

QUESTION
Questions from the Hon Mark Buttigieg MLC on behalf of the Opposition
NSW North Coast Flooding
1. Is it possible to restore any of Lismore art gallery's collection, including the highly significant Afghan War Rugs on loan from the Drill Hall Gallery at ANU?
ANSWER: The Lismore Regional Gallery Collections are in cold storage and being assessed by Lismore City Council's conservation consultants. Afghan Rugs have been returned to their owners for assessment and conservation.

QUESTION
2. What is the value of the Afghan War Rugs? (a) Were they insured? (b) What was their value? (c) Are they priceless? (d) What actually happens to such invaluable items lost in flooding?
ANSWER: The Afghan rugs are owned by the Australian National University. Items A – D are a matter for the owner of the rugs.

QUESTION
3. What is the fate of the Hannah Cabinet?
ANSWER: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Hanna Cabinet (valued at \$1 million) was housed on the first floor of the Lismore Regional Gallery, which flood water reached, causing damage to the cabinet• The Cabinet was repatriated separately (from the Gallery's collection) by International Conservation Services (ICS) and transported at the artist's request to International Art Services in Canberra for initial assessment; and• The Cabinet is undergoing conservation treatment by Geoff Hanna's conservator Greg Peters.

QUESTION
4. How many conservators work for the NSW Government? (a) How many conservators were sent to the Northern Rivers to help rescue collections inundated by the flooding? (b) What support is being provided to small museums and galleries across NSW affected by flooding? Please provide a list itemised by venue and what support each has received.

ANSWER:

There are 68 conservators who work across the NSW Cultural Institutions.

- (a) No conservators from the State Cultural Institutions were sent to the Northern Rivers to help rescue collections inundated by the flooding. Conservators from the NSW Cultural Institutions are assisting with the conservation of objects and works through advice and technical support where necessary.
- (b) Create NSW has worked closely with Museums & Galleries NSW to provide advice and support to small museums and galleries. This includes a website with information and links to resources for salvaging and conserving flood affected collections. In addition, funding has been provided through the following mechanisms:
- A \$200,000 Recovery Grants program, with grants of up to \$30,000 available for eligible organisations and up to \$10,000 for individuals and groups opened on 31 March, and applicants will know the results three weeks after the grants close on 28 April;
 - \$70,000 was provided to Arts Northern Rivers to deliver micro-grants (\$1,000) to artists and creative groups in the Northern Rivers region.
 - \$45,000 was provided to Arts Northern Rivers to replace damaged office equipment and computers so that they could operate and provide support to the arts and cultural sector.
 - Up to \$50,000 has been made available to Richmond River Historical Society to secure the collection of Lismore Museum.
 - \$5,000 was approved for Geoff Hannah, creator of the Hannah Cabinet, through the Small Project Grants program to remove three cabinets from his flood affected home. These cabinets are now being conserved at Powerhouse Museum.

QUESTION

5. Has the Government done a survey of the museums and galleries of the north coast to assess the scope of damage?

ANSWER:

- Create NSW has contacted clients and stakeholders in flood and adverse weather affected LGAs to offer support and gather impact/damage data on cultural assets including small museums;
- A database has been created with information regarding impact of floods and adverse weather on cultural assets including small museums; and
- This database is updated on a regular basis as damage reports and information is received.
- Create NSW is working closely with Arts Northern Rivers and Museums & Galleries NSW to ensure that appropriate levels of support are provided.
- Arts Northern Rivers has surveyed its constituents and is providing guidance to Create NSW on the best approach.

QUESTION

6. How many museums and galleries in NSW have been flood affected?

ANSWER:

The following figures, which cover the whole state, are based on information compiled following communication with Create NSW clients, Museums and Galleries NSW and key stakeholders including local governments and the Regional Arts Development Organisation Network;

- five galleries – high impact in the Northern Rivers Region, including Lismore Regional Gallery
- one museum – high impact – Richmond River Historical Society, Lismore
- 10+ museums and galleries reporting low impact ,causing a short closure of operations during flood and adverse weather event, but no damage to collections reported and now operational.

QUESTION

7. What damage has there been at Richmond River Historical Society and Museum at Lismore?

- (a) Has there been high humidity and mould?
- (b) Does this threaten the collection there?
- (c) Have you sent conservators to protect the collection there?

ANSWER:

- Richmond River Historical Society has received minimal damage to its collection as it was stored on the first floor of the museum which the flood waters did not reach.
 - Up to \$50,000 from Create NSW is available to assist with assessment and conservation costs for the Museum's flood damaged material.
- a) & b) Industry professionals have advised that the majority of the collection was not impacted by humidity or mould. However, the damaged component of the collection has been moved to cold storage (to prevent mould growth) and will be assessed; Professional conservators will be available to treat the damaged collection when the assessment is complete.
- c) No conservators were sent to the museum.

QUESTION

8. What is the estimated cost of restoring all of the collections that were damaged in the floods?

ANSWER:

Assessment of the damage to the collections is underway, and once assessed, the value of restoration will be estimated.

QUESTION

9. Will the NSW Government be diverting any of the \$500 million allocated to downsizing the Powerhouse Museum into a commercially-focused creative industries precinct into helping salvage the collections of small museums and galleries damaged by the floods?

ANSWER:

No

QUESTION

Powerhouse Parramatta flood risk

10. At Question Time in the Legislative Council on February 22 2022, Minister Franklin said that “even in a one-in-1,000 year river flood—and I am sure the honourable member is not suggesting that today’s precipitation event is such a case—the ground floor would still remain half a metre above the floodwaters.” Given that there is a 10% chance of a one-in-1,000 year flood occurring in the 100-year lifespan of the building, is the Minister comfortable with a buffer zone of 50 centimetres should such a catastrophic flood occur?

ANSWER:

During the State Significant Development Approval process flooding risk was a key consideration. The Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) obtained an independent assessment of the flood risk from WMAWater. The Development Approval reflects a floor level of RL7.5 which is above the 1 in 1000 river flood level and higher than the relevant City of Parramatta Council requirements.

The recent heavy rain over a four-week period inundated the lower portion of the site at RL3.5 which is approximately 1.6 metres above the river’s edge and 4 metres below the ground floor level of the Museum. The recent inundation events are consistent with Arup Engineering expectations and the approved Powerhouse Parramatta design.

QUESTION

11. In the figure numbered P1.7-PMFH-MOF in Arup’s Appendix E rare flood technical note, whose subject line is “Flood Risk Assessment for Inclusion of St Georges Terrace Building into Powerhouse at Parramatta Site,” it appears as if nearly the entire construction site is labelled H6 – Unconditionally dangerous and not suitable for any type of development, with the remainder labelled as H5 – unsafe for all people and all vehicles and buildings require special engineering design and construction.

- (a) What percentage of the Powerhouse Parramatta will be built on land labelled by Arup as H6 – Unconditionally dangerous and not suitable for any type of development?
- (b) What percentage of the Powerhouse Parramatta will be built on land labelled by Arup as H5 – unsafe for all people and all vehicles and buildings require special engineering design and construction?
- (c) What justification is there for building the Powerhouse Parramatta on land that your own flood risk assessors have deemed unconditionally dangerous, not suitable for any type of development, and/or unsafe for all people and all vehicles?

Given the above, how does the minister justify his comments in the Legislative Council that the Powerhouse Parramatta “will be safe, and it will be magnificent?”

ANSWER:

The Arup report and all appendixes are the responsibility of Infrastructure NSW, who have provided the below information:

The Powerhouse Parramatta State Significant Development Application assessed the impacts of the development against the requisite flood considerations, which is the 1 in 100 year event, or 1% flood event. The assessment was independently reviewed as part of the Department of Planning and Environment's determination and was deemed suitable.

The question presupposes that development should be assessed against the probable maximum flood (a 1 in 10,000,000 or 0.00001% chance of occurring in any one year) rather than the 1 in 100 year or 1% flood event. If this was the case the majority of development in Parramatta would not have been permitted.

Figure P1.7-PMFH-MOF demonstrates the residual risk after the Museum is developed. The figure shows that the risk relates to areas outside of the building footprint (or within the undercroft), which is the same risk shown for all other adjacent buildings. The flood risks during the probable maximum flood for people sheltering in the building are nil due to Level 1 being 7 metres above the probable maximum flood level.

However, hazard classifications, such as the H5 and H6 classifications mentioned in the question, are not typically used to assess the hazards of a development against the probable maximum flood.

QUESTION

12. Lisa Havilah has said that the Powerhouse Parramatta will be a "very safe building to visit." Would the building be safe in a rare catastrophic flood?

ANSWER:

Powerhouse Parramatta has been designed to withstand large and rare flood events. A rare flood like a 1 in 1000 or 0.1% flood would have catastrophic outcomes for many parts of Parramatta. However, Powerhouse Parramatta would not experience any floor level inundation in such a flood. Structurally the building can withstand the impacts from a probable maximum flood (a 1 in 10,000,000 or 0.00001% chance of occurring in any one year).

QUESTION

13. The SES has warned that, in the event of a flash flood in Parramatta, people would need to evacuate within 9 minutes. Could over 5000 people be evacuated from the Parramatta Powerhouse within 9 minutes?

ANSWER:

There will not be a need to evacuate the building in the event of a flash flood in Parramatta. A Flood Emergency Management Strategy will be developed prior to Powerhouse Parramatta opening. This strategy will be based on a shelter-in-place approach for flash flooding which is consistent with City of Parramatta Council requirements.

QUESTION

14. Are you aware that SES policy is that evacuation is the primary response strategy for flooding?

ANSWER:

The Arup report and all appendixes are the responsibility of Infrastructure NSW, who have provided the below information:

A 1 in 1000 flood event in Parramatta would be as a result of significant rainfall over a period of time that would limit visitor and potentially Powerhouse employee numbers at Powerhouse Parramatta due to the challenges of movement around Sydney. The Powerhouse Parramatta Flood Emergency Management Strategy will have a risk management approach and response in the lead up to a 1 in 1000 flood event that will be focused on people and collection safety.

As part of the project's State Significant Development Application assessment an independent flood analysis was conducted by WMAWater for the Department of Planning and Environment. The analysis outlined two broad approaches to managing the well-being of people in a flood – evacuate in advance and shelter-in-place.

(WMAWater) stated in regard to this matter:

The first is to evacuate people in advance from the area that will flood. This presents significant difficulty in smaller urban catchments, as there may be risk to life issues in evacuating (intense rainfall, submerged roads, fallen trees etc.).

The alternate is “shelter in place” which means people stay where they are above flood waters and under cover until the flood passes. This can pose risks relating to isolation and lack of critical supplies if the duration of flooding is greater than a few hours.

The shelter-in-place strategy provides the most appropriate response to the flood risks of the area and will be complemented by the development of a Flood Emergency Management Strategy and sufficient emergency power and critical supplies in the building. City of Parramatta Council utilise a shelter-in-place strategy for all buildings that are potentially flood affected in the CBD.

QUESTION

15. Are you aware that SES policy is that “developments that propose shelter in place to manage the flood risk should be prohibited or deferred?”

ANSWER:

The Australian National Disaster Resilience Handbook on Flood Preparedness (Manual 20, Commonwealth of Australia 2009) states the following in regard to shelter-in-place versus evacuation:

Evacuation is a suitable strategy only when, by evacuating, people are not exposed to greater risks than they would face by remaining where they are. Due to the limited warning time available and the dangerous nature of flash flooding, in most flash flood catchments it may be more dangerous for people to evacuate than to shelter in place (i.e. stay inside their building and move to the highest place).

Due to the availability of many floors above the Museum ground floor that are well above the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) level and the provision of emergency power supplies, the use of shelter-in-place in this circumstance is warranted and a sensible response to the flood hazards.

QUESTION

16. Is it correct that shelter in place has been selected as the strategy to manage the flood risk at the Powerhouse Parramatta?

ANSWER:

The shelter-in-place strategy is consistent with City of Parramatta Council's requirements. As noted in the response to Question 5, a 1 in 1000 flood event in Parramatta would be as a result of significant rainfall over a period of time that would limit visitor and potentially Powerhouse employee numbers at Powerhouse Parramatta due to the challenges of movement around Sydney.

As noted in the response to Question 6, a shelter-in-place approach provides the most appropriate response to the flood risks of the area and will be complemented by the development of a Flood Emergency Management Strategy and the provision of sufficient emergency power and critical supplies in the building.

QUESTION

17. Is it correct that page 11 of Arup's "Appendix J—Flood Risk And Stormwater Management Addendum" to the "Powerhouse Parramatta Response to Submissions Report" dated 16 September 2020 states that a "key element" of flood risk management strategy for the project is: "A shelter-in-place strategy for floods in which people can safely stay on Level 1 (which is above the Probable Maximum Flood level) for a short period of time until the flood threat passes?"

- (a) Does this strategy contravene SES policy?
- (b) Why does the flood risk management strategy for the Parramatta Powerhouse contravene SES policy?
- (c) Is this consistent with Minister Franklin's and Lisa Havilah's characterisation of the Parramatta Powerhouse as "safe?"

ANSWER:

The Arup report and all appendixes are the responsibility of Infrastructure NSW, who have provided the below information:

The approach of shelter-in-place is entirely consistent with Commonwealth guidance on this matter and the views of the independent flood review for DPIE by WMAWater.

QUESTION

Out-of-date climate data

18. Do your Government's flood risk management plans rely on up-to-date climate data?

ANSWER:

The most up-to-date projections for climate change related increases to rainfall intensity were considered as part of the project State Significant Development Application approved in February 2021.

QUESTION

19. On your government's "Floodplain Risk Management Guidelines," the paper entitled "Practical Consideration of Climate Change" references a 2007 IPCC report. But the Fifth Assessment Report of the IPCC was released in 2014.

- (a) Is your government relying on 15-year-old climate data/predictions? (b) Has your

government failed to take into account changes in predicted climate change effects in calculating flood risk at Parramatta?

ANSWER:

The Arup report and all appendixes are the responsibility of Infrastructure NSW, who have provided the below information:

The most up-to-date projections for climate change related increases to rainfall intensity have been considered as part of the project State Significant Development Application approved in February 2021.

Arup's "Appendix J—Flood Risk and Stormwater Management Addendum" to the "Powerhouse Parramatta Response to Submissions Report" dated 16 September 2020 states that:

- In modelling the climate change scenario following Australian Rainfall and Runoff 2019 recommendations, the 2090 Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) 8.5 emission scenario was adopted cognisant that the Powerhouse Parramatta project would have a design life spanning more than 100 years; and

A 19.7% rainfall increase has been predicted for this scenario and this has been modelled herein for the 1% AEP event (rounded up to a 20% rainfall increase).

QUESTION

Insuring the Powerhouse Parramatta

20. How are priceless items like the Boulton and Watt engine valued?

ANSWER:

The Museum's Collection is valued by independent assessment every five years and the valuation is put out to tender.

The last valuation of the Collection was in March 2020.

All A category (very high significance) objects and high value objects are valued individually, and the rest of the collection is valued through a sampling process.

The Boulton and Watt engine was determined to be priceless in 2015 (irreplaceable) though a valuation framework established through CAMD (Council of Australian Museum Directors)

Whilst regarded as priceless for accounting purposes, a value is assigned to the Boulton and Watt for insurance purposes in the museum's annual insurance declaration return to iCare (Treasury Managed Fund). This value is based on a prior valuation of the Boulton and Watt, indexed for inflation.

QUESTION

21. How will you insure the Parramatta Powerhouse?

- (a) Who will provide the insurance?
- (b) Who will provide the reinsurance?
- (c) Will the project be insured by the Treasury Managed Fund?

- (d) What is the projected cost of insurance for the 100-year lifespan of the Parramatta Powerhouse?
- (e) Including construction, fitout, operating costs, and insurance costs, what is the total cost of the Parramatta Powerhouse projected to be over its 100-year lifespan?

ANSWER:

- a) The Museum's insurance activities are conducted through the NSW Treasury Managed Fund Scheme of self-insurance for government entities.
- b) iCare manages a comprehensive reinsurance programme supporting extensive insurable risk exposures relating to the NSW TMF Statement of Cover available to TMF member agencies.
- c) See answer to (a)
- d) Operational modelling was conducted for the planning years in the forward estimates (10 years)
- e) Operational modelling was conducted for the planning years in the forward estimates (10 years)

QUESTION

22. Is Guy Carpenter and Company Pty Ltd still the current reinsurance service provider for the NSW government?

- (a) What discussions have you had with them since the most recent floods?
- (b) What discussions have you had with any other insurance or reinsurance providers since the most recent floods?

ANSWER:

iCare is the provider of the insurance solution for the Powerhouse Parramatta project.

iCare also provide insurance advice and all the NSW Government project insurance requirements are managed through iCare.

iCare received a project update during the recent inclement weather events.

QUESTION

23. What has the Covid impact been on the finances of MAAS?

- (a) Have there been insurance payouts for Covid impacts?
- (b) If so, please itemise these.

ANSWER:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) 2019/20: \$810,000

QUESTION

Board meeting attendance

24. How many board meetings have there been since January 1 2021?

ANSWER:

There have been 7 meetings of the Trust from January 2021 to February 2022.

QUESTION

25. How many board meetings were attended by:

- (a) Peter Collins?
- (b) David Borger?
- (c) Paddy Carney?
- (d) Mark Hassell?
- (e) Kellie Hush?
- (f) Suzie Laundry?
- (g) Peter Poulet?
- (h) Lang Walker?
- (i) Eddie Woo?
- (j) Professor Barney Glover?

ANSWER:

- a) Peter Collins – 7/7
- b) David Borger – 6/7
- c) Paddy Carney – 6/6 (Term Ended 31.12.21)
- d) Mark Hassell – 6/7
- e) Kellie Hush – 7/7
- f) Suzie Laundry – 6/7
- g) Peter Poulet – 5/7
- h) Lang Walker – 5/7
- i) Eddie Woo – 6/7
- j) Professor Barney Glover – N/A (Term Ended 31.12.20)

QUESTION

Projected visitor numbers

26. How many visitors are expected annually at the Parramatta Powerhouse?

ANSWER:

Once operational, Powerhouse Parramatta is expected to attract over two million visitors annually.

QUESTION

27. Is it correct that two million visitors are expected at the Powerhouse Parramatta annually?
ANSWER: Yes

QUESTION
28. Is it correct that 187,164 visitors attended the Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo in 2020-21?
ANSWER: Yes, as outlined in the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Annual Report 2020-21

QUESTION
29. Is it correct that 250,232 visitors attended all MAAS sites in 2020-21?
ANSWER: Yes, as outlined in the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Annual Report 2020-21

QUESTION
30. On what basis does the government expect eight times the number of annual visitors across all MAAS sites to attend the Parramatta outpost? (a) Has there been modelling? i. If so, please provide the modelling. (b) Has this projected number of visitors informed the financial projections for the site? (c) If the true number of visitors annually falls short of the expected figure of two million, how will that impact financial projects for the Powerhouse Parramatta and MAAS?
ANSWER: The first full year of operation at Powerhouse Parramatta is projected to attract two million visitors. Powerhouse Parramatta will include expanded opening hours and a changing program that will drive repeat visitation, modelled by the business case. Visitation forecasts were informed by a market depth analysis in addition to modelling the capacity for each of the exhibition and public spaces as part of the business case process. The modelling uses industry forecasting for attendance rates at new cultural precincts.

QUESTION
Staff departures

31. As of March 18, will you provide the total number of staff that have left the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences since Lisa Havilah became the Chief Executive Officer?

(a) Would you provide them by month; and

(b) By job title or classification

ANSWER:

Information provided at Attachment A

QUESTION

32. Will you provide the total number of staff that left the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences in 2016, 2017, and 2018?

(a) Would you provide them by month; and

(b) By job title or classification

ANSWER:

Information provided at Attachment A

QUESTION

33. What were the reasons for the departures of two Directors of Public Engagement?

ANSWER:

The Director of Programs & Engagement resigned for personal reasons. The role was temporarily filled by the Head of Visitor Services, before being integrated into the Directorate of Curatorial, Collections & Programs.

QUESTION

34. What were the reasons for the departures of two Directors of Collections, Curatorial and Exhibitions?

ANSWER:

One was to seek a promotion, the other was for personal reasons.

QUESTION

35. What were the reasons for the departure of the Chief Financial Officer?

ANSWER:

The Chief Financial Officer role was reviewed and a Chief Operating Officer role was created instead. A competitive recruitment process was then conducted.

QUESTION
36. What were the reasons for the departure of the Director of the Parramatta Project?
ANSWER: Restructure of the role to align with changes to project requirements.

QUESTION
37. What were the reasons for the departures of two of Lisa Havilah's Executive Assistants?
ANSWER: One resigned to obtain another role, the other resigned for personal reasons.

QUESTION
38. What were the reasons for the departure of the Director of Design and Delivery?
ANSWER: The temporary contract ended and a competitive recruitment process conducted.

QUESTION
39. What were the reasons for the departure of the Director of Strategy for Parramatta?
ANSWER: The project role concluded.

QUESTION
40. What were the reasons for the departure of the Head of Production?
ANSWER: Resigned to obtain another role.

QUESTION
41. What were the reasons for the departures of two Heads of Conservation?
ANSWER: One transferred to another role with a Cultural Institution, while the other left for personal reasons.

QUESTION
42. What were the reasons for the departure of the Head of Collections?
ANSWER: For personal reasons.
QUESTION
43. What were the reasons for the departure of the Head of Facilities?
ANSWER: Retirement.

QUESTION
44. What were the reasons for the departure of the Head of Editorial?
ANSWER: Retirement.

QUESTION
45. How much has been paid in redundancies to all of the staff who have departed since Lisa Havilah was appointed Chief Executive Officer?
ANSWER: \$930,513 (2019 – 2021)
QUESTION
46. How much was paid in redundancies to all departed staff in 2016, 2017, and 2018?
ANSWER: \$994,022 (2016-2018)

QUESTION
47. How much has been paid or will be paid to Chris Keely as compensation upon his departure? P&O
ANSWER: As per section 39(1) of the NSW Government Sector Employment Regulation 2014 Mr Keely was entitled to receive an amount equal to his total remuneration package for a period of 38

weeks. Mr Keely also received any outstanding salary and accumulated recreation leave entitlements.

QUESTION

48. How much has been paid or will be paid to Grainne Brunsdon upon her departure?

ANSWER:

Following her resignation, Ms Brunsdon received entitlements such as outstanding salary and any accumulated recreation or extended leave.

QUESTION

49. How much has been paid or will be paid to Jody Broun upon her departure?

ANSWER:

This is a matter for the Aboriginal Housing Office in the Department of Planning and Environment, and as such the responsibility of the Minister for Planning and Homes.

QUESTION

Undercroft at Parramatta Powerhouse

50. Have amended drawings relating to the undercroft – showing the provision of fixed, permeable, permanent screens that prevent access to the undercroft other than for maintenance purposes and allow the passage of flood waters – been submitted to the Planning Secretary for approval?

- (a) Were these drawings submitted together with a Flood Impact Assessment demonstrating the screens will not adversely impact on the free flow of flood waters?
- (b) Were these drawings submitted together with a Crime Prevention through Environmental Design assessment?
- (c) Were these drawings submitted together with a Design Report, demonstrating that the amended design has been integrated into the overall design of the development?
- (d) When were these drawings, reports, and assessments submitted to the Planning Secretary for approval?

ANSWER:

Condition C1 of the consent requires this information to be submitted to the Department of Planning and Environment Secretary prior to commencement of construction of the built form of the Museum. This documentation will be submitted to the Secretary prior to the relevant construction certificate, which has not yet occurred.

QUESTION

51. Should a flash flood occur while visitors are in the undercroft area, what is the plan for evacuating them?

ANSWER:

The State Significant Development Application approval does not allow use of the undercroft by visitors to the Museum and thus there would be no need to evacuate people from this part of the building.

QUESTION

Government grants process

52. Following the Auditor-General's "Integrity of grant program administration" report, why were 22 of the 141 applications that received funding not recommended by the independent panel?

(a) Will you please provide the reasons for the funding of each of these 22 applications?

ANSWER:

The Auditor-General's report found:

- the assessment process that Create NSW used for the Regional Cultural Fund was robust and produced transparent and defensible recommendations to the Minister.
- All projects that received funding were assessed by Create NSW as eligible for funding under the program.
- An independent assessment panel assessed applications against the program objectives and criteria. This process was designed in line with good practice in grants administration and was implemented consistently.

The RCF program received 405 applications across all rounds and 147 applications received funding. Some applications that did not score as well as others through the assessment process were not recommended for funding by the panel.

For both rounds, the then Minister provided the full list of projects as appraised by the panel to the then Deputy Premier for consideration, consistent with the guidelines of the Regional Cultural Fund.

Consistent with the approach taken with other Regional Growth Funds, the then Deputy Premier adopted further considerations as to which projects should receive funding, including economic stimulus in drought-affected regional towns and communities, the equity of the funding outcomes across regional NSW, and the views of local Members of Parliament in confirming the merits of eligible projects.

Consideration was also given by the then Minister for the Arts and the then Deputy Premier as to whether the project or organisation was volunteer-run or had a community arts focus (which are of important social, cultural and economic value in regional communities, but typically scored lower than professional arts organisations and local councils).

Final advice was submitted for consideration of the then Minister for the Arts and the then Deputy Premier. Final funding decisions were made by the then Minister for the Arts, in concurrence with the then Deputy Premier.

QUESTION

53. Why did the minister not follow the recommendations of the independent panel?

ANSWER:

The then Minister provided the full list of projects as appraised by the panel to the then Deputy Premier for his consideration, consistent with the guidelines of the Regional Cultural Fund.

The then Deputy Premier adopted further considerations as to which projects should receive funding, including economic stimulus in drought-affected regional towns and communities, the equity of the funding outcomes across regional NSW, and the views of local Members of Parliament in confirming the merits of eligible projects.

Consideration was also given by the then Minister for the Arts and the then Deputy Premier as to whether the project or organisation was volunteer-run or had a community arts focus (which are of important social, cultural and economic value in regional communities, but typically scored lower than professional arts organisations and local councils).

Final advice was submitted for consideration of the then Minister for the Arts and the then Deputy Premier. Final funding decisions were made by the then Minister for the Arts, in concurrence with the then Deputy Premier.

QUESTION

54. Will you please provide a list of each grant application that was recommended by the independent panel but which the Minister decided not to fund?

(a) Will you please list the reasons why the Minister decided not to fund each of these?

ANSWER:

Applications are submitted to the Department in confidence. Releasing applicant and project details would create commercial in confidence, probity fairness and reputational risks to the Department and applicants.

See answer to question 52 above. Final funding decisions were made by the then Minister for the Arts, in concurrence with the then Deputy Premier.

QUESTION

55. Is your Government considering implementing a different process whereby the Minister has less involvement in funding decisions for cultural grant programs, as in New Zealand and the United Kingdom?

ANSWER:

Grants funding guidelines are continuously under review to ensure that the process is in line with good practice in grants administration, implemented consistently, that funding decisions are well documented, and the outcomes are transparent to applicants and the wider arts and cultural sector.

A DPC-Productivity Commissioner led grants review to update the whole of NSW Government Grants Administration Guide is being undertaken, with the updated Guide and any recommendations arising from the review scheduled to be delivered to the Premier in April 2022.

QUESTION
56. Since the Auditor-General's report, what steps and processes have the Government put in place to ensure integrity in the making of Government grants?
ANSWER: The Government welcomes the Final Report of the Public Accountability Committee's Inquiry into Government Grants. Reforms have been made to improve the processes and transparency of grants administered by Create NSW, and to improve stakeholder engagement and awareness over the last two years. These reforms simplify the application process, expand the eligibility criteria to a wider range of applicants, and provide greater transparency and consistency of decision-making through the introduction of Artform and Cultural Infrastructure Advisory Boards to review grant applications and provide advice to the Minister for the Arts. The Minister meets with the chairs of the Boards to discuss their funding advice and their strategic advice on issues facing their artform. These discussions are documented by the Create NSW Secretariat. An independent probity advisory service – O'Connor Marsden & Associates - oversees the administration of Create NSW grants to ensure strict probity principles are complied with and a report is produced on the delivery of each round. The changes to the guidelines and the assessment process ensure that funding decisions by the Minister for the Arts and Create NSW are well documented, and the outcomes are transparent to applicants and the wider arts and cultural sector.

QUESTION
Creative Kids 57. There was a change in policy excluding all programming that includes the supply of any creative materials or art/craft kits from the Creative Kids program from March 1. Why were businesses which relied on your government's promise to allow Creative Kids vouchers to be used until the end of this year only informed of this change on February 28 at 11.15pm, with just 45 minutes' notice?
ANSWER: The changes to the guidelines came into effect on 1 March 2022, and providers have been working with Create NSW to ensure they are operating within the Provider guidelines of the program. The changes to remove creative materials were implemented in response to the continued lifting of COVID-19 restrictions, which recognises the policy intent of the program is to provide arts and cultural tuition to children – in both face-to-face and online formats. Vouchers are still able to be used by approved Creative Kids providers for eligible face to face Creative Kids programs until 31 December 2022.

QUESTION
58. How much was allocated for the Creative Kids program?
ANSWER:

\$216 million across four years (2019 to 2022)

QUESTION

59. At the Portfolio Committee 1 hearing on March 15, Minister Franklin said that parents had downloaded two million vouchers and providers have redeemed 1.49 million vouchers as at March 9, costing over \$149 million. Is this correct?

- (a) What is the precise figure?
- (b) Will you itemise the expenditure on the Creative Kids program for each month since its inception?
 - i. If a monthly itemisation is not possible, please provide an itemisation for as granular a period as possible. For instance, if not monthly, then quarterly, or half-yearly, or annually.

ANSWER:

- a) The precise figure as at 9 March 2022 was \$149,348,717.20. As at 25 March 2022, the figure was \$150,790,373.83
- b) Below is an itemisation of voucher expenditure by month up to 25 March 2022.

Month:	Vouchers Redeemed:	Voucher Expenditure:
Nov-18	2	\$ 200.00
Dec-18	47	\$ 4,697.00
Jan-19	10,205	\$ 1,019,727.00
Feb-19	34,357	\$ 3,434,082.50
Mar-19	23,425	\$ 2,338,132.80
Apr-19	19,689	\$ 1,964,598.26
May-19	23,779	\$ 2,375,581.87
Jun-19	14,556	\$ 1,449,988.50
Jul-19	19,541	\$ 1,949,627.30
Aug-19	15,589	\$ 1,555,856.00
Sep-19	14,940	\$ 1,485,626.41
Oct-19	18,466	\$ 1,832,569.00
Nov-19	12,510	\$ 1,245,835.09
Dec-19	17,380	\$ 1,728,952.59
Jan-20	24,185	\$ 2,415,082.05
Feb-20	52,439	\$ 5,242,073.14
Mar-20	26,144	\$ 2,610,839.21
Apr-20	12,223	\$ 1,221,227.15
May-20	8,863	\$ 885,365.31
Jun-20	9,602	\$ 956,201.10
Jul-20	24,657	\$ 2,463,267.85
Aug-20	22,389	\$ 2,234,923.45
Sep-20	27,692	\$ 2,764,840.53
Oct-20	40,729	\$ 4,071,040.80
Nov-20	55,095	\$ 5,505,866.89
Dec-20	112,039	\$ 11,193,076.43
Jan-21	64,665	\$ 6,462,686.16

Feb-21	72,516	\$ 7,249,075.29
Mar-21	56,884	\$ 5,681,801.77
Apr-21	45,629	\$ 4,558,715.98
May-21	40,888	\$ 4,082,602.00
Jun-21	55,785	\$ 5,573,144.09
Jul-21	59,072	\$ 5,903,955.69
Aug-21	65,456	\$ 6,542,695.52
Sep-21	45,501	\$ 4,547,796.27
Oct-21	34,719	\$ 3,469,720.96
Nov-21	56,933	\$ 5,691,322.65
Dec-21	107,366	\$ 10,734,232.78
Jan-22	66,397	\$ 6,638,452.88
Feb-22	65,171	\$ 6,515,928.45
Mar-22	31,900	\$ 3,188,965.11
TOTAL:	1,509,425	\$150,790,373.83

QUESTION

60. What is the budget for Creative Capital?

ANSWER:

Creative Capital is a \$60 million fund announced by the NSW Government in June 2021.

QUESTION

61. What has been the expenditure on Creative Capital, itemised by each month since its inception?

If a monthly itemisation is not possible, please provide an itemisation for as granular a period as possible. For instance, if not monthly, then quarterly, or half-yearly, or annually.

ANSWER:

The first Round of the Creative Capital program was assessed in 2021, with 60 successful Minor Works and Equipment projects announced to a total of \$6.1 million. All recipients have a legally binding Funding Agreement in place.

The first stage EOI for Medium to Large Projects has also been completed, with 51 applicants invited to participate in Stage 2, closing on 11 April 2022.

Spend to date –

- Administration Costs – \$31,421.00.

Forecast FY22 – Grant Funds (based on Funding Agreement payment schedules) \$4,058,491

QUESTION

62. Has funding that was allocated for Creative Kids been reallocated to other priority spending areas within Create NSW, including the Creative Capital program?

ANSWER:

This is Cabinet in Confidence.

QUESTION

Powerhouse NSW Creative Industries Residencies

63. Please provide a list of business which operated out of Carriageworks under Lisa Havilah that have also operated out of the Powerhouse Museum under Lisa Havilah.

ANSWER:

Nell had an artist's studio at Carriageworks and is now an artistic resident at the Powerhouse Museum.

QUESTION

64. What is the value of each of those residencies?

ANSWER:

The licence fee paid by Nell to the museum is \$450 (ex GST) per week. This equates to \$23,400 (ex GST) annually.

QUESTION

65. Has funding for Powerhouse NSW Creative Industries Residencies come at the expense of Create NSW grant programs for regional arts projects and/or other creative arts projects in NSW?

ANSWER:

The Powerhouse NSW Creative Industries Residencies; and its funding; have no correlation to any grant program administered by Create NSW.

The Powerhouse Creative Industries Residency Program does not provide any funding or grants to participants.

The program provides workspace for creative industries. The space is offered at approximately 50% of the commercial value, taking into account location, amenity, size and condition.

In exchange for the subsidy, creative residents contribute to the Powerhouse's education, research and exhibition programs.

QUESTION

Powerhouse staffing, collections, and fitout

66. How many curators and conservators were employed by the Museum of Applied Arts and sciences in:

- (a) 2017-18?
- (b) 2018-19?
- (c) 2019-20?
- (d) 2020-21?
- (e) Does any reduction in these staffing numbers reflect a policy change, related to the removal of the word “museum” from the Powerhouse’s name, to turn each of the Powerhouse facilities into creative arts precincts?

ANSWER:

- a) 30.2 FTE
- b) 37.4 FTE
- c) 47.6 FTE
- d) 51.4 FTE
- e) There has been no change to the name of the Powerhouse Museum.

QUESTION

67. Would the relocation of the collection require an increase in conservators?

ANSWER:

Yes. The Powerhouse has employed up to 15 additional conservators and 12 additional assistant conservators for different phases of the collection relocation and digitisation project.

QUESTION

68. How many State Emergency Services positions does MAAS have at present?

ANSWER:

None

QUESTION

69. What percentage of the current collections at the Powerhouse Museum will remain at the Ultimo site?

ANSWER:

Once the expansion of storage is completed, the Powerhouse collection will be stored at Castle Hill. The NSW Government has committed to the Catalina Flying Boat, Boulton & Watt Steam Engine and Loco No 1 remaining at Ultimo.

Details of future exhibition programs at Powerhouse Ultimo are yet to be determined.

QUESTION

70. How will the collection be protected during renovations?

ANSWER:

It is expected that nearly all objects will be removed from the site for the period of renewal at Ultimo, but possible that some larger items will have protection built around them or moved to parts of the site that are not affected by upgrade work.

This element of the renewal will be managed by highly qualified museum staff that have extensive experience in moving collection objects.

QUESTION

71. When will the Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo be closed?

ANSWER:

The timing for commencement and completion of the Ultimo renewal is subject to the completion of planning, design and procurement processes.

QUESTION

72. What is the budget for fitout at the Powerhouse Parramatta?

ANSWER:

This is commercial in confidence.

QUESTION

Allocation of funds earmarked for Ultimo site

73. Will the government guarantee that all of the \$480-\$500 million allocated to “renewing” the Ultimo site be used exclusively at the Ultimo site?

(a) Will any portion of the funds allocated for the Ultimo site be used for cost overruns at Parramatta?

ANSWER:

Yes.

(a) No

QUESTION

Powerhouse Parramatta design issues

74. What is the planned total presentation space at the Powerhouse Parramatta in square metres, as of March 18 2022?

ANSWER:

Powerhouse Parramatta is being delivered in accordance with the State Significant Development Application approvals.

Powerhouse Parramatta will provide more than 18,000 square metres of museum exhibition and public spaces across seven exhibition spaces enabling a constantly changing program and providing new levels of access to the Powerhouse Collection.

QUESTION

75. How much presentation space at the Powerhouse Parramatta will have AA-rated international museum standard climate controls?

(a) Will this have an impact on collection access, flexibility, and exhibition opportunities?

(b) How much will it cost to retrofit museum standard climate control systems in the future?

ANSWER:

Powerhouse Parramatta will be designed to international standards, including those around temperature, humidity control and security.

All exhibition spaces will be serviced by climate control systems to suit to their intended purposes.

In March 2019, The Council of Australian Art Museum Directors (CAAMD) unanimously agreed to adopt the Bizot Green Protocol guidelines for loans and to implement these guidelines to manage works of art and objects on loan between Council of Australian Art Museum Directors member organisations.

Mechanical Engineers Arup developed environmental conditions that meet the Bizot Green Protocol guidelines, and the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Condition Engineer (ASHRAE) ratings which are the standard reference points for peak bodies including the Bizot Group.

The Bizot Group guidelines were established by The International Group of Organizers of Major Exhibitions (the Bizot Group) and have been endorsed by the National Museum Directors' Council (United Kingdom) and implemented in member museums such as the Tate, the Victoria and Albert Museum, British Museum, The Louvre, The Museum of Metropolitan Art and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

During design development, Arup sought advice and review from their UK office who were directly involved in the development of the Bizot Green Protocol guidelines and benchmarked against international Museums and Galleries.

The environmental conditions for Powerhouse Parramatta are consistent with these guidelines and will support national and international loans alongside providing the highest levels of protection for the Powerhouse Collection.

QUESTION

76. What community consultation took place around the Powerhouse Parramatta?

ANSWER:

Community consultation has occurred in both 2017 prior to the finalisation of the Business Case, and in 2020 as required for the SSD application.

In 2017 Elton Consulting on behalf of Create NSW undertook public consultation activities to inform the final business case.

In March and April 2020, the Powerhouse and Infrastructure NSW undertook a program of community consultation to inform community values and the future of the museum and precinct. Participants included community, cultural, education and local government members and organisations.

In December 2020 the Powerhouse Community Space was opened for the community to learn more about Powerhouse Parramatta, to engage with the museum's STEM learning activities as well as learn about its iconic collections.

Over 2135 community members have visited the Powerhouse Community Space. The sentiment of visitors has been extremely positive, with over 88% of visitors excited about Powerhouse Parramatta being established.

The Community Space was closed on 23 June 2021 due to Covid-19 restrictions. Community consultation is ongoing throughout the project via the Powerhouse Parramatta Community Reference Group, established in 2020, through an open expression of interest process.

The group is an ongoing consultative forum and is an opportunity for the community to continue to contribute to the development of the Powerhouse Parramatta, to ensure community aspirations and high levels of cultural amenity are delivered.

Community and education programs are continuing to expand in Western Sydney in lead up to the opening of Powerhouse Parramatta including:

- The Lang Walker Family Academy in-schools program;
- Collaboration with Western Sydney University;
- A Western Sydney skills partnership with TAFE NSW;
- Creative Studio: School Holidays;
- Creative Studio: STEAM Saturdays;
- Partnership with Deerubbin Local Aboriginal Land Council (DLALC) at Parramatta Gaol;
- Parramatta Artists' Studios Powerhouse Residency;
- Parramatta Artists' Studios: WEAVE Garden;
- Google Creative Lab;
- River Naturalisation feasibility, and;
- The Powerhouse Parramatta Landscape Curatorium

QUESTION

\$75 million stimulus package

77. Of the \$75 million funding package announced in 2021:

- (a) How much of that grant money has now been disbursed?
- (b) How much of that grant money has gone to rural and regional NSW?
- (c) Please provide a full list of recipients and the amount of funding received by each recipient
- (d) Did any recipient receive more than \$12.5 million?

ANSWER:

- a) As at 24 March 2022, \$62,464,357 had been dispersed or allocated for payment from the Performing Arts COVID Support Package. Applications are still being received for performances that were scheduled to be held between 26 June and 18 September 2021.
- b) \$6,964,355 has been allocated to applications where performances were scheduled to be held outside Greater Sydney
- c) Details of recipients will be published in the 2021-22 annual report of the Department of Enterprise, Investment and Trade. Create NSW disclosures at the end of the financial year.
- d) No single application has received more than \$12.5 million.

QUESTION

Regent Theatre Mudgee

78. Do you agree with the Hon. Dugald Saunders and the Hon. Don Harwin about the importance of preserving the Regent Theatre in Mudgee following its state heritage listing?

ANSWER:

It would be a great outcome for the Mudgee community for the Regent Theatre to be preserved as a cultural venue, and I am pleased that its State Heritage Listing will provide protection in the future. Supporting and advocating for the preservation of cultural heritage is a priority of the NSW Government.

Restored heritage theatres can have a positive influence on the community and can deliver economic benefits, particularly through tourism. Heritage theatres also contribute to community wellbeing by adding character to precincts and fostering a sense of history, identity and place.

QUESTION

79. Mr Saunders gave an interview on 2GB on January 20 of this year suggesting that the new owners of the building might build accommodation on the site and simply retain the façade. Would that be in line with the current heritage listing?

ANSWER:

Any proposal for State Heritage Listed buildings would need to be referred to the Heritage Council of NSW for determination. Create NSW is not in a position to comment on specific projects and this is a matter that should be directed to the Minister for Heritage for further advice.

Heritage NSW has advised that the Heritage Council is open to considering a sensitive, adaptive re-use proposal for the Regent Theatre building. Noting that the aesthetic qualities and integrity of the auditorium should be retained as well as the perception of the volume of that space.

Proponents are strongly encouraged to use the Heritage NSW pre-lodgement service and contact Heritage NSW for a Pre-DA meeting to discuss any works proposal. This service is free of charge.

QUESTION

80. Mr Saunders, in that same 2GB interview on January 20, said that government could not be involved in bringing such a theatre back to life.

- (a) Do you agree?
- (b) If so, do you think local and/or state government should remove their support from fully council-owned and -operated theatres across the State?

ANSWER:

Supporting the delivery of cultural infrastructure across NSW, including theatres, is a priority of the NSW Government. The NSW Government's *Cultural Infrastructure Plan 2025+* provides the strategic framework for this support, and it recognises the critical role that local government plays to deliver cultural infrastructure for local communities.

The NSW Government provides investment through its *Regional Cultural Fund* and *Creative Capital* funding programs that supports the development of new and upgraded cultural infrastructure - including theatres - across NSW.

QUESTION

81. Will you commit to acquiring and restoring the Regent Theatre and bringing it back to life as a live performance venue?

ANSWER:

The NSW Government delivers its support for regional and community-based cultural infrastructure through its *Regional Cultural Fund* and *Creative Capital* funding programs. It has not received any applications to these programs from Mid-Western Regional Council or the cultural sector for the Mudgee Regent Theatre.

The *Creative Capital* program provides grants over three rounds in two categories each year, and an application from the Regent Theatre would be welcome.

QUESTION

82. Do you agree with Mr Saunders that art deco theatres like this are "a bit of a tinderbox?"

ANSWER:

Supporting and advocating to continue cultural usage of existing infrastructure, including heritage theatres, for cultural purposes is a priority of the *Cultural Infrastructure Plan 2025+*. The NSW Government has invested in heritage theatres across NSW through its *Regional Cultural Fund* and *Creative Capital* funding programs, including:

- the redevelopment of the Roxy Theatre in Leeton as a performing arts institute
- upgrades to the Athenium Theatre in Junee

- upgrades to the Union Theatre in Lithgow
- upgrades to the Rochdale Theatre in Lismore

QUESTION

83. Would it be possible, under the current heritage listing, to redevelop the site into accommodation?

ANSWER:

Any proposal for State Heritage Listed buildings would likely need to be referred to the Heritage Council of NSW for determination. Create NSW is not in a position to comment on specific projects and this is a matter that should be directed to the Minister for Heritage for further advice.

QUESTION

84. Or is the theatre fully protected as a theatre?

ANSWER:

Create NSW is not in a position to provide advice about what specific protections the Mudgee Regent Theatre's State Heritage Listing provides. Information about the theatre's heritage listing can be found on the State Heritage Inventory at <https://www.hms.heritage.nsw.gov.au/App/Item/ViewItem?itemId=5052045>. Any specific questions about the application of the listing should be directed to the Minister for Heritage for advice.

QUESTION

85. Will you condemn the plans Mr Saunders floated in his 2GB interview on January 20 that the site be redeveloped into accommodation?

ANSWER:

Supporting the restoration of heritage theatres is a priority of the NSW Government. The NSW Government continues to demonstrate this support by investing in heritage theatres across NSW through its *Regional Cultural Fund* and *Creative Capital* grants programs.

The office of the Minister for the Arts is not aware of any development plans that the owner of the Mudgee Heritage Theatre has for the building, and it would not be appropriate to comment on this.

QUESTION

86. Have you had any conversations with the Heritage Minister about the Regent Theatre Mudgee?

ANSWER:

The former Minister for Heritage was responsible for formally recognising the Regent Theatre Mudgee as an item of State heritage significance. The notice of the theatre's State Heritage Listing was included in the New South Wales Government Gazette on 7 February 2020.

QUESTION

Aboriginal heritage

87. Your predecessor declared that one of his “key projects” was to “overhaul Aboriginal cultural heritage legislation,” labelling the current “legislative position... wholly unsatisfactory.” What is the status of plans to protect or create specific legislation for Aboriginal cultural heritage?

- (a) What is your response to calls from NSW First nations groups that Aboriginal cultural heritage is not sufficiently protected in NSW?
- (b) Do you agree with your predecessor that the present legislative framework is “wholly unsatisfactory?”

ANSWER:

This Government has committed to delivering standalone Aboriginal cultural heritage legislation. At present the protection and management of Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW is primarily administered under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*. These provisions under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 have a number of short comings that the reforms seek to address, namely;

- The current provisions are outdated, and inappropriately sit in legislation which deals with flora and fauna. We also need to ensure Aboriginal voices are heard in the management of Aboriginal heritage.
- The current system is inflexible and inefficient to administer and subject to criticism by both the Aboriginal community, industry and development proponents.
- Optimal heritage outcomes are not being achieved through the current system.

It is clear that the current system is not achieving the desired outcomes. This is true for Aboriginal communities, the planning sector and the wider community in general.

The work to deliver new legislation is continuing. The key Aboriginal stakeholder groups, with NSW Aboriginal Land Council and the NSW Native Title Services Corporation, are working closely with Government to progress the reforms. I am personally meeting with the Council and Board members of the key stakeholders to hear their feedback and ensure this government is taking a holistic approach to reform the current Aboriginal Cultural Heritage protections.

Once the present discussions with NSW Aboriginal Land Council and the NSW Native Title Services Corporation conclude, wider consultation will take place.

QUESTION

88. Will you adopt recommendations from the Inquiry into the Heritage Act which states that:
- (a) Recommendation 7: “two members of the Heritage Council of NSW must be an Aboriginal man and an Aboriginal woman, with expertise in Aboriginal cultural heritage”, and
 - (b) Recommendation 16: “That, as a matter of priority, the NSW Government progress the reform of Aboriginal cultural heritage legislation in tandem with the review of the Heritage Act 1977”

ANSWER:

The review of the *Heritage Act 1977* commenced in 2021 and aims to deliver a modern Act that provides for the protection, celebration and activation of the State's Significant heritage. The Heritage Act Review has provided feedback that will impact on the Aboriginal cultural heritage reform process. To ensure the highest level of legislative alignment, Aboriginal Affairs NSW is working collaboratively with Heritage NSW.

The NSW Government has committed to working closely with key stakeholders to respect Aboriginal self-determination within the cultural heritage reform process. To recognise Aboriginal self-determination, I support the Review's recommendation that an Aboriginal woman and Aboriginal man have seats on the Heritage Council of NSW.

Together the Heritage and Aboriginal Cultural Heritage legislative reforms will deliver a comprehensive and integrated upgrade of all heritage legislation and administration in NSW.

QUESTION

89. Have you had conversations about the legislative framework surrounding protection of Aboriginal heritage with the new Heritage Minister?

ANSWER:

To respect Aboriginal culture and Aboriginal people's connection to Country, the NSW system must improve to offer better protection for Aboriginal cultural heritage. I have met with Minister Griffin to discuss Aboriginal cultural heritage. To ensure the best possible outcomes can be achieved, it is clear the new Aboriginal cultural heritage system must be achieved through a whole of government approach.

QUESTION

90. When will you take action to change the legislative framework around protecting Aboriginal heritage in NSW?

ANSWER:

The goal for the Government remains providing legislative protections for Aboriginal cultural heritage that are acceptable to Aboriginal people and the NSW Government. I fully appreciate that progression of the reforms can only occur with appropriate engagement of the Aboriginal community and other critical stakeholders.

I acknowledge this process has been delayed, and I understand this has been a long and complex reform process. While I do not want to lose momentum, for an important issue like Aboriginal cultural heritage, we need to take the time to get it right.

We are continuing our work with the NSW Aboriginal Land Council and the NSW Native Title Services Corporation to design a model which can be taken to public consultation as soon as possible.

QUESTION

Sydney Theatre School

91. Have you had any contact with the Sydney Theatre School management to discuss their financial situation?

ANSWER:

The Sydney Theatre School manages a small independent venue for hire – The Chippen Street Theatre. This is included as an eligible venue as part of the Government's Performing Arts COVID support packages.

Performances that were part of the 2021 Sydney Fringe that were programmed in that space received support through the Performing Arts COVID Support package.

As at 29 March 2022, no other applications for performances in the venue had been received.

QUESTION

92. Is the government planning to assist the Sydney Theatre School in any way?

ANSWER:

See answer to question 91 above. The Sydney Theatre School is invited to contact Create NSW to discuss the support options that are available.

QUESTION

New Sydney CBD Theatre

93. Michael Cassel has said that he wishes to build an \$80 million theatre in the Sydney CBD without requiring government funds, but that he is unable to find a location.

- (a) Is there a government plan to investigate locations for a new downtown theatre?
- (b) Does the government regard the introduction of a new downtown theatre as a priority?
- (c) Has there been any discussion with the City of Sydney about finding a location for a new downtown theatre?

ANSWER:

On 7 October 2021, as part of the COVID-19 Economic Recovery Strategy, the Government requested Create NSW develop a Theatre and Film Studios Strategy for Sydney to investigate actions that could deliver new film studios and commercial theatres.

Create NSW is finalising the Draft Sydney Commercial Theatre & Film Studios strategy which will provide a strategic framework to guide any future investment or support for the delivery of new commercial theatres in the Sydney CBD. A focus of the draft strategy is on partnerships with the private sector to deliver commercial theatre and film studio infrastructure.

QUESTION

Struggling arts scene

94. How many theatres and performance spaces have been forced to close since the pandemic began in early 2020?

ANSWER:

At least four venues have closed for commercial reasons. The Landsowne Hotel was closed as a result of the landlord's decision to convert the upstairs performance room to hostel accommodation. I am advised the owners of the Old 505 Theatre in Newtown and Giant Dwarf in Redfern have indicated their preference for the venues to continue as performing arts venues, and will be seeking new commercial operators for this purpose. Narrabeen RSL Club announced it was entering voluntary administration and temporarily closing in March 2022.

These venues, and their programmers, have received support through various packages provided by the NSW Government including the Performing Arts COVID Support and Relaunch Package and the Live Music Support Package. The pandemic has also impacted in ways that it is not appropriate for the NSW Government to intervene – including influencing commercial decisions made by privately run businesses.

QUESTION

95. What are your government's plans to save the Old 505 Theatre in Newtown and other struggling music and performance spaces?

ANSWER:

I am advised the owners have indicated their preference that the Old 505 Theatre in Newtown would continue as a performing arts venue and hope to seek a new commercial operator to achieve that objective.

As at 11 April 2022, the performing arts support packages had provided support to over 304 venues across NSW. \$143 million has already been approved for payment to support venues and their related parties. Support continues to be available for affected performances until the end of April 2022.

QUESTION

96. With the pandemic ongoing, and variants sure to arise, what contingencies do you have in place to support the arts sector, apart from the insurance scheme the government belatedly announced in January?

ANSWER:

The Government's Performing Arts Relaunch packages continue to support affected performances up until 30 April 2022.

The Government's Event Saver Scheme provides certainty to organisers of major events until 31 December 2022.

In partnership with Support Act, the NSW Government is providing \$5 million to support musicians and arts workers who have been unable to work due to the pandemic.

The Visual Arts Commissioning Program is a commitment of \$1 million to support commissions of up to \$100,000 per visual artist to assist with the return to the creation of visual art works.

In 2021/22, there has been a \$6 million increase in funding to the arts sector through the Arts and Cultural Funding program to support a range of programs, including COVID recovery for artists, arts workers, organisations and venues. This is part of a \$24 million increase in funding under this program over the next four years.

Any further support for the sector will be considered as the need arises.

QUESTION
Election commitments- Regional Youth 97. What election commitments have been implemented? (a) Please list for each when it was implemented and the cost of implementation?
ANSWER: The following election commitments have been implemented: 1. Office for Regional Youth was allocated \$10 million over 4 years in the 2019-20 budget to establish a Minister for Regional Youth, who will give voice to young people in regional areas, including: a. delivery of a Regional Youth Strategy, b. establishment of a Regional Youth Taskforce c. funding for the Office for Regional Youth. 2. \$54.4 million for projects and programs aimed at supporting regional young people was allocated from round three of the Stronger Country Communities Fund. These funds were committed to 293 projects in February 2020.

QUESTION
98. What election commitments have not yet been implemented? (a) Please list for each when, why it is outstanding and the expected date of implementation?
ANSWER: All election commitments in relation to Regional Youth have been implemented.

QUESTION
Closing the gap 99 At the Budget Estimates hearing you said “there is a ministry for regional youth because of the significant difference in everything from health issues to educational outcomes to employment opportunities between urban and regional youth”. (Hansard page 19). How do you propose to close the gap in relation to: (a) Health issues? (b) Educational outcomes? (c) Employment opportunities?
ANSWER: The Office for Regional Youth works closely with other NSW government agencies, not for profit organisations, peak bodies, regional communities and also consults with the Regional Youth Taskforce to address the challenges facing regional youth.

- a) Examples of projects which illustrate how the Office for Regional Youth are working across government to close the gap on health outcomes for regional youth include:
- The \$10.3 million Children and Young People Wellbeing Recovery Initiative offers a range of grants to assist with wellbeing, recovery, and resilience for regional young people.
 - The NSW Active Youth Program pilot project targets inactive regional youth in three regions of NSW (Kempsey, Eurobodalla, Bathurst) and delivers a range of activities and programs in collaboration with the Office of Sport.
 - The \$10 million Holiday Break program improves physical and mental health of regional young people by delivering social and recreational programs during the school holidays.
 - \$27,658,221 funding on the Stronger Country Communities Fund round 3 aligned with the wellbeing pillar of the Regional Youth Framework. Examples of projects include:
 - Top Blokes Mentoring Program in Cessnock and Maitland - The program delivers weekly workshops for males aged 10-24 in schools and community organisations to strengthen the mental health and emotional resilience of young males, while building connection with communities.
 - Swoopin' Season in Kyogle. The Kyogle Council Youth Advisory Committee delivered a multi-year, mobile youth outreach connecting young people with youth workers, health professionals, inspirational peers and community champions through events, workshops and community engagement activities.
 - \$31,957,938 of funding from the Bushfire Local Economic Recovery Package focuses on improving the wellbeing of children and young people. Examples of projects include:
 - Welfare and Resilience Counselling – Rural outreach counselling focused on resilience-building, bushfire-related trauma, and suicide prevention.
 - Positive Future – A recovery program designed to build resilience, mental health and networks for bushfire-affected young people and communities.
- b) Examples of projects which illustrate how the Office for Regional Youth are working across government to close the gap on educational outcomes for regional youth include:
- Youth Community Coordinators in each region work with schools and training organisations in a 'meet you at the school gate' model to broker place based community led solutions to improving outcomes for regional students.
 - The Birrany and Mulungan pilot project provides activities to identified year 8 and 9 students to engage with education and build work-ready skills at Western Plains Zoo.
 - The Maayumi-Li Gem pilot project is a two year program that supports Walgett PCYC to deliver youth activities at Lightening Ridge Central School to improve student engagement.
- c) Examples of projects which illustrate how the Office for Regional Youth are working across government to close the gap on employment outcomes for regional youth include:
- The Regional Gap Year campaign links young people to jobs and skills and training opportunities. The Regional Gap Year provides a portal for all NSW government agencies to promote regional opportunities for young people.
 - The Youth Radio pilot project provides funding for new projects enabling young people to develop twenty first century employment skills such as digital capabilities, creativity, collaboration, communication and media literacy by participating in youth radio and podcasting activities.

- The Office for Regional Youth provides funding and support to programs such as Fit4Work, a ten-week job-ready program delivered by NSW Police.
 - \$8,106,252 funding from the Stronger Country Communities Fund round 3 aligned with the work ready pillar of the Regional Youth Framework. Examples of projects include:
 - Soil2Soul project - utilises existing infrastructure on a Narromine lime farm in the Central West and Orana region, employing at least 20 young Aboriginal people aged 15-18 years to learn skills across agriculture, retail, customer service and management.
 - Glen Innes Wool Works Shearing and Wool Handling School - enhances educational opportunities for young people across the region to learn the shearing trade.
 - \$9,697,666 of funding from the Bushfire Local Economic Recovery Package aligned with the work ready pillar of the Regional Youth Framework. Examples of projects include:
 - Wollondilly Local Skills Ready Program – Local young people will gain formal qualifications by completing programs that combine employment-based practices with formal technical training.
 - Caring for Country Traineeship Project – provides a year of full-time employment and training to 12 Aboriginal job seekers.

In addition, the Office for Regional Youth works closely with other NSW government agencies, not for profit organisations, peak bodies, regional communities and also consults with the Regional Youth Taskforce to address the challenges facing regional youth.

QUESTION

Youth Advisory Council

100. Have you met with the Youth Advisory Council?
- (a) If yes, what was discussed?
 - (b) If not, why not and when do you intend to meet the Council?

ANSWER:

No. In the short time I have been minister I have not yet been able to meet with the Youth Advisory Council. I would like to meet with them and will endeavour to attend one of their meetings in the coming months.

QUESTION

Grants

101. In relation to the following grant schemes identified by the former Minister for Regional Youth at Budget Estimates last year, what amount was expended in each local government area which was a beneficiary of the following grants:
- (a) \$61 million for youth projects through the Bushfire Local Economic Recovery package?
 - (b) \$54.4 million for youth projects through the Stronger Country Community Fund Round 3?

(c) \$20.3 million for the Regional Youth Community Coordinators and the Children and Young People Wellbeing Program?

(d) \$10 million of Holiday Break funding through the NSW Economic Recovery Program?

ANSWER:

a) Many youth projects funded through the Bushfire Local Economic Recovery fund are being delivered across multiple local government areas (LGA) and it is not possible to report how much of the allocated funds for those projects is delivered in each LGA. The LGAs that received funding for youth projects are:

- Armidale Regional Council
- Bega Valley Shire Council
- Bellingen Shire Council
- Blue Mountains City Council
- Central Coast Council
- City of Lithgow Council
- Clarence Valley Council
- Coffs Harbour City Council
- Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council
- Eurobodalla Shire Council
- Glen Innes Severn Council
- Greater Hume Shire Council
- Kempsey Shire Council
- Lake Macquarie City Council
- Mid-Coast Council
- Nambucca Shire Council
- Oberon Council
- Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council
- Richmond Valley Council
- Shoalhaven City Council
- Snowy Monaro Regional Council
- Snowy Valleys Council
- Wagga Wagga City Council
- Walcha Council
- Wollondilly Shire Council

b) The \$54.4 million through the Stronger Country Community Fund Round Three was allocated for youth grants across LGAs as follows:

- Albury City Council: \$971,899
- Armidale Regional Council: \$583,324
- Ballina Shire Council: \$537,121

- Balranald Shire Council: \$434,377
- Bathurst Regional Council: \$605,496
- Bega Valley Shire Council: \$421,312
- Bellingen Shire Council: \$95,985
- Bland Shire Council: \$415,220
- Blayney Shire Council: \$630,996
- Bogan Shire Council: \$764,812
- Bourke Shire Council: \$440,000
- Brewarrina Shire Council: \$431,500
- Broken Hill City Council: \$621,314
- Byron Shire Council: \$471,140
- Cabonne Council: \$404,637
- Carrathool Shire Council: \$315,416
- Central Coast Council: \$1,571,999
- Central Darling Shire Council: \$760,340
- Cessnock City Council: \$551,971
- Clarence Valley Council: \$686,086
- Cobar Shire Council: \$553,794
- Coffs Harbour City Council: \$539,475
- Coolamon Shire Council: \$384,552
- Coonamble Shire Council: \$204,954
- Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council: \$744,000
- Cowra Shire Council: \$467,485
- Dubbo Regional Council: \$1,351,942
- Dungog Shire Council: \$442,000
- Edward River Council: \$1,127,702
- Eurobodalla Shire Council: \$456,876
- Federation Council: \$808,016
- Forbes Shire Council: \$738,559
- Gilgandra Shire Council: \$534,032
- Glen Innes Severn Council: \$178,777
- Goulburn Mulwaree Council: \$395,645
- Greater Hume Shire Council: \$355,293
- Griffith City Council: \$802,618
- Gunnedah Shire Council: \$340,943
- Gwydir Shire Council: \$546,265
- Hay Shire Council: \$764,833

- Hilltops Council: \$1,622,075
- Inverell Shire Council: \$661,961
- Junee Shire Council: \$629,544
- Kempsey Shire Council: \$438,658
- Kiama, The Council of the Municipality: \$844,083
- Kyogle Council: \$395,118
- Lachlan Shire Council: \$330,096
- Lake Macquarie City Council: \$770,989
- Leeton Shire Council: \$342,545
- Lismore City Council: \$766,326
- Lithgow, City of: \$665,533
- Liverpool Plains Shire Council: \$350,000
- Lockhart Shire Council: \$521,834
- Lord Howe Island: \$110,000
- Maitland City Council: \$753,409
- Mid-Coast Council: \$314,867
- Mid-Western Regional Council: \$538,744
- Moree Plains Shire Council: \$269,743
- Murray River Council: \$857,050
- Murrumbidgee Council: \$1,174,279
- Muswellbrook Shire Council: \$500,000
- Nambucca Shire Council: \$835,776
- Narrabri Shire Council: \$529,667
- Narrandera Shire Council: \$169,952
- Narromine Shire Council: \$470,000
- Oberon Council: \$772,778
- Orange City Council: \$930,667
- Parkes Shire Council: \$572,620
- Port Macquarie-Hastings Council: \$509,109
- Port Stephens Council: \$694,881
- Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council: \$1,180,115
- Richmond Valley Council: \$641,657
- Shellharbour City Council: \$803,413
- Shoalhaven City Council: \$1,140,251
- Singleton Council: \$415,993
- Snowy Monaro Regional Council: \$1,093,428
- Snowy Valleys Council: \$752,420

- Tamworth Regional Council: \$504,466
 - Temora Shire Council: \$500,000
 - Tenterfield Shire Council: \$418,246
 - Tweed Shire Council: \$715,040
 - Upper Hunter Shire Council: \$316,252
 - Upper Lachlan Shire Council: \$54,000
 - Uralla Shire Council: \$115,000
 - Wagga Wagga City Council: \$503,716
 - Walcha Council: \$168,060
 - Walgett Shire Council: \$529,444
 - Warren Shire Council: \$762,000
 - Warrumbungle Shire Council: \$398,137
 - Weddin Shire Council: \$350,000
 - Wentworth Shire Council: \$391,634
 - Wingecarribee Shire Council: \$503,615
 - Yass Valley Council: \$410,770
- c) Of the \$20.3 million Regional Youth Community Coordinators and the Children and Young People Wellbeing Program: \$10 million has been allocated to the Youth Community Coordinator Initiative and \$10.3 million has been allocated to the Children and Young People Wellbeing Initiative.

The Youth Community Coordinator initiative includes the appointment of Youth Community Coordinators and Project Officers who are employed in the nine regions across NSW.

The \$10.3 million allocated to grants under the Children and Young People Wellbeing Recovery Initiatives, are split into 3 funding streams. Within each of these streams, maximum amounts are allocated per LGA with the aim of spreading the funds. However, not all LGAs will apply or will receive the maximum amount. Applications will be assessed on merit until the funds are expended. As grants are currently open it is not possible to report how much funding will ultimately be expended in each LGA.

Eligibility for the Children and Young People Wellbeing Recovery Initiative is as follows:

- Large Grants Regional (\$10,000 to \$50,000) – all regional LGAs are eligible up to a maximum of \$100,000.
- Large Grants Storm and Flood (\$10,000 to \$50,000) – All Local Government Areas (LGAs) declared storm and flood impacted in 2021 under Natural Disaster Declarations with the Australian Government Reference Number (AGRN) 954 and 960, which includes 21 metropolitan Councils, are eligible up to a maximum of \$100,000 across an LGA.
- Small Grants (under \$10,000) – All Regional Local Government Areas and the 21 metropolitan Councils declared storm and flood impacted in 2021 under Natural Disaster Declarations with the Australian Government Reference Number (AGRN) 954 and 960, are eligible for up to a maximum of \$50,000 across an LGA.

d) Of the \$10 million Holiday Break funding, the amount of funding expended on council grants by LGA from 22 November 2021 (when funding was allocated) to March 25, 2022 is as follows:

- Albury City Council: \$5,000
- Armidale Regional Council: \$7,300
- Bega Valley Shire Council: \$9,600
- Bellingen Shire Council: \$9,770
- Berrigan Shire Council: \$7,742
- Bland Shire Council: \$10,000
- Bogan Shire Council: \$10,000
- Bourke Shire Council: \$ 10,000
- Broken Hill City Council: \$10,000
- Clarence Valley Council: \$9,914
- Coffs Harbour City Council: \$4,950
- Coonamble Shire Council: \$10,000
- Cootamundra-Gundagai Regional Council: \$10,000
- Edward River Council: \$10,000
- Eurobodalla Shire Council: \$10,000
- Gilgandra Shire Council: \$10,000
- Glen Innes Severn Council: \$7,700
- Goulburn Mulwaree Council: \$10,000
- Greater Hume Shire Council: \$9,710
- Gunnedah Shire Council: \$2,000
- Hilltops Council: \$9,843
- Kempsey Shire Council: \$4,500
- Lake Macquarie City Council: \$9,000
- Leeton Shire Council: \$10,000
- Lismore City Council: \$10,000
- Mid-Coast Council: \$8,550
- Murrumbidgee Council: \$10,000
- Nambucca Shire Council: \$2,890
- Narrabri Shire Council: \$8,680
- Narromine Shire Council: \$10,000
- Port Macquarie-Hastings Council: \$3,237
- Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council: \$6,000
- Shellharbour City Council: \$9,930

- Shoalhaven City Council: \$10,000
- Singleton Council: \$2,000
- Tenterfield Shire Council: \$10,000
- Upper Hunter Shire Council: \$10,000
- Wagga Wagga City Council: \$10,000
- Walcha Council: \$10,000
- Warren Shire Council: \$5,000
- Warrumbungle Shire Council: \$10,000

In addition to the council grants, funding has been delivered to not-for-profit organisations and Holiday Break program partners who deliver programs across multiple LGAs.

QUESTION

Regional NSW Youth Action Plan

102. Of the short term priorities in the Plan, how many are on target for implementation?

ANSWER:

The most recent six-monthly review of the Regional Youth Action Plan covered the period 1 July to 31 December 2021 and indicated that all of the six short term priorities are on target.

QUESTION

103. Of the short term priorities in the Plan, how many are not on target for implementation?

(a) Why are they not on target?

ANSWER:

The most recent six-monthly review of the Regional Youth Action Plan covered the period 1 July to 31 December 2021 and indicated that all short term priorities are on target.

QUESTION

104. Of the medium term priorities in the Plan, how many are on target for implementation?

ANSWER:

The most recent six-monthly review of the Regional Youth Action Plan covered the period 1 July to 31 December 2021 and indicated that nine medium term priorities are on target.

QUESTION

105. Of the medium term priorities in the Plan, how many are not on target for implementation?

(a) Why are they not on target?

ANSWER:

The most recent six-monthly review of the Regional Youth Action Plan covered the period 1 July to 31 December 2021 and indicated that three medium term priorities are delayed by COVID-19.

QUESTION

106. Of the long term priorities in the Plan, how many are on target for implementation?

ANSWER:

The most recent six-monthly review of the Regional Youth Action Plan covered the period 1 July to 31 December 2021 and indicated that twenty long term priorities are on target.

QUESTION

107. Of the long term priorities in the Plan, how many are not on target for implementation?
(a) Why are they not on target?

ANSWER:

The most recent six-monthly review of the Regional Youth Action Plan covered the period 1 July to 31 December 2021 and indicated that seven long term priorities are delayed by COVID-19.

QUESTION

Youth employment

108. What support is provided by the Office for Regional Youth to ensure young people are aware of their rights at work and know what to do if they are underpaid or mistreated at work?

ANSWER:

The Regional Gap Year campaign website, which was created by the Office for Regional Youth has a page called 'Your rights at work' with the following links which contain further information:

- SafeWork NSW
- Advocate for Children and Young People
- Fair Work Ombudsman – horticulture showcase
- What is an award wage?
- Fair Work Ombudsman – Young workers and students
- What are the National Employment Standards?
- How the Fair Work Ombudsman can help

QUESTION

Regional youth coordinators

109. How many regional youth coordinators have been appointed?

ANSWER:

Nine Regional Youth Community Coordinators have been appointed.

QUESTION

110. In which town is each coordinator based?

ANSWER:

- Gosford
- Tocal
- Armidale
- Bourke
- Wagga Wagga
- Queanbeyan/Batemans Bay
- Dubbo
- Nowra
- Grafton

QUESTION

111. Which region/s does each coordinator cover?

ANSWER:

- South East, Snowy Monaro, Queanbeyan, and Palerang
- Central West, and Central Tablelands
- Illawarra/Shoalhaven
- North Coast
- Hunter, Central Coast, Sydney Basin
- Port Stephens, and Mid Coast
- New England, and North West
- Far West
- Riverina Murray

QUESTION

112. How many coordinator positions are currently vacant?

(a) **If yes, what was discussed?** This 'a' point that makes no sense is a transcript error

ANSWER:

There are no vacant Youth Community Coordinator positions as at 30 March 2022.

QUESTION
Regional grants 113. Since the creation of the Office for Regional Youth, what is the total amount of funding allocated to local government areas in: (a) Metropolitan areas of Greater Sydney? (b) Metropolitan areas of Newcastle? (c) Metropolitan areas of Wollongong?
ANSWER: The only funding source allocated by the Office for Regional Youth with eligibility in these areas is the Children and Young People Wellbeing Program a) As at 30 March 2022, no funds have been approved or contracted for the Greater Sydney metro area. b) As of 30 March 2022, \$4,200 has been approved and being contracted for the Newcastle LGA. c) As at 30 March 2022, no funds have been approved or contracted for the metropolitan areas of Wollongong.
QUESTION
114. What funding do you envisage will be allocated in the next 12 months to the local government areas in: (a) Metropolitan areas of Greater Sydney? (b) Metropolitan areas of Newcastle? (c) Metropolitan areas of Wollongong?
ANSWER: Youth Community Coordinators and Project Officers are engaging with eligible organisations in the metropolitan Sydney and Newcastle areas to assist them in completing proposals and grant applications for the Children and Young People Wellbeing Recovery Initiative, funding that has been made available for storm and flood impacted areas. It is anticipated that these engagements will result in funding being allocated for projects in these regions over the next 12 months, subject to the assessment of projects against program guidelines.
QUESTION
Engagement with civil society organisations 115. Since the creation of the Office for Regional Youth have staff consulted with: (a) Social service peak bodies? i. If not, why not? (b) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peak bodies? i. If not, why not? (c) Employee representative peak bodies? i. If not, why not?

- (d) Employer organisation peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (e) Student peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (f) Consumer advocate peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (g) Local Government peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (h) Volunteer peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (i) Non-profit organisation peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (j) Refugee or asylum seeker organisation peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (k) Community legal centres peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (l) Sporting peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (m) Mental health advocate peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (n) Children's welfare peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (o) Carer peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (p) Religious service provider peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (q) Multicultural peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (r) Housing or homelessness peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (s) People with disability peak bodies?
 - i. If not, why not?

ANSWER:

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Yes.
- d) Yes.
- e) Yes.
- f) Yes.
- g) Yes.
- h) Yes.
- i) Yes.
- j) Yes.

- k) No.
 - i. Community legal centre peak bodies have not been consulted to date and will be considered for future consultations.
- l) Yes.
- m) Yes.
- n) Yes.
- o) Yes.
- p) Yes.
- q) Yes.
- r) Yes.
- s) Yes.

QUESTION

Regional youth taskforce

116. Have you met with the Taskforce?

(a) If yes, what was discussed?

(b) If not, why not?

ANSWER:

I had the pleasure of calling the 18 successful applicants for the 2022 Regional Youth Taskforce to inform them of their appointment. I was able to talk with each of them about their application and what they hoped to achieve this year.

I also attended one of their three online orientation sessions on 16 March 2022. I was able to let them know a bit more about myself and I found out some of their major concerns that they have as regional youth in their communities.

We discussed concerns around climate change, access to educational opportunities, supply of essential workers, financial support for sport participation for youth aged 18 years and over and mental health.

I encouraged the Taskforce to continue to bring their concerns to me so I can take their feedback to Cabinet and broader government members to continue to work collectively to create positive change for regional youth.

I attended the first 2022 Regional Youth Taskforce meeting in Dubbo on 10 April 2022 where I met all the Taskforce members in person. We discussed the Work Ready pillar of the Regional Youth Framework.

A further three meetings of the Regional Youth Taskforce will be held during 2022 and I will be attending each of them.

QUESTION

Youth survey

117. Does the Office for Regional Youth conduct any surveys of young people?

- (a) If yes, what topics were surveyed over the past two years?
- (b) If yes, are the findings of the surveys publicly available?
- (c) If yes, what was the cost of the surveys?
- (d) If not, what resources are available so that the Office understands what young people want the government to do?

ANSWER:

- a) Over the past two years the Office for Regional Youth has distributed informal surveys to the Regional Youth Taskforce ahead of their meetings to gain insights on pillars of the Regional Youth Framework. The Office for Regional Youth has also distributed surveys on behalf of other areas of government, including for the Department of Primary Industries on their Youth in Agriculture Strategy, the Department of Education on the Careers NSW initiative, and for ACYP, on their 2022-2024 Strategic Plan.
- b) Results from these surveys are not publicly available, however they are reflected in relevant reports after taskforce meetings, which are circulated across Government through the Office for Regional Youth Steering Committee.
- c) The Office for Regional Youth conducted these surveys within its normal functions and costs were absorbed within operating expenditure.
- d) N/A

QUESTION

Regional Holiday Break program

118. Since the creation of the program, what has been the total cost?

ANSWER:

The Office for Regional Youth partnered with NSW Government agencies and organisations to deliver the Holiday Break program during the 2020-21 summer holidays, 2021 April holidays, and 2021 Winter holidays. Prior to that the Office coordinated Drought Break in the Summer 2019/20 holidays.

Overall, to 31 March 2022, the Office for Regional Youth has provided \$677,784 to support the program. This includes:

- \$129,195 for Winter Break 2021
- \$183,305 for April Break 2021
- \$365,284 for Summer Break 20/21
- Costs for Summer Break 2021/22 are still being finalised.
- Spring Holiday Break 2021 funding was postponed due to Covid-19 public health orders.

A previous program administered by the Office for Regional Youth called Drought Break included a wide range of free and substantially discounted activities held throughout the 2020 summer school holidays, supported by \$1.5 million funding from the NSW Government. This includes:

- \$500,000 to fund grants between \$5,000 to \$10,000 to help eligible councils deliver activities, BBQ and Beats discos at 20 regional towns, and 32 sports clinics in 14 towns.
- \$200,000 to allow 350 young people attend recreational camps.
- \$38,000 to transport young people to camps for free.
- \$750,000 to deliver 80 free training courses in 34 towns.
- \$5,000 in partnership with Create NSW to provide Flickerfest screenings for young people in drought affected communities over the school break.

QUESTION

119. How many free and subsidised activities have been provided?

ANSWER:

Key outcomes from the Holiday Break program from 17 December 2020 to 30 March 2022 include:

- 114 grants to local councils to extend and enhance local youth events, services and programs.
- 34 grants to regional not-for-profits to deliver targeted youth events and services and programs to cohorts with specific service and accessibility needs
- 36 sport and recreation camps with over 1360 participants.
- 16 Active Pools pilots with 480 participants.
- 3 song writing and industry mentoring workshops with 50 participants.
- 47 BBQ and Beats events with over 1909 participants.
- PCYC outreach services in Bourke with over 250 participants.
- 28 multi-sport programs with over 865 participants.

QUESTION

120. How many young people have been supported by free and subsidised activities?
(a) How many people were supported in each region?

ANSWER:

Feedback from grant recipients and program partners provide the following estimates of participants per LGA for Council grant funded activities, Barbecue & Beats events and Multi-Sport programs run between 17 December 2020 and 30 August 2021:

- Albury City Council: 2,355
- Armidale Regional Council: 1,684
- Ballina Shire Council: 9 (COVID-19 Impacted attendance)
- Bega Valley Shire Council: 308
- Bellingen Shire Council: 330
- Berrigan Shire Council: 375

- Bogan Shire Council: 170
- Bourke Shire Council: 697
- Brewarrina Shire Council: 190
- Broken Hill City Council: 215
- Byron Shire Council: 500
- Central Darling Shire Council: 50
- Clarence Valley Council: 206
- Cobar Shire Council: 500
- Coffs Harbour City Council: 470
- Coonamble Shire Council: 214
- Cowra Council: 54
- Dubbo Regional Council: 200
- Edward River Council: 2,332
- Eurobodalla Shire Council: 393
- Gilgandra Shire Council: 90
- Glen Innes Severn Council: 491
- Goulburn Mulwaree Council: 10
- Greater Hume Shire Council: 780
- Gunnedah Shire Council: 20
- Gwydir Shire Council: 40
- Kempsey Shire Council: 250
- Lismore City Council: 1,438
- Mid-Coast Council: 59
- Nambucca Shire Council: 145
- Narrabri Shire Council: 600
- Narromine Shire Council: 1,465
- Port Macquarie-Hastings Council: 300
- Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council: 150
- Shoalhaven City Council: 35
- Tamworth Regional Council: 201
- Tenterfield Shire Council: 71
- Upper Hunter Shire Council: 32
- Uralla Shire Council: 49
- Walcha Council: 342
- Walgett Shire Council: 929
- Warren Shire Council: 315
- Weddin Shire Council: 40

- Wentworth Shire Council: 62

In addition, 36 sport and recreation camps with over 1,360 participants were held for young people across multiple LGAs.

Completion and acquittal reports for Summer Break 2021/22 are still being finalised. Spring Holiday Break 2021 was postponed due to Covid-19 public health orders.

QUESTION

Regional grants

121. Since the creation of the Office for Regional Youth, what is the total amount of funding allocated to local government areas in:

- (a) Metropolitan areas of Greater Sydney?

ANSWER:

- a) As at 30 March, the Office for Regional Youth has not allocated funds in the Greater Metropolitan area of Sydney. 21 storm and flood impacted LGAs in Sydney are eligible for the Children and Young People Wellbeing Program.

QUESTION

Report on Government Services

122. Is the Minister aware that the Productivity Commission's 2022 Report on Government Services found that the proportion of families with a family member aged 24 years or under, receiving Commonwealth rent assistance and paying more than 30 per cent of income on rent in NSW was the second highest of any state at 63.6 per cent?

- (a) What is the Office for Regional Youth doing to address housing affordability for regional youth?
- (b) What targets have been set by the Office for Regional Youth to reduce regional youth homelessness?
- (c) What other agencies within the NSW public sector have officers from the Office for Regional Youth contacted to advocate for action to improve housing affordability and reduce homelessness for regional youth?

ANSWER:

- a) In 2021, Department of Regional NSW established a Regional Housing Supply Unit to lead the NSW Government response to housing supply pressures in regional NSW.

The NSW Government also established a Regional Housing Taskforce to bring together experts from Department of Regional NSW and Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, led by independent chair, Gary Feilding. Of relevance to regional youth, the taskforce made recommendations in relation to low-income households, small households, renters and the critical lack of housing diversity in regional NSW.

On 3 February 2022, the Minister for Planning and Environment announced the \$30 million Regional Housing Fund (RHF) which will provide grants to eligible large, fast growing local governments to address growing housing pressures and respond to the taskforce's recommendations.

- b) The Regional Youth Action Plan includes initiatives such as:

- Rent Choice Youth which provides private rental assistance and support for young people aged 16-24 for up to 3 years.
 - Homeless Youth Assistance Program supports young people experiencing homelessness to reunite with their families or transition to longer term stable accommodation.
- c) Office for Regional Youth engages with the Regional Youth Steering Committee on all matters affecting regional youth, including housing. Senior Executives from the following agencies are members:
- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Department of Education | 9. NSW Treasury |
| 2. NSW Training Services | 10. Department of Premier and Cabinet |
| 3. Aboriginal Housing Office | 11. NSW Police Force |
| 4. NSW Health | 12. Office of Sport |
| 5. Multicultural NSW | 13. Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. |
| 6. Aboriginal Affairs NSW | 14. Transport for NSW |
| 7. NSW Children's Guardian | 15. Department of Community Service |
| 8. NSW Advocate for Children and Young People | 16. Department of Communities and Justice. |

QUESTION

Youth Housing and Homelessness

123. PropTrack's November 2021 Regional Australia Report found that when it comes to the increase in dwelling values and growth in buyer demand, the regions have outperformed metropolitan areas. The Real Estate Institute of NSW's data indicates that NSW regional rental vacancies drop below 1 per cent in November 2021. Has the Office for Regional Youth briefed you on the content of the reports?

- (a) Which stakeholders have you met to discuss government actions to improve housing affordability and reduce homelessness for regional youth?
- (b) Which of your ministerial colleagues have you written to or met formally to discuss government actions to improve housing affordability and reduce homelessness for regional youth?
- (c) Have you written to the Hon Alan Tudge MP, Federal Minister for Education and Youth to advocate and discuss government actions to improve housing affordability and reduce homelessness for regional youth?
 - i. If not, why not?
- (d) Have you written to the Hon Michael Sukkar MP, Federal Assistant Treasurer, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Social and Community Housing to advocate and discuss government actions to improve housing affordability and reduce homelessness for regional youth?
 - i. If not, why not?

ANSWER:

No.

- a) In the short time since becoming Minister, I have yet been able meet with external stakeholders to specifically discuss improving housing affordability and reduce homelessness for regional youth. I will endeavour to meet with relevant stakeholders to discuss this issue in the coming months.
- b) I have not written to or met with ministerial colleagues to specifically discuss this issue however I regularly meet with ministerial colleagues to discuss issues across all my portfolios, especially in regards to supporting various communities across NSW, be it regional youth, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and the arts sector recover from the impact of storms and floods.
- c) No.
 - (i) In the short time since becoming Minister, I have yet written to the Hon Alan Tudge MP, Federal Minister for Education and Youth, but will endeavour to do so in the coming months.
- d) No.
 - (i) In the short time since becoming Minister, I have yet written to the Hon Michael Sukkar MP, Federal Assistant Treasurer, Minister for Housing, Minister for Homelessness, Social and Community Housing, but will endeavour to do so in the coming months.

QUESTION

124. In Wollongong, over the 12 months to 30 September 2021, the median house price across the greater Wollongong region jumped by 23% to \$900,000, while the median unit price grew by 9.4% to \$635,000.

- (a) Who have you met with from the Illawarra Shoalhaven region to discuss improving housing affordability and reducing homelessness for local youth?
- (b) What direction have you given to the Illawarra Shoalhaven Regional Youth Community Coordinator to focus on improving housing affordability and reducing homelessness for local youth?

ANSWER:

Wollongong is not a regional area as defined by the Department of Regional NSW.

- a) In the short time since becoming Minister, I have yet met with anyone from the Illawarra/Shoalhaven region to specifically discuss improving housing affordability and reducing homelessness for local youth.
- b) None. However, the Illawarra/Shoalhaven Youth Community Coordinator attends Youth Interagency Meetings (agencies include Councils, Department of Communities and Justice and Community Groups) each month. Housing affordability and reducing homelessness is an ongoing agenda item. There is a Shoalhaven Homeless subcommittee working on strategies to address these concerns.

QUESTION

125. In Coolah, PropTrack has scored a four-fold increase in prospective buyer engagement wanting to buy in the area.

- (a) Who have you met with from the Central West and Orana region to discuss improving housing affordability and reducing homelessness for local youth?
- (b) What direction have you given to the Central West and Orana Regional Youth Community Coordinator to focus on improving housing affordability and reducing homelessness for local youth?

ANSWER:

- a) In the short time since becoming Minister, I have yet met with anyone from the Central West and Orana region to specifically discuss improving housing affordability and reducing homelessness for local youth.
- b) None.

QUESTION

Healing

126. What have been the outcomes of the Regional Healing Forums held in 2017-18?

- (a) How much funding has been made available to initiatives supporting Trauma?
 - i. 2017-18
 - ii. 2018-19
 - iii. 2019-20
 - iv. 2020-21
- (b) What funding has been allocated to support trauma-informed practice in Aboriginal community-controlled organisations?
 - i. 2017-18
 - ii. 2018-19
 - iii. 2019-20
 - iv. 2020-21
- (c) Has a comprehensive cultural capabilities framework been developed for NSW Public Sector?
- (d) What plans have been developed to assist high needs communities to implement healing priorities identified at the regional healing forums?
 - i. What were those communities identified?

ANSWER:

Discussion outcomes identified in the six Regional Healing Forums have informed:

- Ongoing relationships between communities and service providers and,
- Further dialogue and discussions in communities, including priorities determined and progressed by regional Alliances involved in OCHRE Local Decision Making.

- In Kempsey, ongoing dialogue with key stakeholders involved in Unfinished Business commitments, including Keeping Places Project work relating to the site of the former Kinchela Aboriginal Boys Home.
- A broader understanding of healing principles and trauma informed approach in relationships with communities and work undertaken by Aboriginal Affairs NSW, including Unfinished Business and the Stolen Generations Advisory Committee.

(a) No separate healing funding has been allocated to initiatives supporting trauma. No separate information is reported or available about trauma identified funding. Government funding for programs or services provided across government and the non-government sectors is wide ranging to support Aboriginal people who are living with experience and impacts of trauma.

In 2017 the NSW Government response to Unfinished Business Reparations for the Stolen Generations committed to provide collective reparations in recognition of the trauma experienced by Stolen Generations survivors by their forced removal from families and culture under former government assimilation policy.

Collective reparations funding is available to the four recognised survivor led Stolen Generations Organisations in NSW:

- Kinchela Boys Home Aboriginal Corporation
- Coota Girls Aboriginal Corporation
- Children of Bomaderry Aboriginal Childrens' Home Inc.
- Stolen Generations Council of NSW & ACT Inc.

Stolen Generations Organisation Reparations Funding and the Stolen Generations Healing Fund has provided collective reparations to support survivor led healing activities and support for Stolen Generations survivors who experienced the trauma of forced removal.

Collective reparations funding has been provided to Stolen Generations Organisations totalling:

- i. 2017-2018 - \$759,000
- ii. 2018-2019 - \$1,301,605
- iii. 2019-2020 - \$1,325,000
- iv. 2020-2021 - \$1,025,000

Additionally, Stolen Generations Healing Fund funding guidelines were developed and implemented during 2018-2019 and collective reparations from the Stolen Generations Healing Fund commenced in 2019-2020 FY, totalling:

- (a) 2017-18 – N/A
- (b) 2018-19 – N/A
- (c) 2019-20 - \$375,000
- (d) 2020-21 - \$375,000

(b) Aboriginal Affairs NSW has not allocated specific funding to support trauma informed practice in Aboriginal community-controlled organisations.

However Unfinished Business collective reparations funding supports trauma informed approaches being developed and undertaken in Stolen Generations Organisations and these are Aboriginal community-controlled organisations led by Stolen Generations survivors.

Information regarding collective reparations is provided in response to Question 68 (a).

(c) The NSW Government Response to the Unfinished Business Report into Reparations for the Stolen Generations committed to develop a training package to build a trauma informed public sector workforce, including information about the past impacts of past forcible removal policies on Aboriginal communities (Recommendations 6 and 29).

Through the Stolen Generations Advisory Committee, Aboriginal Affairs NSW has supported the Public Service Commission's project and development of training resources in conjunction with Stolen Generations survivors.

(d) Self-determination principles and rights underpin healing and are applied in working with Aboriginal communities across NSW.

Healing involves sharing cultural perspectives and knowledge to address trauma and restore and sustain holistic wellbeing. Reinstating pride in cultural identity, connection to country and involvement in country are critical elements of healing.

The OCHRE healing forums process invited interested Aboriginal communities to express their interest and readiness to hold a healing forum dialogue in their community.

Healing and trauma are sensitive, complex issues impacting relationships with communities and government. The healing forums facilitated a dialogue to provide culturally safe opportunities to air issues and to build trust and understanding. The forums were not a government negotiation or planning process.

Plans developed by Aboriginal communities with government and government service providers are done through other planning processes. For example, the Local Decision Making Alliances have represented communities to prioritise plans including agreement making Accords developed in those regions.

Priority issues identified by regional healing forums included respect for Aboriginal cultures and identity, fair opportunities and more effective support for Aboriginal families and communities, government accountability for service delivery, workforce cultural capabilities and racism experienced by Aboriginal people and communities. These issues have a wide ranging reach across plans developed across the public sector.

QUESTION

Local Decision Making

127. How many Alliance Accords have now been formalised?

(a) What areas are included?

ANSWER:

Seven Local Decision Making accords and agreements have now been signed between the NSW Government and alliances.

There is a state-wide Accord, covering all of NSW with the following areas additionally covered under local Accords:

- Wingecarribee, Kiama, Shellharbour and Wollongong (Illawarra Wingecarribee region).
- Bathurst, Dubbo, Gilgandra, Mudgee, Narromine, Nyngan, Orange, Parkes, Peak Hill, Trangie, Warren and Wellington (Three Rivers region).

- Albury, Cootamundra, Cummeragunja, Deniliquin, Griffith, Hay, Leeton, Narrandera, Tumut, Wagga Wagga (Riverina Murray region)
- Bourke, Brewarrina, Broken Hill, Cobar, Collarenebri, Coonamble, Enngonia, Goodooga, Gulargambone, Ivanhoe, Lightning Ridge, Menindee, Walgett, Weilmoringle, Wentworth/Dareton and Wilcannia (Murdi Paaki region)

QUESTION

128. What funding has been made available to support the work of Alliances?

- (a) 2017-18
- (b) 2018-19
- (c) 2019-20
- (d) 2020-21

ANSWER:

- (a) 2017-18: \$991,552
- (b) 2018-19: \$3,201,625
- (c) 2019-20: \$1,037,125
- (d) 2020/21: \$1,700,885.

QUESTION

129. Has a business case been developed for funding Alliances and Local Decision Making initiatives over the forward estimates?

ANSWER:

Aboriginal Affairs NSW is currently reviewing the funding allocations for Alliances participating in Local Decision Making and developing a funding approach for beyond 30 June 2022.

QUESTION

OCHRE Aboriginal Economic Prosperity Framework

130. What steps have been taken to enhance Aboriginal employment opportunities across the NSW Public Service?
(a) Does Aboriginal Affairs monitor the Premier's Targets of 3% employment rates across Departments?

ANSWER:

The Premier's Priority target of 114 was achieved in 2021, with 130 current senior leaders identifying as Aboriginal and or Torres Strait Islander, up from 105 in 2020.

The sector has well-developed strategies to attract Aboriginal talent to non-executive roles. In 2021 there was an overall growth in Aboriginal employment to 3.7% across all grades, up 2 percentage points on the previous year. Data is collected annually and reported in the Workforce Profile and State of the Public Sector Report.

The Department of Premier and Cabinet is committed to enhancing Aboriginal employment opportunities and the NSW Government remains committed to sector talent pipeline programs and career development:

- The Aboriginal Internship Program was launched in 2019, with 10 Aboriginal interns placed across NSW Government agencies annually
- In the 2022 Graduate intake, 8% of participants identify as Aboriginal, with culturally capable attraction and recruitment processes supporting this strategy
- Aboriginal Career Leadership Development Program has strong Aboriginal participation rates. There were 75 participants in the 2022 program intake

Many agencies have developed their own tailored talent acquisition programs that are high quality and responsive to organisational needs.

While the Public Service Commission has accountability for Aboriginal employment outcomes for the public sector, the DPC Executive (including the Head of Aboriginal Affairs) review the performance and outcomes from the State of the Sector Report annually for the DPC Cluster as is common practice across the sector.

QUESTION

131. Has the government developed a policy to enhance Aboriginal home ownership which contains targets?

ANSWER:

Aboriginal housing is a matter for the Minister for Homes and the Minister for Families and Communities, however the NSW Aboriginal Housing Office has an Aboriginal home ownership policy which includes targets.

QUESTION

132. Has the NSW Government established an advisory board comprising senior Aboriginal leaders, public sector executives and private sector experts to provide strategic advice to Ministers on the implementation of the Aboriginal Economic Framework?

ANSWER:

NSW Treasury have established the First Nations Advisory Council, which is co-chaired by an external Aboriginal representative, and includes public and private sector executives. The Council will provide policy and program advice to NSW Treasury including in relation to the Aboriginal Economic Prosperity Framework.

The Partnerships Working Group under the Closing the Gap framework is co-chaired by the Coalition of Aboriginal Peak Organisations (CAPO) and includes senior NSW Government Executives. The Group provides advice on socio-economic issues that inform work under Priority Reform Five: Employment, Business Growth and Economic Prosperity.

Priority Reform Five is to support a strong, diverse and self-sustaining Aboriginal business sector that can support community economic development through employment pathways. The Partnerships Working Group considers the outputs of community consultation by CAPO including addressing the barriers faced by Aboriginal businesses which was raised consistently during community consultation. In response to this consultation feedback Aboriginal Affairs NSW is holding regular Aboriginal Business Roundtables.

QUESTION
Stolen Generations Healing Fund 133. How much has been expended from the Healing Fund? (a) 2017-18 (b) 2018-19 (c) 2019-20 (d) 2020-21
The Stolen Generations Healing Fund was committed as part of the NSW Government's response to Unfinished Business Reparations for the Stolen Generations. Stolen Generations Healing Fund funding guidelines were developed and implemented during 2018-2019 and collective reparations from the Stolen Generations Healing Fund commenced in 2019-2020 FY. Funds expended are: (a) 2017-18 – N/A (b) 2018-19 – N/A (c) 2019-20 - \$375,000 (d) 2020-21 - \$375,000

QUESTION
Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme 134. What is the total amount of compensation paid to Stolen Generations survivors? (a) From the reparations fund? (b) From the funeral fund?
ANSWER: As of March 24 2022, the total amount of compensation paid to Stolen Generations survivors as individual reparations through the Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme is \$64,425,004. The total amount paid to Stolen Generations survivors as funeral payments from this Scheme is \$5,847,704.

QUESTION
Aboriginal Land Agreements 135. How many agreements made?
ANSWER: Three Aboriginal Land Agreements have been finalised: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coffs Harbour/Urunga in November 2017• Griffith in April 2019• Matraville in May 2021

In addition, an Aboriginal Land Agreement has been negotiated with the Orange Local Aboriginal Land Council and 'in principle' approval has been provided by the Minister for Lands and Water. The Agreement is currently undergoing appropriate tenure and legal checks with the aim for it to be finalised soon.

QUESTION

136. What funds have been expended?

ANSWER:

Aboriginal Land Agreements are administered by Crown Lands and as such, this is a matter for Minister Anderson, Minister for Lands and Water.

QUESTION

Roads to Home Program (\$55 million)

137. How much has been spent on the program?

ANSWER:

The Roads to Home Program is delivered by the Department of Planning and Environment. This is a matter for Planning and Homes and the question is best directed to the Minister for Planning and Homes for a response.

QUESTION

138. What projects are now complete?

ANSWER:

1. Bowraville Reserve – Bowraville Local Aboriginal Land Council – completed
2. Gulargambone – Weilwan Local Aboriginal Land Council – effective completion (playground being installed)
3. Cabarita Reserve – Forster Local Aboriginal Land Council – effective completion (playground being installed)

QUESTION

139. What projects are now in planning?

ANSWER:

There are 34 projects in the current program (Tranche 1, Tranche 2, Stimulus Package). Three are completed (refer to answer under Question 80). Thirty one are in the planning or executive phase of the project cycle - listed below:

TRANCHE 1:

1. Bellwood Reserve - Nambucca Heads LALC (in Delivery phase)
2. La Perouse Reserve - La Perouse LALC (in Planning phase)
3. Narwan Village – Armidale LALC (in Planning phase)
4. Wallaga Lake Reserve – Merrimans LALC (in Planning phase)
5. Gingie Reserve – Walgett LALC (in Planning phase)
6. Namoi Reserve – Walgett LALC (in Planning phase)
7. Three Ways - Griffith LALC (in Planning phase)

STIMULUS PACKAGE:

8. Box Ridge – Bogal LALC (in Delivery phase)
9. Nyguru Village Pippi Beach - Birrigan Gargle LALC (in Delivery phase)
10. Purfleet Reserve – Purfleet LALC (in Delivery phase)
11. Brungle - Brungle Tumut LALC (in Delivery phase)
12. Peak Hill Reserve - Peak Hill LALC (in Delivery phase)
13. Orient Point – Jerrinja LALC (in Planning phase)
14. Wongala Reserve - Coffs Harbour LALC (in Planning phase)
15. Boona Road (Condobolin) – Condobolin LALC (in Planning phase)
16. Collarenebri Reserve (The Walli) – Collarenebri – LALC (in Planning phase)
17. Nanima – Wellington LALC (in Planning phase)
18. Willow Bend Reserve - Condobolin LALC (in Planning phase)

TRANCHE 2:

19. Bellbrook Reserve – Thungutti LALC (in Planning phase)
20. New Burnt Bridge – Kempsey LALC (in Planning phase)
21. Muli Reserve (Bokal Ynee) - Muli LALC (in Planning phase)
22. South West Rocks (Fig Tree) – Kempsey LALC (in Planning phase)
23. Summervale Reserve – Amaroo LALC (in Planning phase)
24. Balranald Reserve (Endeavour Drive) – Balranald LALC (in Planning phase)
25. Mehi Crescent - Moree LALC (in Planning phase)
26. Namatjira Ave - Dareton LALC (in Planning phase)
27. New Merinee – Dareton LALC (in Planning phase)
28. Stanley Village – Moree LALC (in Planning phase)
29. Warrali Mission – Wilcannia LALC (in Planning phase)
30. Weilmoringle/Wythalbar – Weilmoringle LALC (in Planning phase)
31. Mallee - Wilcannia LALC (in Planning phase)

QUESTION

The Office of Aboriginal Affairs Staffing

140. How many Aboriginal staff are currently employed in the Office of Aboriginal Affairs?
- (a) What proportion of these staff are senior executive staff?
 - (b) What is the average remuneration for non-Aboriginal staff?
 - (c) What is the average remuneration for Aboriginal staff?

ANSWER:

75 staff have identified as Aboriginal at Aboriginal Affairs NSW.

- (a) 7 per cent of staff identified as Aboriginal are senior executives.
- (b) \$114,873.10
- (c) \$125,096.29

QUESTION

Disability Employment

141. How many employees who identify with having a disability are employed by:
- (a) Aboriginal Affairs NSW
 - (b) Art Gallery of NSW
 - (c) Australian Museum
 - (d) The State Library of NSW
 - (e) Sydney Opera House
 - (f) The State Archives and Records Authority of New South Wales
 - (g) NSW Advocate for Children and Young People

ANSWER:

- a) Aboriginal Affairs NSW: 7
- b) Art Gallery of NSW: 9
- c) Australian Museum: 5
- d) State Library of NSW: 21
- e) Sydney Opera House: 12
- f) State Archives and Records Authority of NSW 5, and Sydney Living Museums: 6
- g) NSW Advocate for Children and Young People - It is important to note that while the Advocate for Children and Young People is an independent statutory appointment, staff employed to support their work are employed within the Department of Communities and Justice Cluster and therefore diversity and inclusion figures are reported within the Department's reporting obligation.

At the most recent profile snapshot for 2021 at the end of June, 1 employee identified as having a disability which required no adjustments to the work environment.

It is also important to acknowledge there may be other members within the team that have a disability but have chosen not to identify as such, therefore the figure is not necessarily a true reflection of staffing diversity.

QUESTION	RESPONSIBILITY
<p>142. How many senior managers who identify with having a disability are employed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Aboriginal Affairs NSW (b) Art Gallery of NSW (c) Australian Museum (d) The State Library of NSW (e) Sydney Opera House (f) The State Archives and Records Authority of New South Wales (g) NSW Advocate for Children and Young People 	
<p>ANSWER:</p> <p>The number of senior managers who identify with having a disability employed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Aboriginal Affairs NSW: 0 b) Art Gallery of NSW: 0 c) Australian Museum: 0 d) State Library of NSW: 0 e) Sydney Opera House: 1 f) State Archives and Records Authority of NSW and Sydney Living Museums: 0 g) NSW Advocate for Children and Young People - Please note that as 'senior managers' was not defined, the institutions have generally understood this to refer to executive level staff. <p>It is important to note that while the Advocate is an independent statutory appointment, staff employed to support their work are employed within the Department of Communities and Justice Cluster and therefore diversity and inclusion figures are reported within the Department's reporting obligation.</p> <p>At the most recent profile snapshot for 2021 at the end of June, 1 employee identified as having a disability which required no adjustments to the work environment.</p> <p>It is also important to acknowledge there may be other members within the team that have a disability but have chosen not to identify as such, therefore the figure is not necessarily a true reflection of staffing diversity.</p>	

Minister Franklin Budget Estimate Response

Supplementary Question 31 - Attachment A

Staff Departures 2019-2022

Date	Classification
Jan 2019	GR 5/6
Jan 2019	GR 1
Jan 2019	GR 7/8
Feb 2019	GR 7/8
Feb 2019	GR 1/2
March 2019	BAND 1
March 2019	GR 3/4
April 2019	GR 7/8
April 2019	GR 11/12
May 2019	GR 7/8
May 2019	GR 1/2
May 2019	GR 1/2
July 2019	GR 7/8
July 2019	GR 3/4
Aug 2019	BAND 1
Aug 2019	GR 1/2
Sept 2019	GR 9/10
Oct 2019	GR 1/2
Oct 2019	BAND 1
Jan 2020	GR 11/12
Feb 2020	GR 11/12
July 2020	GR 11/12
Aug 2020	GR 7/8
Oct 2020	GR 5/6
Feb 2021	GR 11/12
Mar 2021	GR 1
April 2021	GR 1/2
April 2021	GR 5/6
April 2021	GR 9/10
May 2021	GR 5/6
May 2021	GR 1/2
May 2021	GR 9/10
May 2021	GR 5/6
July 2021	GR 1/2
July 2021	GR 9/10
July 2021	GR 7/8
July 2021	GR 5/6
July 2021	GR 7/8
July 2021	GR 7/8
Oct 2021	GR 11/12
Oct 2021	GR 11/12

Oct 2021	Grade 1/2
Nov 2021	Grade 9/10
Nov 2021	Grade 9/10
Dec 2021	Grade 7/8
Dec 2021	Grade 7/8
Jan 2022	Grade 7/8
Jan 2022	Grade 7/8
Feb 2022	Grade 1/2
Feb 2022	Assist. Curator 1

Minister Franklin Budget Estimate Response

Supplementary Question 32 - Attachment A

Staff Departures 2016-2018

*note 2016 data is unavailable due to technical system change in 2017

Date	Classification
Feb 2017	NO ELECT
Mar 2017	GR 3/4
Mar 2017	GR 7/8
Mar 2017	GR 7/8
Mar 2017	GR 9/10
Mar 2017	GR 7/8
Apr 2017	GR 5
May 2017	GR 9/10
May 2017	GR 3/4
Jun 2017	GR 1/2
Jun 2017	NO ELECT
Jun 2017	GR 2
Jun 2017	GR 2
Jul 2017	GR 9/10
Jul 2017	GR 7/8
Jul 2017	NA
Aug 2017	GR 9/10
Aug 2017	GR 7/8
Sep 2017	GR 9/10
Oct 2017	GR 1
Oct 2017	GR 5/6
Oct 2017	GR 2
Nov 2017	GR 11/12
Dec 2017	GR 7/8
Dec 2017	GR 9/10
Dec 2017	GR 2
Dec 2017	GR 11/12
Feb 2018	GR 4
Feb 2018	GR 3/4
Mar 2018	GR 2
Mar 2018	GR 5/6
Apr 2018	GR 2
Apr 2018	GR 1/2
May 2018	GR 10
May 2018	GR 11/12
May 2018	GR 5/6

Jun 2018	GR 11/12
Jul 2018	GR 3/4
Aug 2018	BAND 2
Aug 2018	GR 7/8
Aug 2018	GR 5/6
Aug 2018	GR 3/4
Sep 2018	GR 1/2
Sep 2018	GR 1
Sep 2018	GR 5/6
Sep 2018	G2
Sep 2018	GR 5/6
Oct 2018	GR 1/2
Oct 2018	GR 9/10
Nov 2018	GR 5/6
Nov 2018	G2
Dec 2018	GR 12