation areas.

QUESTION 32

Will it be necessary to undertake proficiency training and a practical test to assess levels of skill?

ANSWER

I have been advised by the Minister for Primary Industries that this is not required under the *Firearms Act 1996*, which regulates licensed hunters.

QUESTION 33

Will these changes result in an increase in enforcement staff to deal with compliance by amateur hunters with the regulations?

ANSWER

No. Many NPWS staff already undertake enforcement activity for a variety of issues. This may cause a change in some of the priorities for enforcement in some locations.

QUESTION 34

What additional resources (dollars and staffing) have been negotiated for supervising the recreational hunters?

ANSWER

Nil.

QUESTION 35

Which programs are these staff being drawn from?

ANSWER

Not applicable.

QUESTION 36

Are there plans to allocate more funds to the NPWS to regulate/enforce the laws?

ANSWER

NPWS will prioritise enforcement activities as appropriate.

QUESTION 37

What investigation is being undertaken to address concerns raised about some shooters already entering national parks with firearms and undertaking hunting following the announcement of the law change?

ANSWER

Reports of such activity are investigated by NPWS staff, in conjunction with other agencies such as Police and RSPCA and this results in legal action where appropriate. There were 25 convictions for hunting-related offences in 2011/12.

QUESTION 38

What risk assessments have been conducted regarding access by recreational hunters to state forests in NSW?

ANSWER

I have been advised by the Minister for Primary Industries, who has the Ministerial responsibility for State Forests that a risk assessment was carried out in 2006 under the previous Labor Government prior to allowing access by licensed hunters to declared State Forests in NSW, and a second risk assessment was undertaken in 2009.

QUESTION 39

What risk assessments have been conducted regarding access by recreational hunters to national parks in NSW?

- a) Are these different to the risk assessments for shooting in State Forests?

ANSWER

A risk assessment is currently underway, involving NPWS safety specialists, pest management experts, regional staff, unions, Forests NSW and Game Council. The approach is different to that used by Forests NSW, to account for the different operating context and NPWS' existing established risk management systems.

QUESTION 40

What risk assessments are currently proposed regarding access by recreational hunters to National Parks in NSW?

- a) What funding has been allocated for Risk Assessments regarding access by recreational hunters to National Parks in NSW?

ANSWER

A risk assessment is underway. This is being carried out using existing resources.

QUESTION 41

What advice has been received regarding liability of national park Rangers for accidents that occur while they are supervising recreational hunting in national parks?

ANSWER

Consistent with the development of a range of programs in National Parks, ongoing advice is being received about a range of matters relating to the program.

QUESTION 42

Is further advice being sought about liability issues?

- a) If so, from who?
- b) If not, why not?

ANSWER

Legal advice continues to inform the development of program rules.

QUESTION 43

What checks will be carried out at national parks to ensure that any recreational hunters that enter are appropriately licensed and have appropriate permits?

ANSWER

The rules under which the program will operate are currently being developed through a cross-agency working group.

QUESTION 44

Does the existing NPWS Public Liability Insurance cover the public, paid workers and volunteers in the park against being injured/killed by amateur hunters in National Parks?

- a) If not, are changes being proposed so that they are covered?

ANSWER

NPWS is already insured against a diverse range of events, in accordance with NSW Treasury requirements.

QUESTION 45

What monitoring will be carried out to assess the impact of hunting in national parks on passive users of parks including bushwalkers and campers?

ANSWER

The development of the program currently underway includes consideration of an appropriate regime to assess the effectiveness and impacts of the program.

QUESTION 46

What notice will be provided to the public that a national park, or part of a national park, is open to hunters?

- a) Will any such notice regime ensure that all practical entrances to the park are clearly marked with notices stating amateur hunters are or may be operating in the park?
- b) If not, why not?
- c) What other measures will be used to ensure members of the public are on notice that hunting is or may be occurring in the national park they are about to enter?

ANSWER

The rules under which the program will operate are currently being developed through a cross-agency working group. Once determined for each park, an appropriate strategy will be put in place to ensure effective communication with the public and other park users. In many circumstances this will likely involve a combination of website information, signage and other communication techniques as appropriate.

QUESTION 47

Will national parks be closed when hunting is taking place and how will the public and tourists be notified?

ANSWER

The rules under which the program will operate are currently being developed through a cross-agency working group. Whether, how and when parts of parks are closed to the public will be informed by the risk assessment and on-ground practical realities.

QUESTION 48

What has been the outcome of an investigation into alleged illegal clearing on a property owned by Ron Greentree called Boolcarrol at Wee Waa?

ANSWER

OEH issued a remedial direction to each of the landholders in respect of some of the cleared vegetation. The property is jointly owned and all owners received the direction.

QUESTION 49

Was vegetation illegally cleared and if so how much?

ANSWER

After considering the many permissible circumstances in which native vegetation can be cleared, it appeared to OEH that some of the native vegetation may have been cleared illegally.

QUESTION 50

Were endangered ecological communities cleared?

ANSWER

OEH suspected that a small amount of the cleared vegetation may have been part of an EEC but decided to investigate the clearing in totality under the Native Vegetation Act.

QUESTION 51

Please can you provide copies of any PVP that applies to Boolcarrol?

ANSWER

PVPs are issued by Catchment Management Authorities.

QUESTION 52

Is a report of illegal vegetation clearing on the property Beefwood on the Newell highway north of Moree being investigated?

ANSWER

Yes.

QUESTION 53

On what date will you or have you informed the owners of Beefwood of their environmental obligations?

ANSWER

As part of the investigation process, OEH contacts the landholders to discuss clearing events and to allow the landholder to explain why the clearing occurred. As this matter is currently under investigation, it would be inappropriate to respond further.

QUESTION 54

Can you please provide a copy of the PVP for the Beefwood property?

ANSWER

PVPs are issued by Catchment Management Authorities.

QUESTION 55

Please can you inform us how many reports of illegal clearing were made to the OEH Environment Hotline or OEH directly for each NSW catchment management area in the last 5 years?

ANSWER

The total number of Environment Line reports of possible vegetation clearing events is indicated in the following table. OEH notes that not all clearing reported is illegal as clearing can be carried out legally in certain circumstances.

These reports are not collected by Catchment Management Authority areas.

Number of Environment line reports of vegetation clearing by financial year					
	2007– 2008	2008– 2009	2009– 2010	2010– 2011	2011– 2012
Number of reports	380	482	345	415	377

QUESTION 56

Please can you inform us of the outcome of the investigation into each of those reports?

ANSWER

The Office of Environment and Heritage takes a risk management approach to managing reports of clearing of native vegetation. OEH contacts informants and landholders and reviews other sources of information to determine the level of investigation warranted. Some reports are found to be in relation to approved clearing, where a property vegetation plan or development consent is in place.

Clearing incidents that are excluded from the operation of the Native Vegetation Act (such as clearing in certain zones and certain local government areas) are referred to the relevant authority. In relation to some matters, OEH determines that the clearing was allowed, such as where regrowth was cleared or the clearing was done for routine agricultural management activities (as provided for in the Native Vegetation Act). OEH investigates the remaining matters and depending upon the scale of the clearing and other factors, OEH's responses include sending advisory and warning letters to landholders, or educating landholders, where it appears that a minor breach may have occurred. OEH issues penalty notices for moderately significant breaches and for more significant breaches OEH issues remedial directions. In the most serious cases OEH prosecutes those responsible for the clearing.

QUESTION 57

How many compliance officers do you have for the Native Vegetation Management Act in each NSW catchment management area?

ANSWER

Native vegetation compliance officers are based in Wollongong, Griffith, Dubbo, Alstonville, Grafton, Newcastle, Sydney, and Tamworth.

OEH has 19 EFT (equivalent full time) officers dedicated to native vegetation compliance. OEH compliance officers are not restricted to work within CMA boundaries. All investigators are authorised to investigate Native Vegetation matters anywhere in New South Wales.

QUESTION 58

Please can you supply the last 5 years of results from Satellite Monitoring Program (SLATS) for each catchment Management Area and the number of illegal vegetation clearing cases detected, the ha involved and the outcomes of investigations?

ANSWER

The satellite monitoring program identifies “unexplained” clearing, not illegal clearing. Unexplained clearing includes legal clearing not requiring an approval, such as routine agricultural management activities. Results from the four completed monitoring periods are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

The SLATs program itself cannot determine whether or not clearing detected by satellite is illegal or not. This is because the program compares satellite images taken over time to identify changes in vegetation, and then removes any areas which are known to be allowed or outside the jurisdiction of the Native Vegetation Act. What remains includes a mixture of areas where landholders have cleared vegetation lawfully, such as for routine agricultural management and regrowth, and areas of illegal clearing. This type of clearing is referred to as unexplained clearing because it requires assessment at the property level to determine whether or not the clearing was illegal.

The tables below provide information about “unexplained” clearing as detected by SLATs.

Table 1. Number of properties with greater than one hectare of unexplained agricultural clearing detected by satellite in each Catchment Management Authority region (Note: one hectare is used as a minimum size to reduce false-positive detections).

CMA	Number of properties			
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Northern Rivers	139	209	390	263
Hunter Central Rivers	79	94	203	101
Hawkesbury-Nepean	12	44	73	21
Sydney Metro	0	0	0	0
Southern Rivers	17	41	75	22
Border Rivers-Gwydir	123	228	117	84
Namoi	70	129	104	60
Central West	141	157	181	84
Lachlan	38	72	77	9
Murrumbidgee	16	13	32	9
Murray	5	6	5	3
Western	41	85	95	33
Lower Murray-Darling	14	27	12	5

Table 2. Total area of unexplained clearing on properties with greater than one hectare of unexplained agricultural clearing detected by satellite in each Catchment Management Authority region (Note: one hectare is used as a minimum size to reduce false-positive detections).

CMA	Total area (ha)			
	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Northern Rivers	1370	1859	2532	1039
Hunter Central Rivers	391	313	1045	398
Hawkesbury-Nepean	58	117	221	64
Sydney Metro	0	0	0	0
Southern Rivers	91	175	256	97
Border Rivers-Gwydir	1447	2622	1822	567
Namoi	444	1453	1095	407
Central West	1664	1405	2583	798
Lachlan	447	514	606	22
Murrumbidgee	81	46	288	23
Murray	18	24	56	22
Western	1546	2090	1969	724
Lower Murray-Darling	809	558	186	65

The types of outcomes of investigations into potential illegal clearing identified by satellite monitoring have been provided in response to question 56.

QUESTION 59

When were proceedings for each of the two prosecutions and five convictions secured during this term of government initiated?

ANSWER

The two prosecutions initiated in 2011/12 were commenced on the following dates:

- 5 July 2011; and
- 9 November 2011.

The five prosecutions completed in 2011/12 were commenced on the following dates

- 27 June 2008
- 18 August 2010
- 28 October 2010
- 25 March 2011
- 4 May 2011

QUESTION 60

How many prosecution of illegal land clearing have been initiated since the O'Farrell Government took office?

ANSWER

Four.

QUESTION 61

Is the SPOT5 vegetation map being produced to replace the current EOAM in the Native Vegetation Act and site assessment generally under planning laws?

ANSWER

No.

QUESTION 62

Following the recommendation in the government's green paper for reform of the planning system "that consultants that provide Environmental Impact Statements should be chosen from an accredited panel, and required to meet certain standards regarding the impartiality of quality of their work," will you be introducing an accreditation scheme for ecological consultants and when?

ANSWER

The Government is in the process of considering the options for accreditation of ecological consultants as part of the reforms of the NSW Planning System. Any decision about an ecological consultants accreditation system will be made as part of these reforms.

QUESTION 63

If the answer to question 1) is yes will it be a mandatory or voluntary scheme?

ANSWER

Not applicable.

QUESTION 64

For how many years has OEH and its predecessors been in discussion with ecological consultant professional bodies over the development of a voluntary accreditation scheme?

ANSWER

This matter has been generally discussed since late 2004.

OEH has been actively discussing the development of an industry led voluntary accreditation scheme with the Ecological Consultants Association of NSW Inc for just over one year.

QUESTION 65

Have there been discussions between OEH and ecological consultants professional bodies over the development of an accreditation scheme since September 2011? Please provide information on the nature of those discussions.

ANSWER

Yes. OEH has had discussions with the Ecological Consultants Association of NSW Inc. (ECA) regarding the ECA's proposed development of an industry lead accreditation scheme.

OEH is supporting the development of the industry led scheme.

The ECA has produced a draft model for an industry-based program, and is consulting across the industry on the details.

QUESTION 66

Is OEH developing an accreditation scheme for ecological consultants? Or as the Planning Green Paper suggests when will you develop your own mandatory accreditation scheme for ecological consultants?

ANSWER

No.

OEH is not currently developing a mandatory accreditation scheme for ecological consultants.

The Government is in the process of considering the options for accreditation of ecological consultants as part of the reforms of the NSW Planning System. Any decision about an ecological consultants accreditation system will be made as part of these reforms.

QUESTION 67

How much native vegetation has been cleared across NSW for private native forestry in 2011-2012 financial year?

ANSWER

Data is not yet available for the 2011-12 financial year. However, it should be noted that private native forestry carried out in accordance with the Private Native Forestry Code of Practice is based on the principles of ecologically sustainable forest management and does not constitute permanent landuse change or "clearing".

QUESTION 68

Have there been calculations of the carbon emission involved either with each PNF operation or collectively and what have been the results?

ANSWER

No.

QUESTION 69

Did the landholders with private native forest approvals at Mount Rae forest carry out any independent targeted surveys for threatened species well known in this forest prior to logging such as the Gang Gang cockatoo, Eastern Bentwing bat, or Greater broadnosed bat at the specific request of OEH?

ANSWER

No.

QUESTION 70

Are Gang Gang cockatoo, Eastern Bentwing bat, or Greater broadnosed bat included in the PNF prescriptions that apply to Mount Rae forest and, if not, why not?

ANSWER

No. None of these species are included in the appendix to the Private Native Forestry Code of Practice for Southern NSW, which lists those species for which specific prescriptions are required if there is a known record or site evidence of that species within the forest operation area.

QUESTION 71

How many applications for Private Native Forestry PVPs have there been in the 2011-2012 financial year?

ANSWER

521.

QUESTION 72

Of the applications for Private Native Forestry PVPs in 2011-2012, how many were approved?

ANSWER

469.

QUESTION 73

What was the average timeframe between submission of a PNF application and approval?

ANSWER

28 days.

QUESTION 74

How many PNF applications that were approved 2011-2012 had engaged an independent ecological consultant to undertake an ecological survey?

ANSWER

The PNF regulations and the associated Code of Practice do not require landholders to undertake an independent ecological survey.

QUESTION 75

How many applications for PNF PVPs in 2011-2012 involve a landholder sending a map and OEH signing off after a desk top assessment without an independent expert ecological survey of the wildlife at the property?

ANSWER

The PNF regulations and the associated Code of Practice do not require landholders to undertake an independent ecological survey. Of the applications received, a subset is visited by EPA officers prior to approval.

QUESTION 76

What percentage of PNF PVPs applications receive a site visit from OEH to undertake an ecological survey of the vegetation prior to approval?

ANSWER

PNF regulations and the associated Code of Practice do not require OEH to undertake an ecological survey prior to approval.

QUESTION 77

What percentage of PNF approved PVPs receive a compliance visit from OEH or the EPA to ensure compliance within the first year of their operation?

ANSWER

12%. PNF regulations and the associated Code of Practice do not require OEH to undertake an ecological survey prior to approval.

QUESTION 78

How many audits have been carried out on PNF PVPs in 2011-2012?

ANSWER

60 audits and 53 monitoring inspections.

QUESTION 79

Please can you provide all of the Ecological harvesting Plans for all PNF operations involving Endangered Ecological Communities.

ANSWER

Only one ecological harvesting plan has ever been issued, in August 2008 for five hectares at a property at Nabiac. A copy is attached at Tab 1.

QUESTION 80

In light of the four major development proposals in the area, will OEH initiate a study to assess the historical biodiversity of the Hunter Estuary, to identify what has been lost so far?

ANSWER

OEH is currently drafting a plan of management for the Hunter Wetlands National Park which has the primary objective of conserving and improving the existing biodiversity qualities within the Hunter Estuary. In preparing the plan of management historical data collected within the estuary is reviewed and used to inform current and future conservation programs to be implemented within the national park estate. A component of the plan of management is monitoring populations to ensure the populations are at least maintained, if not improved through conservation works.

QUESTION 81

Will OEH establish a critical threshold beyond which ecological impacts of development in the Hunter Estuary will not be tolerated?

ANSWER

The 7 part test under the EP&A Act is the threshold for determining whether a critical threshold is met. It is a role for the consent or determining authority (eg Council or Department of Planning and Infrastructure) to consider the 7 part test assessment.

QUESTION 82

Will OEH conduct a study on the drivers of current population decline of migratory shorebirds in the Hunter Estuary before any more development takes place in this area?

ANSWER

Councils are responsible for preparing and implementing estuary management plans, with technical and financial support from OEH. Hunter councils prepared an estuary management plan for the Hunter River in 2009 - http://www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au/environment/coast_and_estuary/estuary_management

QUESTION 83

Hunter Development Corporation sold 242 hectares of land at Tomago to PWCS as offset for the T4 coal loader proposal. Has this site already been used as an offset by Newcastle Coal Infrastructure Group and WesTrac for other developments in the area?

ANSWER

No.

QUESTION 84

How will the government ensure that groundwater and the Hunter River will not be further polluted by toxic waste leeching as a result of the T4 proposal?

ANSWER

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure is responsible for assessing the project. The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has an advisory role only in the assessment and approval process. If the project is approved, the EPA will issue an environment protection licence for the coal loader. The licence will be subject to strict conditions.

QUESTION 85

Will the EPA establish baseline limits to toxic pollution of the Hunter River and groundwater at Kooragang Island and when?

ANSWER

Under the *Contaminated Land Management Act 1997* the EPA has adopted the Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality 2000 as the appropriate benchmark for surface and groundwater pollutants. This guideline applies across NSW.

QUESTION 86

According to OEH website Upper Hunter Air Quality monitoring stations, Singleton and Muswellbrook are the only two sites where PM2.5 is monitored. Will you immediately ensure that every monitoring site measures PM2.5.

ANSWER

There are three air quality monitoring stations in the Upper Hunter that monitor PM2.5. These are Muswellbrook, Singleton and Camberwell.

The selection of these three sites for PM2.5 monitoring was based on advice from an independent air quality expert and endorsed by the NSW Health's Expert Advisory Committee on Air Pollution. The expert's advice indicated that the three sites provide adequate coverage for the airshed.

QUESTION 87

When will the EPA require that all coal train wagons are covered?

ANSWER

The EPA will not be requiring coal train wagons to be covered because the data currently available does not suggest that the movement of uncovered coal trains in NSW contributes appreciably more particulates to the ambient air quality than other train movements. The EPA has required ARTC to undertake further studies to monitor dust levels from trains, including coal trains, in the Hunter.

QUESTION 88

Was monitoring for the report October 2012 prepared by Environ Australia Pty Ltd for Australian Rail Track Corporation "PRP4 – Particulate Emissions from Coal Trains" only undertaken at two sites and during wet periods in February and March.

ANSWER

The monitoring was undertaken between 13 February and 20 March 2012 at two monitoring locations in the suburbs of Mayfield and Metford. The next stage of monitoring will be undertaken for a 30 day period between November 2012 and mid January 2013 during what is anticipated to be warmer, drier conditions.

QUESTION 89

Is it generally considered preferable to monitor the potential for dust pollution from a source during dry times in order to arrive at reliable conclusions?

ANSWER

Yes. The wet conditions during the pilot study were unexpected. The next stage of monitoring will be undertaken between November 2012 and mid January 2013 during what is anticipated to be warm and dry conditions.

QUESTION 90

Will ARTC be required to put in place the following monitoring requirements:

- a) continuous monitoring of PM1, PM2.5 and PM10 for a minimum of 12 months at various distances from the coal corridor.
- b) Recordings of the fine particles count and characterisation of particles in addition to the overall mass?

ANSWER

The scope of the next stage of the monitoring program will include continuous measurement of airborne concentrations of TSP, PM10 and PM2.5 for a minimum period of 30 days within the rail corridor. The findings of this monitoring will allow the EPA to determine if further studies are required to adequately address the issue.

QUESTION 91

Why was the Environ Australia Pty study not peer reviewed?

ANSWER

Experts from the EPA, the Office of Environment and Heritage, and NSW Health reviewed the report and its findings. These agencies formed a specialists' view about the study and peer review is not considered necessary.

QUESTION 92

NSW Health cautions that air quality in Newcastle and the Hunter valley regularly exceeds national standards. In its submission on the proposed fourth coal terminal (T4), NSW Health

advises that the public interest and public health expectations are to reduce air pollution. How will the EPA ensure that all new developments in Newcastle and the Hunter Valley do not result in elevation the levels of particle pollution in the area?

ANSWER

Air quality in Newcastle generally meets all relevant standards. While some standards have been exceeded in the Hunter Valley in small communities adjacent to mining areas, the larger population centres generally comply with relevant standards.

The Department of Planning and Infrastructure is responsible for assessing the impacts of proposed major industrial developments. The EPA has an advisory role and provides expert advice to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure to ensure that all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures are used to meet relevant air quality standards, and reduce pollution. As part of the assessment process, the Department of Planning and Infrastructure must assess cumulative impacts.

These mitigation measures are enforced by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure through conditions of approval.

The EPA regulates the operation of new industrial activities through environment protection licences issued under the *Protection of the Environment Operation Act 1997*, which include conditions to ensure that activities are undertaken in an environmentally sound manner.

QUESTION 93

Is the EPA satisfied that the T4 proposal will not create additional particle pollution levels in populated areas?

ANSWER

The T4 coal loader proposal is being assessed by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. The EPA will provide expert advice. The Department of Planning and Infrastructure will set dust limits in its conditions of approval, if the project is approved.

End of questions from the Hon C Faerhmann MLC

Questions from Mr D Shoebridge MLC:

Heritage:

QUESTION 1

Has a decision been made to sell all or part of the Parramatta Female Factory?

- a) If so, when was this decision made and by whom?
- b) Which part is proposed to be sold?
- c) Who is responsible for managing the sale?
- d) Who is the consent authority for the sale?
- e) What public consultation will occur prior to any sale?
- f) What protection will there be in any sale terms for heritage value on the site?
- g) What protection will there be in any sale terms for public access to the site?

ANSWER

This is a matter for the Minister for Health. I have been advised that the response to your question is No.

QUESTION 2

On 2 Dec 2010 and Ausgrid contractor damaged an AHIMS listed rock engraving in Cromer NSW. The statutory time for commencing a prosecution runs out on 2 Dec 2012.

- A) Has a prosecution been commenced in relation to this damage? If not/why not?
- B) What is the status of any prosecution commenced in relation to this incident?
- C) Will a prosecution be commenced in relation to this incident? If not/why not?

ANSWER

A prosecution has been commenced against Ausgrid in the Land and Environment Court for an alleged offence against section 86(2) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. The matter is listed before the Court for first mention on 14 December 2012.

QUESTION 3

Will Knowledge Holders and Traditional Owners be the final decision makers in relation to the protection and/or destruction of Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW under any new legislation relating to Aboriginal cultural heritage?

ANSWER

The Government is awaiting draft recommendations from the Aboriginal Culture and Heritage Reform Working Party.

QUESTION 4

Does the government stand by its commitment for Aboriginal cultural heritage legislation to be administered by a stand alone commission? If not, why not?

ANSWER

The Government made a commitment to review the Aboriginal heritage legislation, and has demonstrated its commitment with extensive consultation processes undertaken across NSW. No commitment was ever made for a stand alone commission. Government will

consider all feasible options proposed, and keenly awaits the final recommendations from the expert Working Party.

QUESTION 5

Has the OEH provided a briefing to Premiers detailing potential savings to be made from not having a stand alone body administering Aboriginal cultural heritage?

- a) What potential savings were detailed?
- b) Does the briefing consider the likely increased cost from litigation and community protest resulting from Aboriginal people not having decision making powers in relation to their heritage. If not, why not?

ANSWER

No.

QUESTION 6

Will the Minister reintroduce mandated annual reporting in relation to the destruction of Aboriginal cultural Heritage in NSW? If not/why not?

ANSWER

This information is available on the public website. The current Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit process enables the Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAP) to assess the cultural significance of areas the subject of development proposals. Decisions to protect and destroy are therefore informed by the RAPs. These decisions are publicly and freely available. Generally, the community is seeking local information and thus an annual report is of limited benefit to communities.

.

End of questions from Mr D Shoebridge MLC

Questions from the Hon A Fazio MLC:

QUESTION 1

In the Budget Estimates hearing the Minister stated that 86 significant Aboriginal objects or sites had been protected recently. Could you please provide a list detailing all sites and objects protected from 2011 to present. For objects please provide:

- a) Object name/description
- b) Where the object was found
- c) Where it is stored
- d) If it has been moved, how and when it will be made available to the community from which it was taken.

ANSWER

From 1 January 2011 to date there were 16 Aboriginal Places declared. This brings the total number of Aboriginal Places declared to 87.

The Aboriginal Places declared since 1 January 2011 are listed in the table below:

Name of Aboriginal Place	Type	Date Gazetted	Local Government Area
Brungle Cemetery	burial ground	8 July 2011	Tumut
Bridge Reserve	teaching and settlement	29 July 2011	Narromine
Mack Reserve	teaching and settlement	12 August 2011	Narromine
Lake Macquarie Resting Place	burial ground	2 September 2011	Lake Macquarie
Tuggerah Lake Resting Place	burial ground	16 September 2011	Wyong
Kings Tableland	meeting place and engravings	4 November 2011	Blue Mountains
Bomen Axe Quarry	industry and lookout site	23 March 2012	Wagga Wagga
The Murie	living place and cemetery	4 May 2012	Lachlan
Bellambi Point	midden and burial ground	1 June 2012	Wollongong
Wollundry Lagoon & Tony Ireland Reserve	story, cultural resource	8 June 2012	Wagga Wagga
Nap Nap Burial Ground	burial ground	22 June 2012	Hay
Toogimbie Burial Ground	burial ground	13 July 2012	Hay
Buladelah Mountain	teaching and cultural site	13 July 2012	Great Lakes
Wiradjuri Reserve and Gobba Beach	story, cultural resource,	13 July 2012	Wagga Wagga

East Ballina (Angels Beach)	massacre and burial ground	27 July 2012	Ballina
King Tom's Memorial Headstone	burial memorial	5 October 2012	Maitland

There are 1632 protected Aboriginal cultural heritage objects currently recorded in the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System. Detailed information and description about each of these objects is included in the attached spreadsheet.

QUESTION 2

Relics and objects held and moved under a Care and Control permit are owned by Government.

- is there a register of them?
- Where are they being stored? Please provide details of objects and place of storage for the last financial year.
- Do you have plans to undertake an audit on these items?

ANSWER

- Yes, OEH maintains a register of documents relating to licences, permits and notices.
- The database identifies the objects and where they are stored which may be a regional office, or local Aboriginal Community or a museum.
- No. An Audit of the Management of Cultural Materials was conducted by IAB in 2011.

QUESTION 3

How many offsets signed off by OEH and Aboriginal communities were created in the last financial year? Please provide details as to location.

ANSWER

There were no offset areas specifically for ACH related to development approvals in the last financial year.

QUESTION 4

In the last two financial years please provide information about how many of these areas have had subsequent approvals to be re-mined? In each of these cases how were Aboriginal groups consulted?

ANSWER

There were none.

QUESTION 5

It appears that in the Upper Hunter strategic Land Use Policy no land has been put aside for local Aboriginal Communities? What are you doing about this?

ANSWER

The Strategic Regional Land Use Policy Package sets out a range of initiatives to better balance growth in the mining and coal seam gas (CSG) industries with the need to protect important agricultural land and water resources. Hence, the Upper Hunter Strategic Regional Land Use Plan does not indentify lands to be put aside for local Aboriginal communities as this issue is outside the focus of the Plan.

QUESTION 6

Who is responsible at OEH to talk about sites now that Norman Laing has moved position? Has his position been filled?

The Director of Country, Culture and Heritage Division is responsible for this matter. This position is filled by Norman Laing.

QUESTION 7

Given the reduction in staff and district managers in the OEH how will the Minister ensure that experienced staff in Aboriginal culture and heritage are not lost

The Office of Environment and Heritage is currently undergoing a strategic realignment, as announced on 17 July 2012. Once realigned, OEH will continue to deliver our core functions and will build on our many examples of excellence in policy, program delivery and operations. The protection and promotion of Aboriginal cultural heritage remains a core commitment of OEH.

QUESTION 8

Minister you advised that one of the options contained in the Wood Smoke Discussion Paper is for local councils to require the removal of older wood heaters by owners before the sale of a property. What safeguards would be put in place to ensure that the heritage values of properties with older wood heaters would not be adversely compromised by this measure?

ANSWER

The Environment Protection Authority will consult with the Heritage Council of NSW regarding potential impacts of the options in the Wood Smoke Discussion Paper on the heritage fabric of buildings. The appropriate guidelines for local councils who wish to pursue these options will be developed in partnership with the Heritage Council if necessary.

QUESTION 9

Minister you advised that one of the options contained in the Wood Smoke Discussion Paper is for local councils to require the removal of older wood heaters by owners before the sale of a property. What safeguards would be put in place to ensure that the heritage values of properties with open wood heaters would not be adversely compromised by this measure?

ANSWER

This is a duplicate of question 8 above

QUESTION 10

Apart from the submission from the Heritage Council of NSW dated 28 February 2012 to the Joint Chairs of the NSW Planning System review, what involvement have you or any of your agencies had in the review of the planning system in NSW? Please provide copies of any correspondence or submissions that have been sent?

ANSWER

After the Heritage Council submitted its response to the Joint Chairs of the NSW Planning System review, the Heritage Council was briefed by an Executive Director from the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DP&I) about the Green Paper. The Heritage Council of NSW then held a Key Heritage Stakeholders Workshop and based on the outcomes of that workshop, prepared and lodged a submission to the Green Paper. A copy of the Heritage Council's submission on the Green Paper is attached.

The Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) and the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) have had the following involvement in the latest review of the planning system:

- Minister Parker being consulted on the development of the Green Paper, as part of the Cabinet process;
- Development of a joint OEH/EPA submission to the Chair of the Independent Planning System Review, letter dated 24 April 2012 – see attached (MD11/4395);
- An Agency Reference Group meeting with DP&I, OEH and other key representatives of agencies on 15 August 2012;
- Two informal meetings held with staff from DP&I; and
- Senior staff attendance at the White Paper Workshop with Minister Hazzard on 11 October 2012 to primarily discuss opportunities for agencies to inform the development of the reforms.

QUESTION 11

What meetings or discussions have you or your senior officers had with the NSW Minister for Planning in respect of the review of the NSW Planning system? Please provide dates and minutes of these meetings?

ANSWER

Senior EPA and OEH staff, along with other key stakeholders, attended the White Paper Workshop which was hosted by Minister Hazzard on 11 October 2012. No other meetings have been held with Minister Hazzard at this stage regarding the latest round of planning reforms.

QUESTION 12

Given that the "A New Planning System for NSW" Green Paper dated July 2012 only mentions "heritage" 5 times (at pages 18, 24, 37, 43 and 56) what have you done to ensure that heritage matters are fully considered in this review?

ANSWER

To assist in the preparation of the Heritage Council of NSW's submission on the Green Paper, the Council held a Key Heritage Stakeholders Workshop and based its submission on the outcomes of that workshop. A representative of the Heritage Branch recently attended a Key Stakeholders workshop held by DP&I on the White Paper. When the White Paper and the draft legislation are released the Heritage Council will seek a further briefing from DP&I.

Senior EPA and OEH staff, along with other key stakeholders, attended the White Paper Workshop which was hosted by Minister Hazard on 11 October 2012. Another workshop was held with OEH, EPA and DP&I staff on 26 October 2012 to further discuss the development of the White Paper.

QUESTION 13

What action have you taken to ensure that the protections currently provided by Development Control Plans and other planning instruments, such as Castlecrag DCP 3 adopted by Willoughby Council in 1987 and the Willoughby Local Environment Plan (LEP95) adopted in 1995 to protect the Griffin Conservation Area, will remain in any new planning system for NSW?

ANSWER

This issue was raised in the Heritage Council's submission to the Green Paper. DP&I and OEH are meeting regularly to discuss the development of the White Paper and these issues will be raised through these forums.

QUESTION 14

Have you received representations from any conservation or heritage groups in respect of the potential impacts of the review of the NSW Planning system on heritage conservation and protections? Please provide copies of these?

ANSWER

OEH and EPA have received representations from the following conservation and heritage groups in respect of the NSW Planning System:

- The Paddington Society – letter dated 13 September 2012
- Nature Conservation Council – letter dated 10 September 2012
- Lane Cove Sustainability Action Group – letter dated 17 September 2012

It has not been possible to obtain consent from these third parties to release their correspondence within the given time frames.

QUESTION 15

Will you or any of your agencies be making submissions in response to the Government's Planning Green Paper on heritage matters? If not, why not?

ANSWER

The Heritage Council made a submission on the Green Paper on 14 September 2012.

On 17 September 2012, OEH was invited by DP&I to be involved in the development of the White Paper. As it was believed that this would be a more effective avenue to engage with DP&I on the planning reforms a joint OEH and EPA submission on the Green Paper was not lodged. However, OEH is proposing to make a submission on the White Paper which will include heritage matters.

Historic Houses Trust

QUESTION 16

How many FTE positions at the Historic Houses Trust are currently vacant?

ANSWER

HHT current has 39.3 FTE vacancies the majority of which are new roles that are being filled as part of a planned restructure.

QUESTION 17

What is the total expenditure on consultants engaged as part of the organisational restructure since March 2011?

ANSWER

Nil.

QUESTION 18

How many FTE positions will be lost as a result of the restructure?

ANSWER

At the end of the restructure process HHT will have transitioned from 208.1 FTE in 2010 to 166.8 FTE by 2013.

QUESTION 19

In 2011/12, what changes have been made to the hours properties are open to the public?

ANSWER

There were no changes to property opening hours in 2011/12.

QUESTION 20

In 2010/11 Annual Report of the Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales reports that a sum of \$890,000 was spent on "Redundancy termination payments". What is the expenditure for 2011/12?

ANSWER

\$587,118.02

QUESTION 21

How many staff positions within Historic House Trust of New South Wales have been made redundant since 26 March 2011?

ANSWER

From 26 March 2011 (to 30 June 2012) HHT has made 22 voluntary redundancies.

QUESTION 22

What expenditure was incurred by the Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales on consultants in 2011/12? Please provide a list of consultants engaged, the purpose of the engagement, and the amount paid to them.

ANSWER

\$169,874.43

Frost Design – marketing and communication strategic planning - \$111,874.43

Urbis – retail business review - \$50,000

Urbis – Mint marker rental evaluation - \$8,000

QUESTION 23

Did any Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales properties reduce their public opening hours in 2011/12? If so, please provide details of the old and new opening hours for relevant properties.

ANSWER

There were no changes to property opening hours in 2011/12.

QUESTION 24

How many blackberries are assigned to your staff?

ANSWER

In 2011/12, 179 phones were assigned to the Premier's and Ministers' offices.

QUESTION 25

For each phone, how much was in each bill in the 2011/12 financial year?

ANSWER

The total expenditure on mobile phones by the Premier's office and Ministers' offices as represented in the Department's financial system is set out in the table below. Please note that this expenditure may include mobile phone purchase costs as the financial system does not separate the purchase costs and mobile usage charges.

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Premier's Office	\$103,152	\$76,457	\$68,475	\$27,570
Ministers' Offices	\$475,539	\$358,396	\$120,285	\$169,655
TOTAL	\$578,691	\$434,854	\$188,761	\$197,226

Note. 2010-11 figures are a combination of 9 months of Keneally Government and 3 months of O'Farrell Government.

QUESTION 26

How many have phones been lost in your office?

ANSWER

For Premier's office and Ministers' offices, the number of phones lost was:

	2011/12
Premier	1
Ministers	5
Total	6

QUESTION 27

What is the cost of replacing those phones?

ANSWER

The cost is the normal contract price and this cost is claimed through the NSW Treasury Managed Fund.

QUESTION 28

How many iPads does DPC assign to your office and to whom have they been issued?

ANSWER

For Premier's office and Ministers' offices the number of iPads issued was as follows.

	2011/12
Premier	10
Ministers	43
Total	53

QUESTION 29

How many iPads have you purchased for your office and to whom have they been issued?

ANSWER

iPads are supplied by the Department of Premier and Cabinet and have not been purchased by Ministers' offices.

QUESTION 30

How many iPhones does DPC assign to your Ministerial office and to whom have they been issued?

ANSWER

In 2011/12, 179 phones were assigned to the Premier's and Ministers' offices.

QUESTION 31

How many iPhones have you purchased for your office and to whom have they been issued?

ANSWER

Nil.

QUESTION 32

How many iPhones have been lost in your office?

ANSWER

Nil.

QUESTION 33

How many iPads have been lost in your office?

ANSWER

For Premier's office and Ministers' offices, the number of iPads lost or stolen was as follows.

	2011/12
Premier	1
Ministers	0
Total	1

QUESTION 34

What is the cost of replacing those phones or iPads?

ANSWER

The cost is the normal contract price and this cost is claimed through the NSW Treasury Managed Fund.

QUESTION 35

How many media or public relations advisers are employed for each of your portfolio agencies?

10.7 Equivalent full time.

QUESTION 36

What is the forecast for 2012-13 for the number of media or public relations advisers to be employed and their total cost?

ANSWER

The Office of Environment and Heritage is currently undergoing a strategic realignment. It is not appropriate to comment on staffing forecasts at this time.

QUESTION 37

Have any of your overseas trips been paid for in part or in full by using public money?

ANSWER

Information regarding Ministerial travel is available on the relevant Minister's appropriate agency website, in accordance with Ministerial Memorandum M2009-10 "Release of Overseas Travel Information".

QUESTION 38

If so, did any of your relatives accompany you on these trips?

ANSWER

Information regarding Ministerial travel is available on the relevant Minister's appropriate agency website, in accordance with Ministerial Memorandum M2009-10 "Release of Overseas Travel Information".

QUESTION 39

What is the annual remuneration package for your Chief of Staff?

ANSWER

Ministerial staff numbers and salary bands are available on the Department of Premier and Cabinet website at http://www.dpc.nsw.gov.au/about/publications/premiers_and_ministers_staff_numbers.

QUESTION 40

What is the annual remuneration package for your head media advisor?

ANSWER

Ministerial staff numbers and salary bands are available on the Department of Premier and Cabinet website at http://www.dpc.nsw.gov.au/about/publications/premiers_and_ministers_staff_numbers.

QUESTION 41

What is the annual remuneration package for each of your staff?

ANSWER

Ministerial staff numbers and salary bands are available on the Department of Premier and Cabinet website at http://www.dpc.nsw.gov.au/about/publications/premiers_and_ministers_staff_numbers.

QUESTION 42

What is the estimated expenditure for your office budget in 2012-13?

ANSWER

The total budget allocation for the Premier's and Ministers' offices in 2012-13 is \$40,103,650, with \$5,744,883 allocated to the Premier's office and \$34,358,767 to the Ministers' offices.

QUESTION 43

Have any office renovations or fit outs been undertaken in your office since April 2011?

ANSWER

Information on the assets balances for leasehold improvements are available in the Department of Premier and Cabinet Annual Report.

QUESTION 44

If so, could you give details of contracted costs?

ANSWER

Information on the assets balances for leasehold improvements are available in the Department of Premier and Cabinet Annual Report.

QUESTION 45

What is your Ministerial office budget for 2012/13?

ANSWER

The budget allocations for the Premier's office and Ministers' offices are as follows.

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Premier	\$7,002,312	\$8,500,000	\$9,075,038	\$5,309,465	\$5,744,83
Ministers	\$39,673,567	\$40,334,000	\$40,978,962	\$31,516,017	\$34,358,767
TOTAL	\$46,675,879	\$48,834,000	\$50,054,000	\$36,825,482	\$40,103,605

Note. 2010-11 figures are a combination of 9 months of Keneally Government and 3 months of O'Farrell Government.

QUESTION 46

How many political advisors are in your office?

ANSWER

Ministerial staff numbers and salary bands are available on the Department of Premier and Cabinet website at http://www.dpc.nsw.gov.au/about/publications/premiers_and_ministers_staff_numbers.

QUESTION 47

How many administration staff?

ANSWER

Ministerial staff numbers and salary bands are available on the Department of Premier and Cabinet website at http://www.dpc.nsw.gov.au/about/publications/premiers_and_ministers_staff_numbers.

QUESTION 48

How many Department Liaison Officers are assigned to your office?

ANSWER

Three Department Liaison Officers service the Environment and Heritage Cluster.

QUESTION 49

How many staff in the Department are assigned to Ministerial support duties?

ANSWER

15.6 EFT

QUESTION 50

Are any contractors or consultants working in your Ministerial office? If so, in what capacity?

ANSWER

No.

QUESTION 51

How much did your Ministerial office spend on contractors or consultants?

ANSWER

Nil.

QUESTION 52

How much did your Ministerial office spend on taxi fares, including Cabcharge in the 2011/12 financial year?

ANSWER

Taxi expenditure by the Premier's office and Ministers' offices as represented in the Department's financial system is represented in the table below.

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Premier	\$26,418	\$32,525	\$27,600	\$15,485
Ministers	\$133,697	\$143,251	\$32,678	\$80,609
TOTAL	\$160,155	\$175,776	\$60,277	\$96,094

Note. 2010-11 figures are a combination of 9 months of Keneally Government and 3 months of O'Farrell Government.

QUESTION 53

Are any of your portfolio agencies undergoing a restructure?

ANSWER

Yes.

QUESTION 54

How many jobs are expected to be cut as a result of that restructure?

ANSWER

OEH anticipate it will reduce its workforce by 425 positions over three years through natural attrition, maintaining vacancies and as a result of the realignment process.

QUESTION 55

How many people are expected to have their wages cut as a result of that restructure?

ANSWER

The OEH Strategic Realignment will involve the transition from a program-based structure to a regionally-based service delivery structure, and will deliver targeted reductions in total salary expenditure. New or changed positions will be graded and assessed based on the work to be performed, and current OEH staff will have the first opportunity to apply for vacancies. In keeping with standard public service processes, salaries will be based on the work performed in individual positions.

QUESTION 56

How many voluntary redundancies were offered in your Departments since April 2011?

ANSWER

As at 22 October 2012, 166 voluntary redundancies have been offered across the Environment and Heritage Portfolio.

QUESTION 57

How many voluntary redundancies were accepted from employees in your Departments since April 2011?

ANSWER

As at 22 October 2012, 139 voluntary redundancies have been accepted by employees across the Environment and Heritage Portfolio.

QUESTION 58

How many voluntary redundancies are expected to be offered in 2012/13?

ANSWER

205

QUESTION 59

How much did your Department(s) spend on catering in 2011/12?

ANSWER

\$1,472,079.24 (across the Environment and Heritage portfolio).

This includes catering provided to support staff involved in essential operational activities such as fire management and wildfire fire-fighting and pest and weed programs.

QUESTION 60

How much did your Department(s) spend on stationery in 2011/12?

ANSWER

\$1,944,310.31 (across the Environment and Heritage portfolio)

QUESTION 61

What is your Department's catering budget?

ANSWER

The budget is consistent with the actual expenditure and it includes savings requirements across the Environment and Heritage portfolio.

QUESTION 62

What is your Department's stationery budget?

ANSWER

The budget is consistent with the actual expenditure and it includes savings requirements across the Environment and Heritage portfolio.

QUESTION 63

Since April 2011 have any of the agencies in your Department(s) changed their branding?

ANSWER

See the response to Question 17 (the Hon Cate Faehrmann) for rebranding from DECCW to OEH.

The Centennial and Moore Park Trust has been working on an amended logo for Centennial Park, given its 125th anniversary this year.

QUESTION 64

If so, how much was spent on rebranding the agency?

ANSWER

See the response to Question 17 (the Hon Cate Faehrmann) for rebranding from DECCW to OEH.

The rebranding for Centennial Park has cost \$990.

QUESTION 65

How long is the average turnaround for responding to correspondence in your Department(s)?

ANSWER

These statistics are not readily available within the current document management system. However preliminary analysis indicates that on average the department provides a response to 23 per cent within two weeks and 75 percent within four weeks.

QUESTION 66

How many pieces of correspondence have been outstanding for more than 60 days?

ANSWER

As at 6 November 2012 analysis indicates that there are approximately 14 pieces of correspondence that have been outstanding for more than 60 days.

QUESTION 67

In 2011/12 how many invoices has your Department(s) failed to pay a supplier or contractor for more than 30 days?

ANSWER

34,550 invoices.

The main reasons for accounts being paid outside the due date period were:

- invoices raised for large capital works are only paid on satisfactory review of work
 - invoices raised for large capital purchases may include items not yet received but are expected to be received in the near future.
 - some short payment terms are not necessarily appropriate in more remote settings where the documentation may take time to be collected and matched for payment.
-

QUESTION 68

As a result of late payment, how much penalty interest has been paid to contractors since 1 January 2011?

ANSWER

\$1,851.13

QUESTION 69

How many invoices have been outstanding for longer than 60 days?

ANSWER

4,937.

The main reasons for accounts being paid outside the due date period were:

- invoices raised for large capital works are only paid on satisfactory review of work
 - invoices raised for large capital purchases may include items not yet received but are expected to be received in the near future.
 - some short payment terms are not necessarily appropriate in more remote settings where the documentation may take time to be collected and matched for payment.
-

QUESTION 70

Does your Department provide recurrent grant funds to non-government organisations? If yes,

- a) What are the names of all organisations in receipt of funding?

- b) What is the total amount of funding received by each organisation including goods and services tax?
- c) On what date was the funding advanced?
- d) What was the purpose for each grant or funding advance?
- e) Was any funding withheld or returned?
- f) If so, what were the reasons for withholding or requiring the funding to be returned?
- g) What is the indexation rate applied to non-recurrent grant funds in 2011/12?

ANSWER

a) – d) A list of grants, including recurrent and external grants, is provided in the Annual Report of each agency.

- e) No
- f) Not applicable
- g) Nil

QUESTION 71

How many contractors has your Department(s) retained since 1 July 2012 and at what cost?

ANSWER

193 contractors. Cost of \$3,347,759.15 (to 30 September 2012). Note that these are agency contractors employed under state contract.

QUESTION 72

What is the current level of Aboriginal employment within your Department(s)?

ANSWER

Across the Environment and Heritage Portfolio, the level of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment as at 30 June 2012 is as follows:

Office of Environment and Heritage	11.0%
Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust	3.0%
Environment Protection Authority	1.3%
Taronga Conservation Society	2.0%
Historic Houses Trust	0.5%

There were no Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff reported for Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust, Parramatta Park Trust, Lord Howe Island Board and Western Sydney Parklands Trust in 2012.

QUESTION 73

How has that changed since 1 July 2011?

ANSWER

The overall percentage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islands staff across the portfolio has not changed significantly since 1 July 2011, however, due to the establishment of the separate EPA on 29 February 2012, the percentage of Aboriginal and Torres Island staff in the OEH has risen.

The following information is provided for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment as at 30 June 2011:

Office of Environment and Heritage (Note: includes Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust and the EPA)	8.9%
Royal Botanic Gds and Domain Trust (Note: also included in OEH figures)	2.7%
Taronga Conservation Society	1.3%
Historic Houses Trust	0.5%

There were no Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff reported for Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust, Parramatta Park Trust, Lord Howe Island Board and Western Sydney Parklands Trust in 2011.

QUESTION 74

Since 1 July 2011, how much has been spent on charter air flights by your Department

ANSWER

The majority of aircraft charter costs are associated with the operational aspects of the business managed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS). In the 2011/12 financial year NPWS spent \$1,635,981 on external aircraft hire. Flight operations are a key mechanism to deliver on core functions such as fire management and pest control.

Miscellaneous Questions

QUESTION 75

Is your department currently undertaking any feasibility studies, audits, taskforces or reviews? If so; then:

- What are the terms of reference or details of each study, audit, taskforce or review?
- Who is conducting the study, audit, taskforce or review?
- Was each study, audit, taskforce or review publicly advertised seeking expression of interest or competitive tenders?
- Is there a contract in place detailing terms of engagement for the study, audit, taskforce or review?
- What is the timeline of each study, audit, taskforce or review.
- What are the details of any costs involved in each study, audit, taskforce or review?

ANSWER

I am advised:

As with previous NSW Governments, the Government undertakes feasibility studies, audits, taskforces and reviews to inform government decision making. A number of feasibility studies, audits, taskforces and reviews are currently being undertaken across the NSW Government.

OEH/EPA each have a three year audit and compliance program. It is focussed on internal control processes to identify any weaknesses and opportunities for improvement to operational functions, process and procedures. The program is based on an enterprise risk assessment. Terms of reference are determined prior to the scheduling of each audit.

The audits are undertaken by an external provider.

QUESTION 76

Have any agencies within your Department(s) engaged consultants in the 2011/12 financial year?

ANSWER

Yes.

QUESTION 77

If yes, which companies were engaged for consultancy services in the 2011/12 financial year?

ANSWER

Avisure Pty Ltd, Aerodrome Operations Support, Ageconplus Consulting, Airport Services, Alan Taylor & Associates, Ann Prince Consulting Pty Ltd, AON Risk Services Australia Ltd, Arche Consulting Pty Ltd, Arup Pty Ltd, Blairlanksy, Blue Grass Consulting, Centre for International Economics, Close Encounters Trading Network, Colleen Morris, DAFF CPM, Dain Simpson Associates and Hassell Pty Ltd, Dan Tuck Archaeologist, Deloitte, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, Dept of Agriculture and Fisheries, Department of Environment WA, Du Pont Australia Ltd, Earthcheck Pty Ltd, Ecos Environmental P/L, Environmental Consultancy, Ernst & Young, Fly By Night Bat Surveys Pty Ltd, Freeman Ryan Design, Frost Design and Urbis, Geotech Solutions Pty Ltd, GHD Pty Ltd, Gunthorp Consulting P/L, Haskoning Australia, Hyder Consulting Pty Ltd, Inconsult Associates, Internal Audit Bureau, Jackie Miles, Janet Heywood, Kiama Municipal Council, Knight Frank, KPMG Australia, Maitland & Butler, Mott Macdonald Hughes Trueman, Nous Group, OHM Consultants, OEH, Peter Bardsley, Peter J Boyce Associates, Polychrest Pty Ltd, Powercorp Operation Pty Ltd, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Procure Group Pty Ltd, PSM Consult Pty Ltd, RIC Mcconaghy P/L, Richard Aitken Pty Ltd, Richard Dennis Leplastrier, Robert Kooyman, RSM Bird Cameron, Sarah Martin, SKM, Social Ventures Australia, Stafford & Associates, State Property Authority, Sydney Environmental & Soil, Syneca Consulting, The Customer Experience Company, The Odour Unit Pty Ltd, Town Planning Advice, Track Assessment, Trigger Design, Truman, University of Ballarat, University of New England, WMA Water, Wright Corporate Strategy Pty Ltd, Zaniol & Associates PT, ZOE Morgan Gregory.

QUESTION 78

For what purpose has your Department engaged consultants?

ANSWER

Various services, such as engineering, environmental, management services, organisational review, business and strategic planning / reviews, probity advice, airport services, asset management, audit, geotechnical advice, land management/development, surveying, town planning, corporate governance advice and other specialist advice.

QUESTION 79

How much have your agencies spent on consultants in the 2011/12 financial year?

ANSWER

\$2,190,353.43

QUESTION 80

What is your Department(s) budget for consultants in the 2012/13 financial year?

ANSWER

The budget is consistent with the actual expenditure and it includes savings requirements across the Environment and Heritage portfolio

QUESTION 81

Have any agencies within your Departments sponsored any organisations or events in the 2011/12 financial year?

ANSWER

Yes

QUESTION 82

If yes, which organisations and events were sponsored in the 2011/12 financial year?

ANSWER

2BOB Community Radio (Hunter)
3 Pillars Network Pty Ltd, National Sustainable Food Summit 2012
3 Pillars Network, Sustainable Food Conference
Australian Industry Group, Environmental Solution Forum
Australian Life Cycle Assessment Association Event
Australian Life Cycle Assessment Association Event
Australian Waste and Recycling Expo, Impact Environmental Services
Blacktown Meals On Wheels, Seniors Week Morning Tea
Bland Shire Council, Seniors Week Morning Tea
Blue Mountains Lithgow Oberon Tourism Awards
Bombala Council, Seniors Week Morning Tea
Broken Hill City Council, Seniors Week Morning Tea

Canberra Outdoor and Lifestyle Expo - ACT
 Centacare Wilcannia-Forbes, Seniors Week Morning Tea
 Centre For Sustainability Leadership, Centre For Sustainability Leadership Fellowship Program
 Sydney 2012
 Ecoforum Limited, Ecoforum Conference 2012
 Eden Whale Festival
 Federation Of Parents And Citizens' Association Of NSW, Federation Of Parents And Citizens'
 Associations Of NSW Annual Conference 2012
 Financial Councillors Association Of New South Wales, Annual Conference
 Footworks Sports Academy, Cricket Comp
 Forster Adventure Race
 Garie Surf Life Saving Club, Free Park Entry for Active Members and Lifesavers
 Gloucester NAIDOC Week Event
 Goulburn Mulwaree Council, Seniors Week Morning Tea
 Grasshopper Soccer, Junior Soccer Comp
 Gundagai Neighbourhood Centre, Seniors Week Morning Tea
 Hartley Life Care
 Hike for Hunger
 Humpty's Hike
 Impact Environmental Services, NSW Annual Premier Waste Conference
 Jacaranda Cottage Fun Run (Womens' Refuge)
 Jindabyne Lions Club, Spirit of the Snowies
 Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, Walk for a Cure
 K'Ozzie Festival
 Keep Australia Beautiful NSW, Clean Beaches Awards 2012
 Keep Australia Beautiful NSW, Sustainable Cities Awards 2012
 Kosi Run
 Lachlan CMA, Energise The Catchment
 Lendlease Annelsey Bowral Retirement Village, Seniors Week Morning Tea
 Lithgow Army Cadets
 Local Community Services Association, Annual Conference
 Local Government, Shires Annual Conference and Local Government Environment Awards
 Lord Howe Island Discovery Day Sports Carnival
 Lord Howe Island Golf Club - Golf Open
 Master Chef, Love Food Hate Waste program
 Mothers Day Classic, Bike Parking At Mothers Day Classic 2012
 Mountain Designs Geoquest 48hour Adventure Race
 Mountains to Beach
 National Trust, Bushweek In The City
 Nature Conservation Council, Conference
 New Australian Sports Assoc, Cricket Comp
 NSW Business Chamber – NSW Business Chamber Annual Awards 2012
 NSW Coastal Conference, Floodplain Management Association Annual Conference
 Orange & Bathurst, Community Sustainability Day Sustainability Living Expo
 Parkes LGAA, Distributed Energy Open Day
 Parramatta City Council, Australia Day Event
 Perisher Ambassador Program
 Perisher Snowy Mountains Music festival
 Printing Industries Association Of Australia - NSW Employers Mutual Printing Industries
 Craftsmanship Awards 2012
 Riverina Eastern Regional Organisation of Councils, Rural Regional Landfill and Waste Management
 Conference
 School and Sports Clubs, 2 Complementary Tickets for Park Entry on 5 Occasions Each Year
 Sea to Summit
 Shoalhaven City Council, Aboriginal Youth Dance Project
 Short Circuit Relay Cancer Fundraiser
 Snowy Ride - Signature Region Event

South East Arts, Lake Light Sculpture
Sponsorship of Queanbeyan City Council to host a South East Regional Council seminar on Love Food Hate Waste
Sydney Festival
Sydney Festival - Bike Parking At 2012 Domain Concert Events
Sydwest Multicultural Services, Seniors Week Morning Tea
Thredbo Blues Festival
Thredbo Jazz Festival
Three Peak Challenge
Total Environment Centre Inc, Seminar On Best Practice In Sustainability
Total Environment Centre, Green Capital Events 2012
Tumbafest, Tumbarumba Festival
Tumut Region Business Awards
Tweed Shire Senior Citizens Committee, Seniors Week Morning Tea
University of NSW, Industrial Chemistry Scholarship
Upper Murray Challenge
Upper Snowy Landcare Committee, Water Catchment Calendar
Urana Shire Council, Seniors Week Morning Tea
Waste and Recycling Contractors Association
Waste Management Association, Commercial and Industrial Waste Seminar.
Waste Management Association, Commercial and Plastics Waste Seminar.
Waste Management Association, Industrial Ecology Conference
Western Sydney Community Forum, Western Sydney Car Pool 2012
Wetland Care Australia
Wintersports – Interschool Challenge
Women and Fire Fighting Conference
Women in Super, Mothers Day Classic
Worimi LALC, NAIDOC
Youth Alive NSW, Big Exo Day

QUESTION 83

How much did your agencies within your Departments spend on sponsoring organisations and events in the 2011/12 financial year?

ANSWER

\$540,792.46

QUESTION 84

What is your Department(s) budget for sponsorship in the 2012/13 financial year?

ANSWER

The budget is consistent with the actual expenditure and it includes savings requirements across the Environment and Heritage portfolio.

QUESTION 85

Has the Minister been rovided with Speech, Voice or Media Training since becoming Minister? If so, then;

- a) Who conducted the training?

- b) When was it conducted?
- c) Where was it conducted, what were the costs of the training?
- d) Who paid for the training?

ANSWER

No, the Minister undertook media training in 2011, funded personally.

End of questions from the Hon A Fazio MLC

- END -