

## Answers to questions

### Roads—safety (Question No 876)

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) How many instances of road accidents have occurred at the intersection of Valley Avenue and Gozzard Street.
- (2) What is the breakdown of reported causes of road accidents at this intersection.
- (3) Does the ACT Government have any plans to install barriers, lights or any other preventative measure to increase driver and pedestrian safety at this intersection; if so, what are the Government's intentions for this intersection.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) 2017 crash data is not yet finalised. Based on the last seven years of available data (2010-2016), there has been a total of 32 reported crashes.
- (2) All reported crashes were "property damage only". 24, were right angle crashes, four rear end crashes, three crashes with one vehicle reversing and one single vehicle crash.
- (3) There are currently no plans for infrastructure upgrades at this intersection.

---

### ACT Health—audit report (Question No 877)

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to Report 11/2017 of the ACT Auditor-General, why has the directorate not addressed the audit finding, made in 2012-13, that "[t]he credit card acquittals for some credit card holders were not performed in a timely manner".
- (2) By when will the directorate implement measures to address the finding referred to in part (1).

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The Directorate continues to address the unresolved audit finding by implementing a process of suspending credit cards for two weeks for individuals who have not completed their credit card acquittals.
  2. The Directorate will continue to emphasise the need for card holders to complete credit card acquittals in a timely manner and include the use of suspending or cancelling credit cards for non-compliant individuals.
-

**ACT Health—invoices  
(Question No 879)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the answer to question on notice No 786, dated 15 November 2017 concerning the reasons for late payments of ACT Health supplier invoices, why is there no backup plan to enable processing of invoices during staff vacancy transition periods.
- (2) What measures have been adopted to minimise the occurrence of system errors.
- (3) What strategies are being adopted to move away from paper-based processing to electronic processing and tracking of supplier invoices, including but not limited to, scanning of paper documents and employment of email and other electronic technology.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. ACT Government has now implemented an electronic invoice processing system (APIAS) which features an automatic escalation process for overdue invoices.
  2. The roll out of APIAS across ACT Government will minimise system errors.
  3. ACT Government has moved to the APIAS invoicing system.
- 

**Health—budget  
(Question No 880)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the budget of \$330 million for non-hospital services, what is the purpose for the budget of \$12 115 for the Tuggeranong Health Centre Stage 2.
- (2) What is the purpose for the budget of \$81 523 for the Enhanced Community Health Centre Belconnen.
- (3) Does the budget of \$6 342 595 for the Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander Residential Alcohol and other – Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm (“NBHF”) represent a component of the capital costs of construction.
- (4) Why is the NBHF described as “Residential”.
- (5) Does the budget of \$26 641 898 for the Secure Mental Health Unit – DHULWA represent a component of the capital costs of construction.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. The \$12,115 is the actual expenditure (not budget) in the 2015-2016 financial year for construction works for Tuggeranong Health Centre Stage 2.

2. The \$81,523 figure is the actual expenditure (not budget) in the 2015-2016 financial year for construction works for the Enhanced Community Health Centre Belconnen.
3. Yes, the \$6,342,595 figure is the actual expenditure (not budget) in the 2015-2016 financial year for capital cost of construction work for Ngunnawal Bush Healing Farm (NBHF).
4. As a new type of service to the ACT, ACT Health is taking a staged approach to the opening and operation of the NBHF, however it remains the intention to operate a residential program at the NBHF.

Depending on the successful evaluation of the day programs and the identification of a suitable providers, ACT Health hopes to have a residential program operating in 2019.

5. Yes, the \$26,641,898 figure is the actual expenditure (not budget) in the 2015-2016 financial year for capital cost of construction works for the Secure Mental Health Unit – DHULWA.

### **Brian Hennessy Rehabilitation Centre—closure (Question No 882)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Mental Health, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the answer to part (4) of question on notice No 619, dated 27 October 2017, about the future of Brian Hennessy Rehabilitation Centre (BHRC), why did the Minister state that the Government had made “no decision” regarding future use of BHRC and that “[a] decision on future use is anticipated for 2018” when, on 18 November 2017, he made a media announcement that the BHRC would remain open until at least 2021.
- (2) What was the status of the Government’s decision-making in relation to the BHRC when the Minister gave his ministerial statement on 31 October 2017.
- (3) In the ministerial statement of 31 October 2017, why did the Minister make no mention of the status of the Government’s decision-making in relation to the BHRC.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) On 31 October 2017, the Minister indicated no decision had been made by the Government regarding the future use of BHRC, because the government was undertaking careful consideration of the issues and community needs going forward. This included consideration of the Supported Accommodation - Market Testing and Options Analysis Study that had been completed in 2017, by external consultants. This study is also being used to inform 2018-19 Budget considerations.

While the Minister has since announced BHRC will not close until appropriate accommodation is found for all residents, a final decision regarding the future use of the BHRC site is still under consideration.

- (2) The Government was still considering the analysis of the Supported Accommodation - Market Testing and Options Analysis Study at the time of the Ministerial statement on 31 October 2017.

(3) See answer to Q2.

---

**Health—withdrawal of codeine-based medicines  
(Question No 883)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the withdrawal of over-the-counter codeine-based medicines on 1 February 2018, what studies did ACT Health make in relation to the likely impact on presentations to (a) The Canberra Hospital pain management unit, (b) emergency departments and (c) nurse-led walk-in clinics.
- (2) What were the findings of those studies.
- (3) In what ways did ACT Health respond to those findings.
- (4) If there were no studies, findings or responses, what strategies did ACT Health adopt to mitigate any possible influx of presentations to public health facilities from 1 February 2018.
- (5) What were the average waiting times for appointments at the pain management unit as at (a) 30 June 2017, (b) 31 December 2017 and (c) 31 January 2018.
- (6) What estimate did ACT Health make as to the waiting time from 1 February 2018.
- (7) If no estimate was made, why not.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) ACT Health did not undertake studies in relation to likely impact on presentations to The Canberra Hospital Pain Management Unit, emergency departments and nurse-led walk-in clinics in relation to the up-scheduling of codeine.

It is too early to comment on whether patient care or waiting times have been impacted by the rescheduling of codeine. ACT Health anticipates the impact on hospital emergency department or Walk-in Centre presentations will be low as a result of the changes.

The Pain Management Unit (PMU) is not expected to experience a significant increase in referrals as a result of the codeine change.

- (2) As above, ACT Health did not undertake studies.
- (3) As above, ACT Health did not undertake studies.
- (4) The Commonwealth led an extensive awareness and communication campaign for consumers and health professionals through the Nationally Coordinated Codeine Implementation Working Group (NCCIWG). This campaign was undertaken, in part, as a strategy for ensuring consumers could be appropriately managed through the primary care system, and to minimise any unnecessary influx of presentations to the public health sector.

ACT Health is represented on the NCCIWG.

Through NCCIWG, each of these organisations prepared extensive communications material and resources for health practitioners and consumers. The Therapeutic Goods Administration has made a full suite of these resources available on its website [www.tga.gov.au](http://www.tga.gov.au).

The ACT therefore considered the extensive suite of materials developed by the Commonwealth to be adequate for ACT purposes.

The Capital Health Network held an information evening for health practitioners about the changes on 1 February 2018, with ACT Health assistance. ACT Health continues to engage with local stakeholders regarding the codeine changes.

The ACT collects data for schedule 8 (controlled) medicines prescribing and will be monitoring this data for any increases to controlled medicines prescribing which may correlate with the scheduling change.

(5) (a) 30 June 2017

Urgent medical assessment	21 days
Non-urgent medical assessment	403 days

(b) 31 December 2017

Urgent medical assessment	10.5 days
Non-urgent medical assessment	422 days

(c) 31 January 2018

Urgent medical assessment	17 days
Non-urgent medical assessment	500 days

The increased waiting times to access a non-urgent appointment across December and January is related to the Christmas/New Year period where there is traditionally lower levels of activity due to mandatory shutdown, clinician leave and patient availability.

(6) ACT Health did not estimate future waiting times from 1 February 2018.

(7) ACT Health does not anticipate Pain Management Unit waiting times to be significantly impacted as a result of the changes.

### **Canberra Hospital—alert levels (Question No 887)**

**Mrs Dunne** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the response to question on notice No 774, what were the trigger points that caused the declaration of alert level 3 throughout July, August and September 2017.
- (2) If trigger points changed at any time during that period on what dates did they change.

- (3) At the point of change, what were the trigger points, and what did they change to.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The *Capacity Escalation Procedure* (CEP) is an operational tool to assist with bed management and patient flow throughout the hospital. The use of this tool initiates business processes in response to peaks in bed demand. During July, August and September 2017, the Canberra Hospital CEP was activated. A combination factors as outlined in the procedure were triggers for Alert Level 3 being activated. It is important to note that occupancy fluctuates throughout the day due to patient movement, and the other factors at play on any given day can vary.
- (2) The list of trigger points in the procedure did not change during the period.
- (3) As stated above CEP is an operational business process tool and trigger points vary from day to day and within each day.

### **Waste—management (Question No 889)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) How many smart “bigbelly” bins are currently in operation across the ACT.
- (2) Where are the bins located.
- (3) How have the bins impacted on waste collection frequency.
- (4) How is the collection schedule determined.
- (5) How are recyclables retrieved and/ or sorted from the compressed collected through the bins.
- (6) At which locations do the bins and recycling bins exist.
- (7) Does the Government have any plans to introduce the bins at any other location in the future.
- (8) Will an ACT Waste Feasibility Study be undertaken to evaluate the potential future financial and environmental impacts of the bins; if so, when will the study be undertaken; if not, why not.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Three.
- (2) Link Park in Wright, Section 5 Campbell and East Lake Parade Kingston Foreshore.
- (3) The bins in the low use areas at Wright and Campbell resulted in a reduced frequency of emptying as bins were only emptied when approaching capacity, as indicated by

the remote sensor. The bin in the high use area at Kingston required the same collection frequency. Whilst the compacting feature provides an increase of 30% on the capacity of a standard bin, a greater benefit is achieved through the ability to remotely monitor rubbish levels to determine when bins need emptying.

- (4) The bin sensor alerts the service truck operator when the bin is at 70% capacity.
  - (5) Nil – the bin is for general waste only.
  - (6) No recycling bins are located in the vicinity of the Bigbelly bins.
  - (7) Not at this time.
  - (8) An assessment of the smart bin trial was conducted internally by TCCS in mid-2017, in close consultation with the Waste Feasibility Study.
- 

### **Waste—recycling (Question No 890)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) How many local shops in the ACT have a collection service for waste disposal bins.
- (2) How many local shops in the ACT have facilities to dispose of recyclables separately (either as a separate bin or as a compartmentalised bin).
- (3) What assessment is made in determining which local shops get a facility to dispose of recyclables separately and on what is that assessment based.
- (4) At the local shops that do not currently have separate recycling bins, does the Government have plans to roll them out; if so, when and at which shops.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) provides rubbish collection services in public area at 66 local shops.
  - (2) There are no local shops with recycling facilities. Recycling bins are provided throughout the City, in Glebe Park and in some high use locations in Braddon.
  - (3) Nil.
  - (4) There are no current plans to roll out recycling bins to local shops.
- 

### **Roads—resurfacing (Question No 892)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) How are roads in the ACT selected and prioritised for resurfacing, including criteria for selection, timeframes for completion and determining which road resurfacing method is appropriate.
- (2) Which roads in Ainslie have been resurfaced since 1 July 2017 to date including (a) what work was carried out, (b) the dates the work was carried out and (c) the cost of the each project.
- (3) What cumulative length of road in Ainslie has been resurfaced since 1 July 2017 to date.
- (4) Can the Minister provide a cost breakdown of the resurfacing works in Ainslie from 1 July 2017 to date, including the cost for each project by (a) materials, (b) equipment, (c) contractor costs and (d) any other relevant categories of cost.
- (5) Are all contracts for road resurfacing works put out to tender; if not, why not.
- (6) For all contracts not put out to tender, how are those contractors chosen.
- (7) Which contractors were engaged to undertake these resurfacing works, including the (a) contract number, (b) contract title and (c) value of contract.
- (8) Why were the stretches of road in Ainslie identified in part (2) chosen for resurfacing.
- (9) Were any of the resurfacing works identified in part (2) the result of requests from the Fix My Street portal; if so, which ones.
- (10) How many Fix My Street requests for road maintenance in Ainslie were received during (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18 to date.
- (11) Does the Government conduct consultation or letterbox drops to inform residents that nearby roads will be resurfaced; if not, why not and what other forms of consultation are undertaken.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) For the arterial road network:
  - Every year one third of the arterial road network is mechanically surveyed. Condition data on skid resistance, cracking, roughness, rutting is collected.
  - A computer based pavement management system is used to plan resurfacing that uses the condition data and optimises the outcome of the available maintenance funding.

For the municipal network:

- Each road in the municipal network is inspected visually once in three years in a separate program. Sites are prioritised for resurfacing in the following year depending on pavement condition and traffic volume.

In relation to treatment selection:

- In developing the resurfacing program, various surfacing treatment types are considered for each site, carefully evaluating their suitability and cost effectiveness.



- The primary objective is to deliver a large, regular preventive resurfacing program using relatively low-cost treatments to maximise the effect of the available budget. Examples of preventative treatments include chip seal and microsurfacing. This approach aims to prevent structural damage to the road and minimise the requirement for relatively high cost corrective treatments.
- Annual reseal programs are required to be delivered in the warmer months between October and April each year.

(2) Between 18 and 23 January 2018 the following streets in Ainslie were resealed.

- Baker Street;
- Campbell Street;
- Leslie Street;
- Quick Street;
- Sutter Street;
- Campbell Street Service Road;
- Suttor Street Service Road 1; and
- Suttor Street Service Road 2.

Where necessary these streets were patched with asphalt in mid-2017 in preparation for the resurfacing. Progress payments total \$138,500 (GST exclusive) in relation to resealing in Ainslie since 1 July 2017. There will be future payments on final completion and acceptance of the work.

- (3) Records are kept by area not by length. 21,809 square metres of road have been resealed in Ainslie since 1 July 2017.
- (4) Resealing is delivered under a contract to provide a complete service. The component costs are not a reporting requirement of the contractor.
- (5) The resealing contract was procured by open public tender.
- (6) The resealing contract is procured by open public tender.
- (7) Downer is currently engaged to undertake resealing, the contract expires at the end of June 2021.

Contract Number: 2016.27122.111  
 Contract title: Resealing of ACT Roads 2016-2021  
 Value of Contract: \$45,436,329.32

- (8) Based on condition assessments, as outlined at 1) above, the roads in Ainslie were prioritised for resealing to prevent water penetration into ageing road surfaces.
- (9) No.
- (10) Number of requests for road maintenance received through Fix My Street (categories included potholes, roads).

Year	Total
2015	0
2016	19
2017	18
2018	2

- (11) Three to four days before resealing works are undertaken, adjoining residents receive a notice in their mailbox providing information on the upcoming works and a brochure about what to expect when the street is resealed.

Each day a media release is issued by Transport Canberra and City Services outlining works programmed on the following day, this is supported by a tweet about where works are to be undertaken and daily updates on the website. Prior to the works commencing, signs are installed in the suburbs notifying motorists and residents of the upcoming reseal works.

### **Environment—elm leaf beetle (Question No 893)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) In how many and what suburbs in the ACT is the elm leaf beetle present.
- (2) What percentage of elm trees in those suburbs are affected.
- (3) In what suburbs is the elm leaf beetle a significant threat.
- (4) What management plans does the Government have for control of the elm leaf beetle.
- (5) What strategies has the Government adopted to preserve those trees that are already affected.
- (6) What is the current annual cost of these management plans.
- (7) In respect to the trial that is currently in operation, (a) when did the trial start, (b) how is it funded, (c) what is the total cost of the trial, (d) what trees/ regions are involved in the trial, (e) who is undertaking the work, (f) who is assessing the results, (g) what has the directorate learnt so far and (h) when will the results be available.
- (8) Who is responsible for pest control on trees located on National Capital Authority land.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Elm leaf beetle (ELB) is now present in most suburbs/areas where elms are present.
- (2) Anecdotally about 80% of elm trees have been affected this year.
- (3) ELB does not represent a significant threat to elms in the ACT context.
- (4) The Government has no management plans/strategies in place to control ELB. There is consensus among biosecurity agencies in ACT and other jurisdictions that ELB can no longer be controlled.
- (5) See response to question 7.

- (6) N/A.
- (7) (a) TCCS commenced trials in 2013-14 and several different methods have been used in each subsequent year.
- (b) TCCS Urban Treescapes' recurrent budget.
- (c) Trials to date have cost approximately \$5,000 each year.
- (d) Trials have been conducted on elm trees in Glebe Park, below Scrivener Dam, Brisbane Avenue, Macarthur Avenue, Moreshead Drive, Benjamin Way and Eastern Valley Way. The National Capital Authority also trialled chemical treatment in the Parliamentary Triangle in 2015-16.
- (e) Urban Treescapes technical staff. A specialist contractor from Melbourne applied diatomaceous earth to wet foliage (a technique trialled in Queensland and Melbourne) in 2016-17.
- (f) Urban Treescapes technical staff.
- (g) Key findings include: some Elm species are not affected; stressed trees are more severely affected; chemical treatment is less effective during a dry spring; there are fewer ELB after a warm and wet winter; to date no effective biological control has been identified; the insecticide Imidacloprid can result in effective control if applied in early spring at a cost of \$50 to \$80 per tree, the effect lasts only 1-2 years and is said to impact negatively on bees which could have long term effects on pollination; TCCS manage more than 10,000 elm trees on public land and there may be just as many on private property, so chemical control is not feasible.
- (h) The ELB management trials are ongoing as TCCS are still monitoring the impact of previous treatments at the treatment sites. The monitoring of results have been based on observations only and at this stage there is no intention to prepare a formal report.
- (8) The National Capital Authority.
- 

### **Planning—recycling facility (Question No 894)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the proposed Capital Recycling Solutions (CRS) material recovery facility in Fyshwick, will the Minister table the briefing documents he, or his delegate, received for the decision in relation to application 201700053 and approval of Notifiable Instrument NI2018-27.
- (2) Were *the Draft Separation Distance Guidelines for Air Emissions* not included in the Draft Environment Impact Statement; if not, given they have been made a requirement for other, similar proposals, why were they not required for the CRS proposal.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) No decision has been made on application 201700053. A scoping document application only commences the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. The

EIS process is an information gathering process and is not an approval process. The scoping document application is not published as it only includes enough information to scope the EIS requirements for the proposal. The scoping document issued by the planning and land authority is a Notifiable Instrument and can be found at <http://www.legislation.act.gov.au/ni/2018-27/default.asp>. The draft EIS is then published and made available to the community for comment, as it contains more detailed comprehensive information on the proposal. The applicant is required to address any comments in a revised EIS.

- (2) The Scoping Document for the proposed Fyshwick recycling facility requires the proponent to address climate change and air quality as part of the EIS process. Once the draft EIS is received, the Authority will refer the EIS to relevant agencies, including ACT Health and the Environment Protection Authority. The applicant will need to adequately address any matters raised by these entities in their revised EIS. These entities may consider the proposal against any relevant guidelines and policies which apply.

### **Education—enrolment projections (Question No 895)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to enrolment projections for ACT schools, what information was used by the ACT Education Directorate in the (a) 2015, (b) 2016 and (c) 2017 calendar years to determine future capacity in each ACT (i) primary, (ii) high and (iii) Kindergarten to Year 12 for the years 2014-2019.
- (2) What reports are prepared by and for the Education Directorate using the information identified in part (1).
- (3) Can the Minister provide a copy of the reports referred to in part (2), including the ACT Public School Enrolment Projections for (a) 2014-2018, (b) 2015-2019 and (c) 2016-2020.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Education Directorate undertakes student enrolment projection modelling for each ACT public school. Projections for schools at the primary, high and college levels in 2015, 2016 and 2017 were completed using
- school census and capacities data
  - land release data
  - sales data and occupation dwelling forecasts sources from the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate
  - birth data sourced from Births, Deaths and Marriages and
  - population estimates sources from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- (2) No reports are prepared from the information listed in response to question 1.
- (3) Not applicable.

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—email policy  
(Question No 899)**

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the current policy pertaining to emailing detainees of the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC).
- (2) What is the process for applying for approval to email a detainee.
- (3) How long does it take for these applications to be processed.
- (4) Can these applications be lodged on the AMC/ACT Corrective Services website; if not, why not.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Detainee access to email is managed in accordance with the *Corrections Management (Email, Internet and Legal Education and Resource Network [LEARN] for Prisoners) Policy 2010*, available at <http://www.legislation.act.gov.au/ni/2010-115/default.asp>.
- (2) Detainees request email contact with individuals and all applications are positively vetted in accordance with the *Corrections Management (Email, Internet and Legal Education and Resource Network [LEARN] for Prisoners) Policy 2010*.

Individuals are not able to make requests to email detainees as ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) has identified that this would significantly increase the risk of victim contact as individuals may create an alias.

The current process for approving email contact based on a detainee application mitigates this risk.

For security reasons, only detainees may apply for new email contacts in part due to the vetting and security process necessary for victim protection, in particular for victims of domestic violence.

- (3) Processing of applications is dependent on a number of factors, including the ability of ACTCS to contact the proposed recipient, staffing levels, and the number of applications that may require processing at any one time. Subject to these factors, ACTCS aims to have requests processed within 24 hours.
- (4) ACTCS does not intend to change the policy for security vetting of email contacts due to the risks outlined above. Detainees will need to continue to make the application for email contact with individuals. As a result there is no need to update the website as members of the public are not able to apply to contact detainees.

---

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—detainee payments  
(Question No 900)**

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to detainee payments at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC), when a detainee payment has been lodged, is (a) an email sent to the payer confirming that their online payment has been received and/ or being processed; if not, why not, (b) a subsequent email sent to the payer confirming that their payment has been successfully processed; if not, why not and (c) a subsequent email sent to the payer confirming that their payment has been accepted into the detainee's account; if not, why not.
- (2) What is the policy regarding the double buy up, that is, the enabling of inmates to purchase more around the Christmas period;
- (3) Is this policy clearly outlined on the AMC/ ACT Corrective Services website; if not, why not.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) Online payments to the AMC Trust Account are effected through a link made available by Westpac on the ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) website. On completion of the transaction, Westpac generates an automated payment reference confirming that payment has been received. This is not confirmation that the payment has been successfully processed into the detainee's account.

All online payments are managed in line with Westpac banking process. This is an automated process and ACTCS is unable to view or amend the details of payments, or issue payment advice notices including emails.

(b) Inter banking clearance processes require three business days to ascertain if the payment is fraudulent or if the depositor has insufficient funds in order to process the transaction. If the bank declines the payment, an email is sent to the relevant detainee to inform him/her of the rejected payment.

(c) It is not standard banking practice for banking institutions to send a notice to the depositor that an amount has been accepted into the recipient's account. For this reason, individuals who make a deposit into the AMC Trust Account do not receive notification from Westpac once their deposit has been accepted into the AMC Trust Account.

- (2) Since suppliers close during Christmas ACTCS provides detainees with the facility of a double deposit for the double buy up. This is a practice of ACTCS and is not embedded in policy.
- (3) This practice is not included in a policy.

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—visitor policy (Question No 901)**

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the procedure for making a booking to visit an inmate at the Alexander Maconochie Centre.

- (2) How many ACT Corrective Services staff members are responsible for managing bookings at any given time.
- (3) How are current policies designed to ensure that visits are secure as well as an efficient experience for the visitor.
- (4) Is it possible to book a visit (a) online or (b) via email; if not, why not.
- (5) Has the Directorate considered assigning visitor numbers in order to reduce the time and resources of completing and processing the paperwork for visitations.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Bookings must be made at least 24 hours in advance, unless otherwise approved by the General Manager, Custodial Operations. The process for booking visits entails the visitor calling a booking line and providing details of the detainee they wish to visit, a preferred date and their contact details in a recorded message. This process ensures that all visits are booked in the order that they are requested. This information, as well as the hours of operation, is conveyed in the recorded message for visits bookings.
- (2) There is one person dedicated to visits bookings at any given time, shared between three staff members in the AMC Executive Support Unit.
- (3) Policies including the *Corrections Management (Visits) Policy 2016* (Visits Policy) ensure that visits are secure as well as an efficient experience for visitors.

Security is ensured by various barrier controls. All visitors to the AMC are required to undergo an iris scan, pass any items to be brought into the AMC through an x-ray machine and consent to corrections dog searches, as required.

The AMC aims to ensure efficiency for visitors by notifying visitors when their booking is confirmed about what to expect when visiting the AMC, and encouraging visitors to arrive with sufficient time to undergo security checks ahead of the scheduled visit time. This information is also available in the Visitors Handbook and the ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) website.

The Visits Policy, Visitors Handbook and ACTCS website all state that a visitor must provide identification, complete a visitor form and undergo an iris scan (to register on the system) at the initial visit.

To expedite visits, visitors are not required to provide identification on each subsequent visit, they are only required to complete the visitor form (for administration purposes) and to undertake an iris scan. All individuals, including staff, who wish to enter the AMC must undertake an iris scan to prove identity.

The purpose of this is to ensure the security and good order of the AMC is maintained by preventing an individual gaining entry to the AMC under an alias or false identification.

- (4) There is no current capacity to book visits online or via email. The telephone booking system was initially put in place to guarantee equal access to visits by ensuring that visit requests were processed in the order in which they were received.

ACTCS is currently exploring the option of an online visits booking system, as well as the potential to book visits via email.

- (5) The directorate is currently exploring ways to reduce the time and resources needed to book and process visits to the AMC. The new ACTCS database currently under development, known as CORIS, offers the potential to streamline the process further and will be explored as the system is rolled out.

---

### **Alexander Maconochie Centre—visitor feedback (Question No 902)**

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to visitor grievances at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC), what is the procedure for visitors lodging written complaints and providing feedback in relation to the AMC.
- (2) Can lodging a complaint or providing feedback be completed solely on the AMC/ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) website; if not, why not.
- (3) Once feedback or a complaint from a visitor has been received by ACTCS, what is the process of investigation.
- (4) Does the process of investigation differ between “feedback” and a “complaint”.
- (5) Once an investigation into a visitor’s feedback or complaint has been completed, what is the policy for responding to the visitor and in what timeframe.
- (6) Does the AMC website clearly display information pertaining to whom the responsible Minister is for ACTCS and how to contact that Minister; if not, why not.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) Visitors can provide written complaints or feedback relating to the AMC by completing a visitor feedback form. These forms are provided to the Manager, AMC Executive Support Team to provide a response and are then recorded by the AMC Compliance Team. Visitors can also contact the ACTCS Policy and Government Unit who will provide them with an email address for written correspondence or by writing directly to the Executive Director, ACTCS. The details for both forms of contact are on the ACTCS website ([www.cs.act.gov.au](http://www.cs.act.gov.au)). Visitors are also able to lodge complaints with the ACT Human Rights Commission or the ACT Ombudsman regarding the AMC.
- (2) Individuals are unable to lodge complaints or feedback via the ACTCS website. This is currently under review.
- (3) Each complaint or suggestion received by ACTCS is managed on an individual basis. Where the complaint is received by the ACTCS Policy and Government Unit, a member of the team will action the complaint or suggestion by gathering information and seeking stakeholder input prior to formulating a response. The response is then reviewed by the relevant ACTCS Executive, prior to submission to the Executive



Director, ACTCS. Complaints received at the AMC are responded to by the General Manager, Custodial Operations and logged by the AMC Compliance Team.

- (4) Feedback is acknowledged, with further information provided if appropriate. The feedback may be forwarded to the relevant Manager, the ACTCS Executive or other relevant staff for consideration or appropriate action. All other correspondence is responded to as outlined in the response to question 3.
- (5) Complaints or suggestions received by ACTCS are typically responded to within 20 working days, depending on the complexity of the issue. The individuals are provided with confirmation of receipt and expected time frame of ACTCS response within 5 working days of ACTCS receiving their complaint or suggestion.
- (6) The ACTCS website does not currently provide any information on the ACT Minister for Corrections. ACTCS will update the Corrections website, including Ministerial reporting, as part of the ACT Government's review of agency websites.

---

### **Environment—Molonglo nature reserve (Question No 903)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the Molonglo Nature Reserve, did the Government seek an exemption from a full environmental assessment for the Molonglo 3 development; if so, why.
- (2) Why was the area not considered important with respect to its characteristic biological and natural landscape characteristics or other related phenomena.
- (3) Did it take from 2014 to 2018 for the Government to release the Molonglo River Draft Management Plan; if so, why.
- (4) Can the Minister outline the steps taken for the completion of the Molonglo Draft Management Plan and provide the date those stages were commenced and completed.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Yes. Under Section 211 (s211) of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* an exemption from requiring an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been sought for Molonglo Stage 3.

The s211 is sought on the basis that sufficient environmental research and studies have been undertaken to identify the potential environmental impacts of the development in Molonglo Stage 3 satisfying both the Commonwealth and ACT legislation. As part of the s211 application, environmental studies were undertaken to address any matters listed under the *Nature Conservation Act 2014* (NC Act).

The Molonglo area (including Molonglo Stage 3) has also been the subject of a Strategic Assessment under the Commonwealth's *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) which gained approval in 2011. This is referred to as the Molonglo National Environmental Significance (NES) Plan.

- (2) The Molonglo Stage 3 area, including the Molonglo River Corridor, was and is considered important with respect to its environmental characteristics and landscape setting. Urban development in Molonglo 3 was included in the Strategic Assessment on matters of NES approved in 2011 by the Commonwealth under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. The approved NES Plan is included in the current s211 EIS exemption application being considered by the planning authority. The approved NES Plan provides for development within the Molonglo Valley area including in Molonglo Stage 3. Among other things, the approval of the strategic assessment established the ACT Government's commitments to adaptively manage and offset important areas including the Kama Nature Reserve, Patch GG and the Molonglo river corridor. Previously in 2008, environmental characteristics and landscape setting were originally considered through the Territory Plan and the National Capital Plan rezonings of parts of the Molonglo Valley area for urban purposes.
- (3) The Molonglo River Draft Reserve Management Plan (the draft plan) was released on 8 February 2018.

The Molonglo Valley NES Plan was approved by the Australian Government Department of the Environment in December 2011. In accordance with this agreement, the reserve management plan was to be finalised by 7 April 2014. A draft plan was prepared meeting this timeframe.

The draft plan was not released for public consultation in 2014 as the new Strategic Bushfire Management Plan for the ACT was being released the same year and consequential changes to the draft plan were required to ensure consistency with the Strategic Bushfire Management Plan. Following revision of the draft plan, further consultation was required with key stakeholders to ensure that the proposed revised policy adequately addressed relevant fire management issues.

Additional consultation was also required to resolve whether the Kama Nature Reserve Buffer zone, required under the NES Plan, was a matter to be determined in the draft Plan. This consultation occurred during 2015.

As a consequence of this consultation, an additional section was added to the draft plan providing functional criteria to guide the design and management of the Kama Nature Reserve buffer zone for the mitigation of urban development edge effects.

- (4) The steps taken to complete the Molonglo River Reserve Draft Reserve Management Plan (draft Plan) including dates of when each stage was commenced and completed are outlined below.

Date	Step
July to December 2013	Preparation of Issues Papers and engagement with Community Reference Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation of issues paper</li> <li>• Engagement with community and stakeholders</li> <li>• Preparation of Consultation Report to inform development of Draft Plan</li> </ul>

Date	Step
February to December 2014	Preparation of draft Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and refinement of draft Plan of Management – versions 1 to 7</li> <li>• Engagement with Community Reference Group and other stakeholders.</li> </ul>
January to December 2015	Consultation and discussion of the Kama Nature Reserve Buffer Zone as part of the draft Plan.
January to July 2016	Development of draft Plan version 8 – circulated for stakeholders for comment and refinements
July to December 2016	Development and delivery of <i>Kama Interface Management Strategy</i>
February 2017	The Conservator endorses draft Plan
March to December 2017	Finalisation of draft Plan version 9
February 2018	Draft Plan version 9 released for public consultation
23 March 2018	Deadline for Submissions on draft Plan version 9

### Roads—speed limits (Question No 904)

Ms Lee asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) How many motorists have been booked for speeding or other offences in school zones since the start of the school year and at what schools did these bookings occur.
- (2) How many motorists were booked for speeding and other offences in the same period last year and at what schools did these bookings occur.
- (3) How many, if any, school zones have flashing or other illuminated signs
- (4) At what schools are these flashing or other illuminated signs installed.
- (5) How many schools have lollypop attendants and (a) at what schools are these attendants located, (b) what are their hours, (c) what is the cost of their employment and (d) who employs them.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) During the first two weeks of school term 2018 (5 to 18 February 2018), ACT Policing issued four Traffic Infringement Notices (TINs) for speeding in school zones. During the same time period, ACT Policing issued six cautions for speeding in school zones.

ACT Policing is unable to specify the exact schools in which these TINs were issued as some streets have multiple schools on them. However, the TINs were issued in

Franklin, Nicholls, Phillip and Reid, and the cautions were issued in Bonner, Gungahlin (two), Hackett, Harrison and Nicholls.

- (2) During the first two weeks of school term 2017 (30 January to 12 February 2017), ACT Policing issued 25 TINs for speeding in school zones. During the same time period, ACT Policing issued 10 cautions for speeding in school zones.

ACT Policing is unable to specify the exact schools in which these TINs were issued as some streets have multiple schools on them. However, the TINs were issued in Aranda, Bonner, Charnwood (two), Deakin, Dickson (five), Franklin, Hackett, Harrison (four), Kambah, Lyneham, Page (four), Palmerston, Phillip (two). Cautions were issued in Aranda (two), Dickson, Harrison (two), Kaleen, O'Connor (two), Page and Palmerston.

\*These figures do not include speed camera data. ACT Policing's records for school zone offences are limited to speeding offences.

- (3) Nil.

- (4) Nil.

- (5) The School Crossing Supervisor program commenced at 20 crossings, which potentially benefits 23 schools, on 5 February 2018. The schools that directly benefit from the program are Amaroo School, Brindabella Christian College (Lyneham campus), Canberra Girls Grammar School (junior school), Chapman Primary School, Florey Primary School, Forrest Primary School, Garran Primary School, Gold Creek School, Harrison School, Hughes Primary School, Lyneham Primary School, Majura Primary School, Mother Teresa School, Namadgi School, Ngunnawal Primary School, Red Hill Primary School, St Clare of Assisi Primary School, Sts Peter & Paul Primary School, Trinity Christian School and Turner School. The three co-located schools that may also benefit from the program are Good Shepherd Primary School, Holy Spirit School and Malkara School.

The supervisors work for an hour in the morning and afternoon, with the shifts based around the individual school start and finish times. The service will cost approximately \$360,000 to deliver in the first year. HOBAN Recruitment has been engaged to deliver the program in the ACT.

## **Energy—gas (Question No 905)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 16 February 2018  
(*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) In relation to the use of conventional gas in ACT Property Group operated properties, how many properties use gas heating.
- (2) How many ACT Property Group operated properties use gas stovetops or cooking appliances.
- (3) What proportion of total ACT Government greenhouse gas emissions come from use of conventional gas.

- (4) How many tonnes of greenhouse gas (including breakdown) are emitted by the ACT Government each year as a result of the continued use of conventional gas in ACT Property Group operated properties.
- (5) Which ACT Property Group operated properties consume the most conventional gas.
- (6) What actions are the ACT Property Group taking to transition away from conventional gas in their properties.
- (7) What is the timeline for ACT Property Group operated properties to be entirely gas free.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) 36.
- (2) 14.
- (3) In the 2016/17 financial year, conventional gas made up 17% of total ACT Government emissions, as defined under the *Annual Reports (Government Agencies) Act 2004 (Act)*, *Annual Reports (Government Agencies) Notice 2017 (Instrument)* and the *Carbon Neutral ACT Government Framework (Carbon Neutral Framework)*.
- (4) In the 2016/17 financial year, 4,640 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e were emitted by ACT Property Group properties reporting ACT Government emissions, as defined under above mentioned Act, Instrument and Carbon Neutral Framework.

The Carbon Neutral Framework defines the ACT Government reporting boundary as all budget dependent entities for which the ACT Government has operational control. As such there are many smaller sites and community centres where ACT Property Group own or operate a property with gas heating, but do not report on emissions as the properties are leased out to non-Government entities. ACT Property Group also does not always have access to consumption data for sites outside the reporting boundary and would be unable to report emissions in any case.

This explains the discrepancy in the number of properties quoted in response to question 1 to those in the breakdown list below:

Location	Gas consumption (MJ)	T CO <sub>2</sub> -e
Mitchell Depot	53,526,807.00	3,443.38
North Building **	4,405,340.83	283.40
Macarthur House	3,650,824.79	234.86
1 Moore Street	2,925,325.41	188.19
255 Canberra Avenue	2,316,138.27	149.00
Village Creek Health Centre	1,322,788.20	85.09
Callam Offices	1,087,418.90	69.95
North Curtin ESA (former school)	959,809.60	61.74

Location	Gas consumption (MJ)	T CO <sub>2</sub> -e
Woden Library	656,426.84	42.23
Dickson Motor Vehicle Registry	619,474.54	39.85
Belconnen Library	609,134.98	39.19
Stromlo Depot	51,344.76	3.30

\*\* North Building HVAC was upgraded to electric in the second half of 2017.

- (5) As per the response to question 4.
- (6) ACT Property Group pursue opportunities to transition away from natural gas as part of any mechanical services upgrades, in line with the Carbon Neutral Framework. This may include projects under the ACT Government Capital Works program and ACT Property Group capital upgrades and planned works programs.

When new mechanical upgrades are considered, design consultants are briefed on costs of electricity and natural gas, the Carbon Neutral Framework and the 100% renewable electricity target. Consultants then take life cycle costs and carbon emissions into their design recommendations with a preference to transition to electricity where feasible.

- (7) There are a number of considerations that need to be taken into account for ACT Property Group properties to be entirely gas free, including:
- technical limitations of current electric heating technology in the Canberra climate will require gas heating to remain at some properties for the foreseeable future;
  - the remaining life cycle of gas heating equipment in some ACT Property Group sites is greater than 15 years and it would be uneconomical to replace equipment until the end of its working life; and
  - electrical load of existing electric heating units will require significant electrical upgrades and potentially ActewAGL distribution transformer/sub-station upgrades at some sites.

---

### **Environment—weed trees (Question No 906)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What are the current restrictions on the sale of weed trees, in particular, non-endemic species, in the ACT.
- (2) What is the current list of weed trees and their status.
- (3) Has the ACT Government considered further restrictions on the sale of the Chinese Elm.

- (4) As the Chinese Elm is often planted as a bird-attractor and is a feeder plant for rosellas and other parrots, are there other local native trees with a similar build/shape to the Chinese Elm that also act as a feeder to parrots.
- (5) Has the Directorate provided advice to garden nurseries on prioritising local native trees over non-endemic species.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Plants declared as pest plants in the ACT are listed in the *Pest Plants and Animals (Pest Plants) Declaration 2015 (No 1)* which is available to the public on the ACT Legislation Register at: <http://www.legislation.act.gov.au/di/2015-59/current/pdf/2015-59.pdf>. This list provides guidance to nurseries. Species categorised as prohibited in this list cannot be sold or otherwise supplied.
- (2) Invasive tree species with the status of 'notifiable', 'must be suppressed', 'must be contained' or 'prohibited' are listed in the *Pest Plants and Animals (Pest Plants) Declaration 2015 (No 1)* at <http://www.legislation.act.gov.au/di/2015-59/current/pdf/2015-59.pdf>.
- (3) Whilst the Chinese Elm has naturalised in places, it has not displayed the characteristics of a serious invasive plant. Therefore it is a lower priority for action with regard to controlling its sale and is not currently a declared pest plant. The Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate will investigate whether suitable sterile cultivars are available for landscape planting in the ACT. If suitable sterile cultivars are available, the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate may consider proposing declaration of non-sterile cultivars of Chinese Elm as prohibited pest plants.
- (4) Yes. Local wattles, eucalypts, kurrajongs, river she oaks and native cypress pines are all examples of bird attractors.
- (5) Information is made available to plant nurseries on suitable plants to grow in the ACT through the Grow Me Instead Program. Grow Me Instead (GMI) is an initiative of the Nursery and Garden Industry Australia (NGIA) promoting a positive change in the attitude of both industry and consumers toward invasive plants. Details of the program specific to the ACT can be found at <http://www.growmeinstead.com.au/public/GMI-brochure-ACT-High-Country.pdf>.

The ACT Government is also participating in a new program called PlantSure. PlantSure is an initiative of the Nursery and Garden Industry Association of NSW and ACT and the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service. The program will be identifying garden plants that should no longer be sold because they are invasive plants. Non-invasive alternatives will be recommended as part of the program and will include local native tree species.

---

### **Domestic Animal Services—rangers (Question No 907)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to an article in The Canberra Times dated 14 January 2018 that noted that Domestic Animal Service (DAS) Rangers will be operating in pairs moving forward, what is the current number of DAS Rangers on staff.
- (2) How many more DAS Rangers will be hired as a result of the commitment made by the Minister relating to the dangerous dogs reform in November 2017.
- (3) What analysis has the Directorate done on whether the increase in staff will be offset by the decision to have the Rangers operate in pairs.
- (4) Why will DAS Rangers now operate in pairs.
- (5) Will this result in an overall improvement in responsiveness and service quality, and an increase in enforcement actions, being the stated goals of the increase in the number of DAS Rangers.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Currently there are eight Rangers.
- (2) Eight additional Ranger positions are in the process of being recruited.
- (3) The requirement for Rangers to operate in pairs when required for safety reasons has been in place for approximately two years. The increased Ranger staffing levels will have a positive impact on operational capacity and capability.
- (4) The decision to have Rangers attend these incidents in pairs is primarily operational safety. Dog attack incidents, by their very nature, can be dangerous and unpredictable. When attending dog attacks, DAS Rangers are required to restrain, contain, and if necessary seize potentially aggressive and dangerous dogs. The potential risks associated with managing a dangerous dog are significantly reduced if Rangers operate in pairs.
- (5) Yes.

---

**Municipal services—parks  
(Question No 908)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the City Renewal Authority (CRA) naming competition for a new park in West Basin in 2017, in which only one of the four choices put to a public vote was a woman, why did the CRA choose those names for the competition.
- (2) Why was there not gender balance in the selection.
- (3) What other names were considered that were not put to the public vote.
- (4) Why were there no Indigenous people or names on the list.



- (5) What grounds does the CRA use for deciding what to name new locations, parks, roads etc, under its jurisdiction.
- (6) Of public parks and roads named in the last three years, what proportion have been (a) democratically chosen, (b) named after a woman, (c) named after a Lesbian, Gay, Transgender, Bisexual and Queer person, (d) named after a person of colour and (e) named after an Indigenous person.
- (7) Have any public parks and roads named in the last three years been named after individuals known to have (a) perpetrated genocide or acts of war against indigenous people historically and (b) committed acts of violence against civilians.
- (8) What steps is the ACT Government taking to ensure women and Indigenous people in particular, and marginalised groups more generally, are better represented in the naming of public spaces in the ACT.
- (9) What steps is the Government taking to ensure that Marion Mahoney Griffin is equally commemorated to Walter Burley Griffin.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The four naming options were provided by the ACT Place Names Committee, which provides recommendations to the Minister, or his delegate, on place names for public places on Territory land in the ACT. In the spirit of embracing community participation the City Renewal Authority consulted with the committee to undertake community engagement to select a preferred name for the new park from an approved shortlist. There were almost 1500 votes cast in the public poll on the ACT Government's YourSay website.
- (2) The ACT Place Names Committee considered naming options for the new park including an Indigenous name and the names of men and women. Key criteria for consideration included people who had a proven association with the history of the location, and who contributed to the development of Canberra as the National Capital, with particular reference to central Canberra. In this instance, Dame Sylvia Crowe DBE, was identified by the committee as fitting this criteria in recognition of the significant contribution she made to the design of Commonwealth Park on Lake Burley Griffin.
- (3) The ACT Place Names Committee gave detailed consideration to the name 'Bindermarran' but was not included in the final shortlist. It is the Committee's understanding that Bindermarran was the first Aboriginal person to have their name recorded in the English language as being directly associated with Cambray/Canberry. The Committee was unable to substantiate the provenance of the name to ensure the wishes of the relevant Aboriginal community were respected. Importantly, the Committee could not be sure about any cultural sensitivities associated with offering the name to the public. The Committee is intending to further research Bindermarran and to look for suitable opportunities to commemorate his name.
- (4) The ACT Place Names Committee did not include the name of an Indigenous person or Indigenous word in the shortlist as available research did not identify suitable names with an established historical association with the location, or names considered suitable for the type and character of the public park being named.

- (5) The City Renewal Authority is not responsible for the naming of public places within its precinct. The ACT Place Names Committee is responsible for assessing the suitability of eminent Australians and Australian flora, or things characteristic of Australia, for commemoration in ACT nomenclature in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Place Names Act 1989*. The committee provides recommendations to the Minister (or Minister's delegate) for the naming of divisions (suburbs) and public places on Territory land within the ACT.
- (6) Of the public parks and roads named in the last three years under the provisions of the *Public Place Names Act 1989*:
- (a) three public parks were named following community engagement processes;
  - (b) 69 women and 71 men have been commemorated;
  - (c) the number named after deceased people who identified as being part of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex and Queer community cannot be measured as the ACT Place Names do not capture this information;
  - (d) the number named after deceased people who identified as being 'a person of colour' cannot be measured as the ACT Place Names nomenclature records do not capture this category of information;
  - (e) the names of eleven Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander peoples have been commemorated and also, nine words from Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander vocabulary.
- (7) The *Public Place Names (Naming of public places) Guidelines 2014* provide that if a public place is to be named after a person, reasonable steps are taken to obtain prior permission from relatives, close colleagues or a relevant professional organisation. This consultation and accompanying research by the ACT Place Names Unit did not identify any individuals commemorated in the last three years known to have;
- (a) perpetrated genocide or acts of war against Indigenous people historically and
  - (b) committed acts of violence against civilians.
- (8) The ACT Place Names Committee seeks to commemorate names which are reflective of diverse cultural situations and to improve the gender balance represented in ACT public place names in accordance with the *Public Place Names Act 1989*. When the committee considers nomenclature themes for new divisions it ensures there is sufficient scope to commemorate names to reflect an inclusive community.
- (9) In 2013 the legacy of Marion Mahony Griffin was commemorated in ACT public place names through the naming of the viewing platform on Mt Ainslie as 'Marion Mahony Griffin View'. The government will consider the further commemoration of Marion Mahony Griffin's contribution to Canberra if suitable naming opportunities are identified.

**Animals—poultry industry code  
(Question No 909)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) How many consultation activities did the ACT Government contribute to the Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines Stakeholder Advisory Group during the development of the draft poultry industry code.
- (2) Did the ACT Government provide any written submissions to the Stakeholder Advisory Group; if so, what were the contents of those submissions.
- (3) What policy positions did the ACT Government advance during these negotiations.
- (4) Will the ACT Government make a subsequent written submission to the public consultation on the draft poultry industry code; if so, what will be the recommendations in that submission.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Government participated in the Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG) for the development of the National Poultry Standards and Guidelines.
- (2) The ACT Government did not make any formal submissions and supported the position of the majority of other jurisdictions.
- (3) The ACT did not advance any policy positions, however the ACT has strong measures already in place to protect the welfare of laying hens. Amendments to the *Animal Welfare Act* were introduced in 2013 to improve and protect animal welfare by outlawing factory farming practices, namely battery cages for egg production.
- (4) On 26 February 2018, Shane Rattenbury, Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety and I provided a joint letter to Animal Health Australia on the proposed Australian Animal Welfare Standards and Guidelines for Poultry. The joint letter indicated the Government's support for promoting high standards for animal welfare as well as opportunities for informed consumer choice.

The joint letter noted that the proposed guidelines no longer refer to criteria evidencing free-range conditions for laying hens. Instead, they introduce generalised requirements for caged and non-caged birds. This change would be inconsistent with the ACT's *Eggs (Labelling and Sale) Act 2001* (The Act) and the proposed *Australian Consumer Law (Free Range Egg Labelling) Information Standard 2017*. The Act and proposed Information Standard require clear labelling of free-range eggs to inform consumer choices.

The joint letter also expressed concern that the absence of free-range criteria had implications for the ability of consumers to make fully informed choices when purchasing eggs.

### **Children and young people—foster care (Question No 910)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to respite care for carers of children in out-of-home care, what funded respite options exist for foster carers seeking support while providing care for children in out-of-home care.

- (2) What unfunded services exist for foster carers seeking support while providing care for children in out-of-home care and do these same provisions exist for kinship carers.
- (3) If kinship carers are unable to access these funded options, what other funded options are available to them.
- (4) What actions are the ACT Government taking to provide support for kinship carers in the community.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A range of respite support options are made available to foster and kinship carers through ACT Together as required, and in the best interests of the child and the caring family. ACT Together maintains a pool of respite foster carers who are asked to commit to a 12 month respite placement of one weekend per month. In recognition of the specific needs of some placements, ACT Together funds external referrals for respite, such as camps. Respite for carers in some circumstances can be provided in a therapeutic way that supports the attachment and bond between carer and child. This can include services such as babysitting and house cleaning.
- (2) ACT Together is funded to provide services for both kinship and foster carers. They provide services for all foster carers and for kinship carers who care for children and young people on long-term court orders. These services include case management, debriefing, advocacy, training and referral to other services as needed. Therapeutic supports including counselling and training are provided for both foster and kinship carers through ACT Together's therapeutic service. For kinship carers this includes free family and individual counselling. Both foster carers and long-term kinship carers receive the same level of support and consistent, coordinated case management services.

Carers ACT provides a Kinship and Foster Care Advocacy Support Service to provide independent support and advice to assist carers in their caring role and resolve issues with service providers and/or Child and Youth Protection Services (CYPS).

*A Step Up for Our Kids* has also introduced a range of additional supports for carers to assist them in their caring role. These supports include:

- i. training for kinship and foster carers on how to provide trauma-informed care to vulnerable children and young people;
  - ii. ensuring carers are provided with appropriate information and support right from the start of the placement by providing children entering care with a therapeutic assessment; and
  - iii. ensuring that carers have access to key health information about the child or young person in their care through the provision of Health Passports.
- (3) Kinship carers are able to access all services listed in the responses to questions 1 and 2.

For kinship carers caring for children on short-term orders, respite support can be provided by respite carers from ACT Together. This is requested via the CYPS placement coordinator and is dependent on availability of respite carers.

Kinship carers can also identify family or close friends for respite. If support is provided through a family arrangement it is unfunded, but if it is through a formal request for ongoing respite it is assessed and funded by CYPS.

- (4) In addition to the services outlined in the preceding questions, the CYPS Assessment and Support Team (Kinship) provides phone and face to face support to those kinship carers they directly case manage.

In 2018, the Connect Kin Program commenced which is providing a trauma informed, attachment-based 8 week group program for kinship carers with a child in their care aged 8 – 16 years who is displaying complex trauma behaviour. The Connect Kin Program is a joint program between ANU and CYPS and is open to kinship carers supported by both CYPS and ACT Together.

The Australian Childhood Foundation provides training for kinship carers, which includes foundation trauma training and life story work for kinship carers.

Kinship carers are able to access dedicated playgroups and informal networking groups to provide peer support. These are coordinated by both ACT Together and Carers ACT.

CYPS also refers kinship carers to community supports including:

- i. Relationships Australia which provides free family and individual counselling to kinship carers; and
- ii. Support through child and family centres, family support services and youth support services.

The ACT Government has allocated \$250,000 to the ACT Carers Strategy, which is being developed using a deliberative democracy process. A Carers Voice Panel, comprising carers and members of the broader community met in 2017 to deliberate on their vision for a carer friendly Canberra, the outcomes we want to see for carers and what our shared priorities should be. This included Kinship Carers, whose stories were listened to with great interest by other panel members, and informed the Carers Voice Panel Report.

I launched the Carers Voice Panel Report and their Vision, Outcomes and Priorities Statement in December. A three year Action Plan, that will deliver on the vision, outcomes and priorities is currently being developed.

---

### **Planning—Manuka Oval (Question No 911)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What was the reason for the use of call-in powers in December 2017 to fast-track the Manuka Oval media and broadcast centre.
- (2) What was the urgency to proceed with the project despite considerable concern and objection from the local community.

- (3) What community consultation and involvement was, and will be, involved in the approval and construction of the Manuka Oval Media Centre moving forward.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

1. I have used my call-in powers in this instance because I considered the proposal will provide a substantial public benefit, particularly to enhance the facilities at Manuka Oval, but also to benefit the wider Canberra community. The provision of a much needed modern broadcast and media facility will serve our economic sustainability goals by capitalising on economic opportunities that are associated with modern sporting venues that will attract national and international events. The provision of this facility will also serve our social sustainability goals by further enhancing the great place that Manuka Oval already is. The newly enhanced Manuka Oval will continue to meet the diverse recreational needs of our residents, the needs of visitors to our city, but will further connect our city and community to a much wider audience nationally and internationally. The proposed development will promote high quality, creative design, and innovation in an existing urban and landscape setting, while safeguarding the heritage and iconic values it holds for the Territory. The use of my ability to 'call-in' this development application will contribute to the timely and considered construction of the facility, whilst preserving the important heritage and environmental values present at the locality.
2. The urgency to proceed with the project revolved around timely construction of the facility, the need to secure, and the ability to deliver a sports broadcasting facility for Canberra to host international events – particularly international cricket test matches, but also major AFL events. Hosting such events require significant advance planning, commitment and certainty that the venue will be at the required standard during the relevant sporting season. The media and broadcast centre will be an integrated component of the Manuka Oval sport facilities. Representations and objections received from the local community during public notification of the development application were thoroughly considered in the assessment process, and my decision provided a response to key issues.
3. A three-staged community engagement process was undertaken by the applicant prior to lodgement of the development application at the beginning of 2017. Stage 1 involved drafting guiding principles for design of the media centre, and Stage 2 sought feedback on draft designs. These stages included letterbox drops, two community workshops, two drop-in sessions, online feedback, and an opportunity for email and written submissions. Stage 3 involved engaging with the community about final designs and changes made to the design following Stage 2 engagement.

The proposal was then lodged as a development application and publicly notified for three weeks as required under the *Planning and Development Act 2007*. The public notification period was extended for an additional week to provide the community with the best possible opportunity to comment without impacting the statutory timeframes. The proposed design was also presented to the newly formed interim Design Review Panel (DRP) which was co-chaired by the ACT Government Architect and the acting Chief Executive of the National Capital Authority during the course of the development application, and prior to final endorsement.

The development application has now been approved and no further community consultation is envisaged or required. However, targeted notification and consultation

may be undertaken by the contractors or agencies involved in the construction phase, for example for verge works and temporary parking arrangements.

---

**Planning—Manuka Oval  
(Question No 912)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Tourism and Major Events, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Urban Renewal*):

- (1) Did a ministerial media release of 5 August 2016 titled “Government commits to new masterplan for Manuka Oval” state that “A panel of community representatives will advise the Government on a detailed masterplan for Manuka Oval” and that “an expression of interest for panel membership will be advertised within the next six weeks”, if so, what is the terms of reference for the community panel.
- (2) What is/ was the membership of the panel.
- (3) When was the panel established.
- (4) How often has the panel met.
- (5) Does the panel remain active.
- (6) What were the results of its consultation.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1-6) The Government is committed to a new masterplan for the Manuka Oval precinct. At this stage, the formation of the community panel has been deferred pending the completion of the Manuka Oval media and broadcast facilities. This timing also avoids any confusion arising from the National Capital Authority’s review of the Development Control Plan for the area. Any future development will be guided by the community through the development of the master plan.
- 

**Director of Public Prosecutions—staff  
(Question No 913)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the current workload for staff, including the Director, for the Office of the ACT Director of Public Prosecutions (ODPP).
- (2) What proportion of staff, including the Director, are routinely working overtime or overloading on casework.
- (3) What proportion of time does the Director spend directly on casework, case management or personal handling of briefs, as opposed to policy, management and oversight tasks.

- (4) What proportion of total briefs are managed directly by the Director compared against delegated to other solicitors or briefed out.
- (5) Given the recent announcement of additional funding and staff resourcing for ODPP, will the new staffing reduce the total work/ caseload on existing solicitors or will the new staff be working on completely separate work.
- (6) How many additional staff and how much additional funding would ODPP require to reduce work/ caseload to an acceptable level.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions is managed independently and all information about management, staffing, and workload is available directly through the Director of Public Prosecutions and their annual reports.

The Government is committed to ensuring that the Director of Public Prosecutions is adequately resourced to undertake its important role in the justice system, and that resourcing decisions about the DPP and other actors in the justice system are made coherently and from the perspective that changes to each will affect the entire justice system.

The \$970,000 announced in the Mid-Year Budget Review for the Director of Public Prosecutions will provide for specialist resources to conduct confiscation of criminal assets matters. The Government is currently considering additional funding for the Director of Public Prosecutions as part of the 2018-19 budget process.

### **Environment—pesticides (Question No 915)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) What is the current regulation of pesticide use in the ACT.
- (2) What are the current obligations on the recording of use of pesticides and are these obligations the same for residents, businesses and government; if not, how do they differ.
- (3) Does the ACT Government's approach to pesticide regulation align with national or international best practice.
- (4) Against what benchmarks does the ACT Government assess the efficacy of its management of pesticides.
- (5) When was the last review of the ACT Government Insecticide Guidelines undertaken.
- (6) What were the results of that review.
- (7) How often are reviews of the Guidelines undertaken.



- (8) Which ACT Government directorates, agencies or services use pesticides, which pesticides do they use and in what (a) quantity, (b) frequency and (c) location.
- (9) Do any ACT Government service, agency or contractor use neonicotinoids or similar chemicals, linked to reductions of bee populations.
- (10) What training is provided by the ACT Government to ACT Government employees on the use of and recording practices for pesticides.
- (11) What training is required of commercial providers in the ACT in relation to the use of and recording practices for pesticides.
- (12) Does the ACT Government have any plans to implement a plant procurement policy which would require suppliers to align with pesticides regulation in the ACT.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Agricultural and veterinary (Agvet) chemicals must be used in accordance with Part 6 of the *Environment Protection Regulation 2005* which specifies they must be used in accordance with their approved label or an off label permit. These conditions are set by the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA), the national regulator. It is illegal to use a chemical which is not registered by the APVMA.

The commercial use of Agvet chemicals is a Class A activity under the *Environment Protection Act 1997* (the EP Act) and a person must not undertake this activity unless they hold an environmental authorisation issued by the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) (see answer to question 10).

- (2) There are currently no legislative requirements for record keeping in the ACT.
- (3) ACT Government's approach to pesticide regulation aligns with national best practice. Commercial operators licensed by the EPA are required to hold nationally accredited competencies delivered by registered training organisations and it is a requirement for all users, both commercial and non-commercial, to use Agvet chemicals in accordance with their conditions of registration which are set by the national regulator the APVMA.
- (4) The regulation of Agvet chemicals in the ACT is similar to that undertaken in other jurisdictions. Notwithstanding this the ACT, along with all jurisdictions, is participating in a Council of Australian Governments reform project to develop a single national framework to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the regulation of agricultural chemicals and veterinary medicines.
- (5) There is no ACT Insecticide Guideline. Agvet chemical use is regulated under the EP Act and associated regulation. As noted in the answer to question 4 the ACT Government is participating in a national reform project looking to develop a single national framework. It is envisaged through this work that there will be changes to the ACT regulatory model.

(6) N/A

(7) N/A

- (8) Please see individual Directorate responses at Attachment A.
- (9) Some ACT Government services, agencies and contractors use neonicotinoids or similar chemicals. All neonicotinoids registered for use in Australia have been through the APVMA's robust chemical risk assessment process and are safe and effective provided products are used in accordance with the label instructions. The APVMA uses an evidence based, weight-of-evidence approach to risk assessments, which consider the full range of risks and take into account studies of the environment, including the impact on non-target species, such as bees, and how these risks can be minimised through clear instructions, restricted uses and safety directions.
- (10) All business (including ACT government agencies) who hold a current environmental authorisation must ensure that all personnel using Agvet chemicals are suitably skilled and have successfully achieved minimum competency standards. These competencies are nationally accredited standards which are delivered by Registered Training Organisations and cover weed spraying, urban pest control, timber pest treatment, fumigation, vertebrate pest management and aerial application.

As part of the Council of Australian Governments reform, work is being undertaken on harmonising minimum competency standards for fee for service providers.

- (11) See answer to question 2. However for quality assurance purposes individual Directorates would require their contractors to keep records.
- (12) As noted in the answer to question 1, all Agvet chemical use (both domestic and commercial) must be in accordance with Part 6 of the *Environment Protection Regulation 2005*.

*(Copies of the attachments are available at the Chamber Support Office).*

### **Clubs—data collection (Question No 916)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Attorney-General*):

- (1) In relation to clubs collecting personal, private data by scanning drivers licences, what do clubs in the ACT need to collect in terms of identifying data in order to satisfy their legal or regulatory obligations.
- (2) How long is this data retained.
- (3) How secure are these systems.
- (4) Does the ACT Government require a specific or minimum level of encryption or data protection to be in place before clubs can collect this data.
- (5) What safeguards are in place to ensure private or identifying data (a) is not on-sold to commercial data services and (b) are not stored in vulnerable or compromised systems.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Clubs are required to verify identity and membership to meet their obligations under gaming and alcohol regulatory frameworks in the ACT. Only members, temporary members, and signed-in guests may play gaming machines or purchase alcohol at clubs.

Clubs must comply with any applicable requirements of the Australian Privacy Principles (APPs) under the *Privacy Act 1988* (the Privacy Act) when collecting, using, disclosing and storing personal information.

The Privacy Act applies only to entities with a gross turnover of more than \$3 million per annum.

However, smaller clubs with gaming machines that are otherwise exempt from the Privacy Act have obligations under the APPs because they are handling personal information as reporting entities under the *Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2006* and its Regulations and Rules (AML/CTF obligations).

Under the AML/CTF obligations, clubs with 16 or more electronic gaming machines are required to:

- enrol with AUSTRAC
- adopt and maintain an AML/CTF program
- report suspicious matters to AUSTRAC
- keep transaction records.

Clubs with 15 or fewer electronic gaming machines are exempt from the requirement to have an AML/CTF program, however, they are still required to enrol with AUSTRAC, report suspicious matters and keep transaction records.

Clubs must collect and verify the identity of customers:

- who are paid out prize winnings of \$10,000 or more; or
- about whom the club's enhanced customer due diligence program requires the club to obtain and verify customer information (such as where a customer is high risk or the club has formed a suspicion about certain behaviour or activities).

For AUSTRAC guidance material for pubs and clubs, see <http://www.austrac.gov.au/pubs-and-clubs%20-gaming-machines>. This guidance material specifically includes scanning and saving government-issued identification documents as an example of compliance with AML/CTF 'Know Your Customer' requirements (pages 26 and 27, *Preparing and implementing an anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing (AML/CTF) program: Pubs & clubs*).

- (2) Clubs must comply with any applicable laws about the retention of data but the applicable laws vary. Clubs with gaming machines must retain customer identification records for at least seven years to comply with AML/CTF obligations.

- (3) As with other private and non-government sector entities, the ACT does not regulate the collection and storage of private information by clubs. Where applicable, the Australian Privacy Principles and Commonwealth laws regulate the collection, storage, and use of personal information by entities other than the ACT Government (and its contracted entities).
- (4) The ACT does not set technical specifications for the storage of data by clubs as the privacy rules and regulations that apply to non-government entities are set by the Commonwealth.
- (5) As noted in the responses to the previous questions, the legal and regulatory obligations of clubs in relation to information they collect depends upon the provisions of any relevant legislation that applies to them. There is not a general provision in ACT legislation setting information management standards for clubs. Provisions of the Privacy Act and the APPs, as they apply to a club, or other legislation imposing requirements for the purposes of particular regulatory schemes may be relevant to the treatment of information by clubs, including whether there are any limits on disclosure to third parties.

### **Housing—homelessness services (Question No 917)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the \$100 000 noted in the Community Services Directorate Annual Report 2016-2017 allocated to “fund professional development initiatives for frontline housing and homelessness services to improve organisational capacity and staff capability”, with further notes that funding would be delivered in the 2018-2019 Budget in the context of the closure of Inanna and Capital Community Housing, what form will this training or professional development take.
- (2) Who will provide this training or professional development.
- (3) Which organisations and people will be able to access it.
- (4) Is this training for people with specific roles (eg tenancy managers, property managers, leadership team) or for staff as a whole.
- (5) Will board members and volunteers of participating organisations will be able to access this training or professional development.
- (6) What consultation has been conducted with housing and homelessness services about what they need in terms of professional development.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) Following the closure of Inanna and Capital Community Housing in 2016, the ACT Government recognised that frontline housing and homelessness services required additional support to enhance organisational capability and staff capacity.

For that purpose, the 2017-18 ACT Government Budget allocated \$100,000 for the professional development of frontline specialist housing and homelessness workers, and their organisations, to build capability and service innovation.

Housing ACT is working with the Joint Pathways Executive to develop a strategic training and development framework to identify fundamental skills required of the sector. This will inform a dedicated training and professional development program which will be delivered to the sector in 2018-19.

- (2) Housing ACT and the Joint Pathways Executive are currently developing a strategic training and professional development framework for the sector. As this initiative is new in development, it is too early to advise who will deliver the program.
- (3) Organisations and staff within the ACT Specialist Homelessness Sector, and organisations registered as ACT community housing providers, will have access to programs within the dedicated training and professional development program in 2018-19.
- (4) As the initiative is in the early stages of development, it is too early to advise if the program will target people in specific roles (for example, tenancy managers, property managers, leadership team) or staff as a whole.
- (5) It is essential that board members have the necessary skills and abilities to administer an organisation. For this reason, board members and volunteers are a specific focus of the ACT Community Services Industry Strategy 2016 – 2026. The \$100,000 Budget initiative will not duplicate activities under Community Industry Strategy. Board members and volunteers will be able to access the dedicated training and professional development program in 2018-19.
- (6) Housing ACT is working closely with the Joint Pathways Executive to deliver this Budget initiative. Together, they are consulting the ACT Specialist Homelessness Sector to identify the fundamental skills for the sector. The strategic training and development framework is also a standing agenda item at each Joint Pathways members meeting, which is attended by staff and management from the ACT Specialist Homelessness Sector every six weeks.

---

### **Public housing—renewal program (Question No 918)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to the Public Housing Renewal Program, can the Minister provide the number of apartments, townhouses, and detached houses that have been constructed to date as part of the Public Housing Renewal Program, broken down by the (a) number of bedrooms and (b) number of Class C adaptable dwellings, or compliance with Liveable Housing Design guidelines (none, Silver, Gold, or Platinum).
- (2) Can the Minister provide the final number of apartments, townhouses and detached houses that will be constructed as part of the Public Housing Renewal Program, broken down by the (a) number of bedrooms and (b) number of Class C adaptable

dwellings, or compliance with Liveable Housing Design guidelines (none, Silver, Gold, or Platinum).

- (3) Can the Minister provide the average construction cost per dwelling (not including land value or acquisition) of new public housing stock that has been built to date as part of the Public Housing Renewal Program, specifically, the cost of apartments, townhouses, and detached houses broken down by the (a) number of bedrooms and (b) number of Class C adaptable dwellings, or compliance with Liveable Housing Design guidelines (none, Silver, Gold, or Platinum).

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) As at 27 February 2018, a total of 379 dwellings have been constructed (excluding the 283 dwellings which have been purchased) for the public housing renewal program as follows:

Category	Apartments	Townhouses	Detached houses	Total
<b>1 bedroom</b>	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>2 bedroom</b>	250	38	6	<b>294</b>
<b>3 bedroom</b>	1	19	63	<b>83</b>
<b>4 bedroom</b>	0	0	2	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>379</b>

Category	Apartments	Townhouses	Detached houses	Total
<b>Class C Adaptable</b>	48	38	0	<b>86</b>
<b>Liveable Gold</b>	203	19	71	<b>293</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>379</b>

- (2) As at 27 February 2018, a total of 393 dwellings are programmed for construction for the public housing renewal program (noting that this excludes dwellings completed to date and that a number of these dwellings are subject to planning and development approvals):

Category	Apartments	Townhouses	Detached houses	Total
<b>1 bedroom</b>	8	0	0	<b>8</b>
<b>2 bedroom</b>	236	105	26	<b>367</b>
<b>3 bedroom</b>	0	0	18	<b>18</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>393</b>

Category	Apartments	Townhouses	Detached houses	Total
<b>Class C Adaptable</b>	41	34	0	<b>75</b>
<b>Liveable Gold</b>	203	71	44	<b>318</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>393</b>

- (3) The Public Housing Renewal Taskforce is still undertaking tender processes for the remaining dwellings yet to be constructed. In order to prevent undue influence on the competitive nature of these processes, it is preferred that average construction costs

per dwelling type are not made public at this time. A more detailed analysis can be provided once all tenders have been awarded. The average costs for Tranches 1 and 2 of the public housing renewal program (which are now completed and included the construction of dwellings to replace Owen Flats, Allawah Court, Karuah and the Red Hill Housing Precinct) were \$245,425.75.

---

### **Housing—multi-unit complexes (Question No 919)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the current timeframe for releasing the resources to support multi-unit living that have been developed by Access Canberra in consultation with stakeholders including the Owners Corporation Network.
- (2) Will these resources be updated regularly to ensure their currency.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Access Canberra has been working with key stakeholders, including the Owners Corporation Network (the OCN), to develop resources for persons purchasing or living in a units plan, including:
  - a general guide which outlines the legal and other responsibilities of persons living in units plans;
  - a more specific guide supporting understanding around the maintenance responsibilities in multi-unit residential settings; and
  - two pamphlets for people who are considering purchasing a unit title residence.

The guides will be informative as well as engaging and targeted at those already living or renting in multi-unit settings, prospective buyers or renters and owners corporations and executive committees.

Stakeholder consultation to ensure these resources meet the needs of the ACT community takes time. Access Canberra is currently waiting on input from the OCN to a request for comments on the general guide. Once this input is received Access Canberra will quickly progress further stakeholder engagement with a view to having the suite of resources made available to the public in late March 2018.

- (2) Access Canberra will monitor changes to legislation around multi-unit living to ensure these guides and pamphlets are up-to-date and continue to meet the needs of the ACT community.
- 

### **Municipal services—tree vandalism (Question No 921)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the ACT Government's policy on the vandalism of trees.
- (2) How many instances of repeated or prolonged vandalism of trees has the ACT Government been made aware of over the last twelve months.
- (3) How many specific instances of repeated or prolonged vandalism of (a) heritage or protected trees and (b) young trees in parks or verges in new suburbs.
- (4) What enforcement actions have the ACT Government taken against tree vandalism in the last twelve months.
- (5) Does the ACT Government undertake targeted education campaigns in tree vandalism hotspots on the repercussions of tree vandalism (for example, a letter to residents on a street with young verge trees on the heat island effect).

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) replaces vandalised trees that cannot be saved by formative pruning. TCCS will seek to prosecute offenders where sufficient evidence is available. Where vandalism is ongoing TCCS will only replace vandalised trees once.
- (2) Approximately 100 developing trees were damaged by vandals during the past 12 months including several examples involving repeated vandalism.
- (3) a) Nil examples on heritage or protected trees.  
b) Some young trees near the playground in Fadden Pines and some trees in public open space near Griffith and Manuka shops and in Braddon have been repeatedly vandalised during the past year.
- (4) No offenders have been identified so no enforcement action has been possible.
- (5) TCCS has undertaken targeted awareness campaigns previously when vandalism hot spots have been identified. TCCS has used signage and letter box drops to bring issues to the attention of adjacent residents and media releases to bring issues to the attention of the wider community.

---

### **Motor vehicles—registration (Question No 922)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) Does the ACT Government offer concessions on vehicle registration renewals to people on low-incomes; if so, what is the eligibility criteria for those concessions; if not, did the ACT Government at any point offer those concessions and why did they discontinue those concessions.
- (2) Do any other states or territories offer concessions on vehicle registration renewals for people with a Centrelink Low-Income Health Care Card.



- (3) What concessions, subsidies or offsets are available for compulsory third party insurance, paid in conjunction with registration fees.
- (4) Has the Government received any concerns or complaints that the cost of compulsory third party insurance remains a barrier for low-income individuals despite vehicle registration concessions.
- (5) What actions has the Government taken to reduce the impact of compulsory third party insurance on low-income individuals.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Yes –
  - Holders of current Centrelink and Department of Veterans' Affairs (DVA) Pension Concession Cards are entitled to 100 per cent discount on registration; and
  - Holders of ACT Seniors Cards are entitled to 10 per cent discount on registration. Seniors with gas or electric powered vehicles are entitled to 28 per cent discount on registration.
- (2) Yes – Low-Income Health Care Card holders are eligible for the following concessions in other states and territories:
  - In Victoria, 50 per cent discount on vehicle registrations; and
  - In Tasmania, specific discounts for registration of motor vehicles (\$49.10), trailers (\$25.50), and motorcycles (\$44.10).
- (3) Compulsory third-party (CTP) insurance is a statutory insurance scheme underwritten by private insurers, designed to cover the at-fault driver to ensure he/she is not personally responsible for compensating injured persons. As such, to ensure that compensation (payable out of premiums) is available to the injured parties, and the scheme is fully funded, concessions are not provided directly to people on low-incomes.

However, the ACT's CTP insurance scheme is a 'community rated' scheme, with all motorists for each vehicle class paying the same amount for CTP insurance regardless of their individual risk profile.

'Community rated' schemes provide equality and affordability, and reduce the cost of CTP for drivers with differing circumstances (such as young and older drivers), a number of whom may also be low income individuals:

- Individual circumstances, such as the age of the driver, the driving record, the age of their vehicle, and the vehicle's location, do not vary the premiums payable by individuals.

Since competition was introduced to the CTP scheme on 15 July 2013, CTP premiums have fallen on average by \$40.23, or 6.8% - the consumer price index has increased by 7.0% over the same period. Competition has also delivered a better range of products and enhanced coverage, such as, at-fault driver cover being offered by most insurers. The benefits from competition have flowed to all motorists, including low-income individuals.

- (4) The public makes contact with the CTP Regulator on a range of CTP insurance matters, with a number of complaints / queries raising the cost of CTP insurance.

Over the period 2015-16 to 2017-18 (to date), 20.0% of the complaints / queries received by the CTP Regulator (6 out of 30 complaints / queries) raised concerns with the cost of CTP insurance.

- (5) The Government has reduced the impact of CTP insurance on low-income individuals by:
- Providing motorists with the option of paying a vehicle registration and CTP insurance for 3, 6 or 12 months;
  - Ensuring the CTP insurance scheme is a 'community rated' scheme; and
  - Introducing competition, which has resulted in CTP premiums falling on average by \$40.23, or 6.8% since 15 July 2013.

### **Budget—playgrounds (Question No 923)**

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the total funding allocation for (a) new playground construction and (b) playgrounds repair in the 2017-18 Budget.
- (2) How does this figure change over the forward estimates.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) \$100,000 for a new community park at Giralang and (b) \$477,000 for high priority playground upgrade (repair) work that includes rubber softfall replacements, bark installations and minor modifications to playground elements.
- (2) Forward year estimates for capital funding are unavailable for (a) new playground construction and (b) playground upgrades (repairs).

### **Municipal services—playgrounds (Question No 924)**

**Mrs Jones** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

Are there any plans to provide the Waramanga community with a playground or nature based playground; if not, what is the rationale for this.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The Government is considering a range of feedback from residents across Canberra regarding additional playground facilities, and this includes feedback from the Waramanga community.

I note that there are four existing playgrounds within the suburb and another four located close by in the neighbouring suburbs of Stirling and Fisher.

---

**Municipal services—nature strips  
(Question No 925)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the status of the proposed new guideline on the use of nature strips in residential areas.
- (2) What is the status of the ACAT's consideration legislation relevant to the proposed new guidelines and when is ACAT due to hand down a decision.
- (3) When will the new guidelines be released publically.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Finalisation of the Nature Strip Guidelines is pending the findings of the ACT Administrative and Civil Appeals Tribunal (ACAT) relating to the *Public Unleased Land Act 2013* (PULA) and unapproved verge developments.
  - (2) ACAT's decision is pending. No update on the timeframe has been provided for handing down a decision.
  - (3) The Nature Strip Guidelines will be publically released following ACAT's decision and findings and subsequent updates to the Guidelines as required.
- 

**Transport—provisional drivers licence review  
(Question No 926)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety*):

- (1) What are the full terms of reference for the review into provisional driver licences in the Australian Capital Territory.
- (2) What will be included in the review into provisional driver licences, including (a) which other jurisdictions will be examined, (b) criteria that the Australian Capital Territory and other jurisdictions will be measured against, (c) What sources of information will be relied upon and (d) any other relevant factors or key components of the review.
- (3) Who will be conducting the review into provisional driver licences, if (a) an ACT Government body, identify the responsible body and (b) third-parties or external contractors will be involved in any capacity, outline (i) the nature of their involvement, (ii) the contract name, contract number, and value of any contracts

undertaken, (iii) the method of procurement or selection for participation and (iv) any other relevant information regarding selection or participation.

- (4) Will the review into provisional driver licences involve any public consultation; if so, (a) what form will the public consultation take, (b) how will it be advertised, (c) the length of the consultation period and (d) whether it will be run through the ACT Government or through an external entity, and if an external entity the supplier and the cost; if not, why not.
- (5) When is the review into provisional driver licences scheduled to be completed.
- (6) Will the results and findings of the review into provisional driver licences be made public; if so, where will they be published; if not, why not.

**Mr Rattenbury:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The review of the ACT Graduated Licensing Scheme is an action item under the ACT Road Safety Action Plan 2016-20 (Action 21). The review is being conducted internally by the Road Safety Policy team within the Justice and Community Safety Directorate. No third parties or external contractors have been engaged.

The review has been guided by the Australian Graduated Licensing Scheme Policy Framework (the national framework), endorsed by the Transport and Infrastructure Council in November 2014. The national framework is based on an extensive review of evidence and incorporates a tiered approach to best practice, and is designed to encourage and guide improvements to Graduated Licensing Schemes for all states and territories.

The ACT discussion paper will incorporate an analysis of best practice evidence, ACT crash data and community feedback in proposing a range of reforms.

Public consultation will include an invitation for public submissions. It is anticipated to commence in the coming months, coordinated and funded by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate, with use of the ACT Government's social media accounts, the 'Yoursay' consultation website and Our Canberra newsletters. Following the consultation period, the Justice and Community Safety Directorate will assess outcomes and make recommendations to me about planning and timing of implementation.

### **Canberra—flags and banners (Question No 927)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Economic Development, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) How much revenue was received from the hire of flags and/or banner poles under the Flags and Banners Operational Guidelines in the financial years (a) 2014-15, (b) 2015-16, (c) 2016-17 and (d) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) Who hired flag and/or banner sites and what was the purpose for the hire in the financial years (a) 2014-15, (b) 2015-16, (c) 2016-17 and (d) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) When were the Flags and Banners Operational Guidelines issued.

- (4) Who approved the Flags and Banners Operational Guidelines.
- (5) When were the costs for hiring flags and/or banner poles last revised, who was involved in the last revision and were there provisions for community input in revising the costs.
- (6) On average, how many people are required to undertake a flag and/or banner installation.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The answer to question (1) is provided in the attached table.
- (2) The answer to question (2) is provided in the attached table.
- (3) The guidelines were first issued in 2006 and were updated in 2012 to the current version.
- (4) ACT Property Group.
- (5) The hiring fees are reviewed at the beginning of each financial year by ACT Property Group. There is no provision for community input, the fees are based on cost recovery.
- (6) Two.

*(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).*

---

### **Asbestos—management issues (Question No 928)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) What steps is the Government taking to maintain the asbestos dump at the old Mugga Quarry.
- (2) Is the Government providing any funding to maintain the asbestos dump at the old Mugga Quarry; if so, provide a breakdown of this funding; if not, why not.
- (3) Were the costs of the ongoing maintenance of the asbestos dump considered in the 2017-2018 Budget.
- (4) Has the Government provided funding for any maintenance work at the asbestos dump; if so, outline and breakdown how this funding has been used; if not, why not.
- (5) What are the short term and long term implications of maintaining the asbestos dump.
- (6) Does the presence of the asbestos dump pose any health concerns for people in the old Mugga Quarry or surrounding regions; if so, outline the Government's plans to address these concerns; if not, outline the steps the Government has taken to ensure that the asbestos dump does not pose any health concerns.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) In accordance with established health and environmental protection requirements the asbestos-contaminated material from the old Canberra hospital that was interred within the Mugga 2 quarry was capped with soil and a retention dam installed to capture runoff within the quarry void. Since this time the site security fencing has been upgraded to secure the site from public access.
- (2) Frequent monitoring of the Mugga 2 quarry occurs following rain events to inspect the quarry area and surrounding infrastructure. The cost of the monitoring is negligible—less than \$1,000 per month.
- (3) Refer to question 2 response.
- (4) Funding is allocated for necessary site maintenance which includes monitoring and stormwater controls as required. Less than \$1,000 per month is required for monitoring. Stormwater controls have recently been maintained at a cost of approximately \$4,000.

Capital funding of \$2.939m was allocated in 2014-15 for progressive rehabilitation of the quarry over the next 15-25 years.

- (5) The Mugga 2 quarry in its current form requires minimal maintenance. The Mugga 2 quarry will be rehabilitated through the progressive landfilling of inert material, as approved by the NCA, including clean soil, non-friable asbestos impacted soil and other inert waste materials. Environment Protection Authority (EPA) approval will be required for the acceptance of these materials.

At the completion of the filling of the quarry void, the area encapsulating the quarry will be incorporated into the Mt Mugga Mugga Nature Reserve. By this time the asbestos material from the old Canberra hospital will be at least 30m below final surface levels.

- (6) No, the dumped asbestos is currently covered with soil which protects the quarry area and surrounding regions.

### **Municipal services—mowing (Question No 929)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What were the total costs associated with wild grass cutting in the financial years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) What action does the Government take to continuously keep wild grass levels at a minimum.
- (3) Does the Government consult with Fire Services on what areas are given priority to be cut.

- (4) Has the Government varied the frequency of wild grass cutting in the financial year 2017-18 in comparison with previous years; if so, outline the Government's reasoning behind this decision and does the Government seek to reduce costs associated with the cutting of wild grass every financial year.
- (5) What is the amount and the proportion of the total recurrent budget for Transport Canberra and City Services allocated for urban mowing services in (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18 to date.
- (6) What proportion of urban mowing was undertaken by (a) public servants and (b) external contractors in (i) 2015-16, (ii) 2016-17 and (iii) 2017-18 to date.
- (7) What is the total number of complaints or queries received in (a) 2016-17 and (b) 2017-18 to date.
- (8) How many of the complaints or queries referred to in part (7)(a) and (b) were from (a) Belconnen, (b) Gungahlin, (c) Inner North, (d) Inner South, (e) Tuggeranong and (f) Woden Valley and Weston Creek.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The following response relates to grass mowing in open space across the urban area, excluding irrigated sportsgrounds:
- Actual expenditure in 2015-16 was \$7.274m;
  - Actual expenditure in 2016-17 was \$7.430m; and
  - Actual expenditure in 2017-18 to end January 2018 was \$4.929m.
- (2) Grass within suburbs is mown on a four weekly program and arterial roads are mown on a five weekly schedule, weather permitting and at times when the grass growth is sufficient to require mowing.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) No.

(5)

<b>Budget</b>	<b>(a) 2015-16</b>	<b>(b) 2016-17</b>	<b>(c) 2017-18 Jan YTD</b>
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
General Urban Mowing	7,173	7,557	4,751
Sportsground Mowing	1,606	1,675	1,002
<b>Total Mowing</b>	<b>8,779</b>	<b>9,232</b>	<b>5,753</b>

Total Urban Place Management Budget (GPO only)	24,628	25,949	15,235
<b>Proportion of mowing budget vs total budget</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>38%</b>

(6)

	<b>(a) Public servants</b>	<b>(b) External contractors</b>
(i) 2015 – 2016	70%	30%
(ii) 2016 – 2017	70%	30%
(iii) 2017 – 2018 to date	75%	25%

Estimates provided based on hectares mown by the respective labour source.

(7) The scope of this question is unclear can you please clarify.

(8) The scope of this question is unclear can you please clarify.

### **Health—anti-smoking measures (Question No 930)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) How many inspectors are employed by the Government for the purpose of enforcing the *Smoke-Free Public Places Act 2003* (the Act).
- (2) On average, how many inspectors are on duty in smoke-free public areas at any given time in the ACT and what enforcement powers do inspectors have to encourage compliance with the Act.
- (3) How many people have been issued (a) cautions or warnings or (b) fines for smoking in smoke-free public areas.
- (4) What is the value of fines issued to individuals who are found smoking or vaping within smoke-free public areas.
- (5) How many complaints has the Government received from members of the public regarding individuals smoking or vaping within banned areas, how were these complaints made and what steps the Government has taken to address these complaints.
- (6) What are the (a) Government's plans to reduce or prevent individuals from smoking in public areas, (b) specific strategies these plans will employ, (c) costs of enforcing these plans and (d) specific target areas of these plans.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There are presently 19 appointed Officers within Access Canberra whose role is to enforce the provisions of the *Smoke-Free Public Places Act 2003* and a number of other laws regulated by Access Canberra. Members of ACT Police are also authorised persons for enforcement purposes.
- (2) Access Canberra officers are not solely appointed as investigators for the purpose of enforcing the smoking laws within the ACT. Investigators respond to complaints and also check for 'smoke-free' compliance when undertaking other regulatory functions such as liquor licence inspections.

In terms of enforcement powers under the *Smoke-Free Public Places Act 2003* officers can direct a person to stop smoking if they suspect on reasonable grounds that the person is in contravention of the Act. They can also issue an infringement notice, or refer a matter to Court.

- (3) Since the inception of Access Canberra in 2014, two formal written warnings have been issued for breaches of the Act. These were both issued to businesses and related to one instance of not having the appropriate "No Smoking" signage in place and one instance of allowing smoking in an outdoor eating area.



Access Canberra has not issued any infringement fines. Issues have been dealt with through education, engagement and written warnings. Most people will stop smoking when directed to do so.

- (4) Nil fines have been issued.

Infringement amounts payable by an individual found to be contravening the provisions of the Act are detailed in Schedule 1 of the *Magistrates Court (Smoke-Free Public Places Infringement Notices) Regulation 2010*.

- (5) A total of Fifteen (15) complaints have been received by Access Canberra since its inception up until 9 March 2018. Typically these related to smoking in or around eating areas and allegations of people smoking within transport areas that are designated as being smoke-free. Access Canberra has not received any complaints about vaping.

Complaints are received through the Complaints Management Team. In response to complaints, Access Canberra officers will conduct inspections in the area to which the complaint relates (shopping centres, playgrounds and bus stops again being the typical areas). Access Canberra applies its Engage, Educate and Enforce philosophy in response to matters of non-compliance and therefore will attempt to resolve these issues through engagement and education in the first instance.

- (6) The ACT Government has introduced several initiatives over the past several years to reduce smoking rates, including introducing new smoke-free public areas across the Territory.

An updated National Tobacco Strategy Action Plan, which sits under the new National Drug Strategy 2017–2026, is currently being developed by the Commonwealth. ACT Health is actively engaged with the Commonwealth and other jurisdictions in the review process for this Strategy. ACT Health is also currently undertaking targeted consultation on the new ACT Drug Strategy Action Plan, which encompasses alcohol, tobacco and other drugs. The new Drug Strategy Action Plan will align closely with the Government's preventive health agenda and relevant clinical service plans. The Plan will include actions for further reducing the harms of tobacco smoke in the community.

## **Government—expenditure (Question No 931)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the total number of invoices paid by the ACT Government in the 2017-18 financial year to date.
- (2) For invoices paid by the ACT Government in (a) 2014-15, (b) 2015-16 and (c) 2017-18 to date, what is the total number of invoices to the value of (i) under \$10 000, (ii) between \$10 000 to \$12 499, (iii) between \$12 500 to \$24 999, (iv) between \$25 000 to \$49 999, (v) between \$50 000 to \$99 999, (vi) between \$100 000 to \$149 999, (vii) between \$150 000 to \$199 999 and (viii) over \$200 000.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The total number of invoices paid by the ACT Government in the 2017-18 financial year to date (from 1 July 2017 to 31 January 2018) is 180,991.
- (2) Invoices that were paid by the ACT Government in the following years by categories:

Financial Year	<\$10,000	\$10,000-\$12,499	\$12,500-\$24,999	\$25,000-\$49,999	\$50,000-\$99,999	\$100,000-\$149,999	\$150,000-\$199,999	>=\$200,000	Grand Total
2014-15	319,027	4,857	11,689	6,275	3,642	1,109	597	3,117	350,313
2015-16	319,206	4,638	12,118	6,882	3,641	1,188	705	3,034	351,412
2017-18 (July to January)	164,081	2,908	5,877	3,331	2,056	785	390	1,563	180,991

### Transport—bike racks (Question No 932)

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) What is the breakdown of the amount of funding that has been used for new bike racks to date.
- (2) What is breakdown of the number of bike racks installed by the ACT Government for the previous three financial years by (a) suburb and (b) type of bike rack.
- (3) Why has the Government installed bike racks primarily in Braddon despite receiving an equal amount of requests for new bike racks from Watson, City, Greenway and Hall in 2016-17.
- (4) Does the Government have plans to address the requests for new bike racks from suburbs other than Braddon in the ACT; if so, what are these plans and will any extra funding be allocated for the provision of these bike racks; if not, why not.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) As part of the Transport Canberra and City Services Minor New Works program the following bicycle racks were provided:

#### 2015 -2016

Suburb	Rack Type	Number of Racks	Cost
Macquarie	Hoop type	2	\$1,500
Greenway	Hoop type	4	\$3,000
City	City type	3	\$2,250

#### 2016-2017

Suburb	Rack Type	Number of Racks	Cost
Crace	City type	2	\$1,500
Mawson	Hoop type	2	\$1,500
City	City type	8	\$6,000
Braddon	City Type	4	\$3,000

**2017-2018**

Suburb	Rack Type	Number of Racks	Cost
Braddon and City	Parliament type	24	\$11,000
Molonglo Valley	Parliament type	2	\$1,500
Arboretum	Parliament type	3	\$1,500

- (2) See response above.
- (3) Braddon is an attractive cycling destination as it has good linkages to high use on and off-road active travel networks. The bicycle racks were provided in locations that were observed to have high demand and the numbers of bicycles locked to street furniture such as sign posts.
- (4) The provision of bicycle racks is evaluated against requests received from the community or where demand is observed. Bicycle racks are also provided as part of developments or capital works projects.

### **Education—school crossing supervisor program (Question No 933)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Transport and City Services*):

- (1) What specific requirements in the School Crossing Supervisor program are needed for a crossing to be deemed “located on road network adjacent to a school”.
- (2) What is the minimum distance away from a school with a close proximity crossing, for a second school to be deemed to benefit from that crossing.
- (3) What guidelines are followed when asserting whether a school benefits from a school crossing under the program and can the Minister provide a copy of these guidelines.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1) All school and pedestrian crossings on public roads that provide direct access to schools used by infant, primary and special needs children were considered to receive a supervisor as part of the program.

Crossings in school car parks or at traffic signals were not considered as part of the program.

- (2) The School Crossing Supervisor program selection committee agreed that co-located schools will potentially both benefit from the introduction of crossing supervisors. This selection committee included representatives from the Education Directorate. Schools were also consulted to develop the program.

Rather than distance, pedestrian and traffic movements, desire lines, the proximity of shopping precincts, access to public transport and car parking facilities were all considered when assessing the potential benefit of the program.

In addition to assisting children to cross roads safely, supervisors will improve traffic flow and reduce congestion, providing a greater benefit to the local school communities in the vicinity of a supervised crossing.

- (3) A number of factors were considered by the selection committee when determining whether a school will benefit from a crossing supervisor, including the location of amenities like shopping centres and access to transport facilities.

The criteria used to select the priority sites is available on the Transport Canberra website (<https://www.transport.act.gov.au/getting-around/active-travel/active-travel-for-schools/school-crossing-supervisors>).

### **Schools—transportable classrooms (Question No 934)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) How many transportable classrooms are currently in use in ACT public schools, (a) what schools are they located in and (b) when were they installed.
- (2) What additional transportable classroom are to be installed this calendar year and in what schools are they to be located.
- (3) How much has been spent on the purchase and installation of transportable classrooms for the financial years (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There are currently 81 transportable buildings in ACT public schools that provide 145 class room spaces including pre-school spaces across the ACT public school system. This includes the buildings installed at Aranda Primary School, Campbell Primary School, Garran Primary School, Neville Bonner Primary School and Telopea Park School for the commencement of the 2018 school year.

1a and b)

Table 1 shows the schools and the installation years of the transportable classrooms.

<b>School (1a)</b>	<b>Year of installation/relocation (1b)</b>
Amaroo School	2005, 2007 & 2014
Aranda Primary School	2001 & 2017
Black Mountain School	2000, 2008 & 2009
Bonython Primary School	2009
Calwell High School	1994
Calwell Primary School	1990
Campbell Primary School	2018
Carolyn Chisholm School	1980s
Charles Conder Primary School	1990's

School (1a)	Year of installation/relocation (1b)
Cranleigh School	2014
Fadden Primary School	1980's
Farrer Primary School	2001
Florey Primary School	1990's
Franklin Early Childhood School	2013
Fraser Primary School	1981, 2005 & 2007
Garran Primary School	2002, 2016 & 2018
Gold Creek School	2001 & 2017
Gordon Primary	1995
Gowrie Primary School	1980's
Harrison School	2001 & 2009
Lanyon High School	1990's
Miles Franklin Primary School	1984
Monash Primary School	1985
Neville Bonner Primary School	2016 & 2017
Ngunnawal Primary School	2001 & 2014
Palmerston Primary School	2003
Stromlo High School	2007
Telopea Park School	2001 & 2018
Theodore Primary School	1990's
The Woden School	1988

These transportable buildings have been refurbished and upgraded as and when required.

- (2) There will be 22 transportable buildings installed at Narrabundah College in the next six months that will provide classroom spaces, speciality teaching spaces, teacher spaces and associated infrastructure while significant infrastructure redevelopment of the school site is undertaken.

There are currently no other transportable buildings scheduled to be installed at ACT public schools in the remainder of 2018.

All of the transportable classrooms at The Woden School will be removed in 2018 as a result of constructing the new permanent classrooms for the year 11 and 12 students.

- (3) The cost of transportable building is variable depending on:
- The market conditions;
  - If it is a new or relocated building;
  - The number of transportable buildings that are being procured or relocated at any one time;
  - The level of refurbishment required for relocated buildings;
  - The access to the school sites;
  - The topography and access to required services at the school site.

For the above reasons the cost of delivering a two classroom transportable building at a school site can range from \$600,000 (excl GST) to \$1,000,000 (excl GST).

- a) In 2015-16 there was no transportable buildings installed under the capital upgrades program.
  - b) In 2016-17 a budget of \$2.6 million (excl GST) was provided for the provision of transportable buildings.
  - c) In 2017-18 a budget of \$1.8 million (excl GST) was provided for the provision of transportable buildings.
- 

### **Schools—New South Wales students (Question No 935)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) Does the Federal Government contribute to the funding arrangements for NSW students in ACT schools; if so, what is the breakdown of how this funding is allocated.
- (2) How much funding did the ACT Government contribute for NSW students enrolled in ACT schools in (a) 2014-15, (b) 2015-16, (c) 2016-17 and (d) 2017 18 to date.
- (3) How will NSW students be allocated to schools under the recent changes to the rules surrounding NSW students in ACT schools and what guidelines will be followed when allocating NSW Students to ACT schools.
- (4) Will these changes affect any previous funding arrangements; is so, how.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Commonwealth Government provides specific purpose payments (direct grants) to the ACT Government for the education of public school students. The funding is provided on the basis of all students attending ACT public schools including students that reside in NSW.

In addition, the ACT Government receives funding for all services, including education, from the Commonwealth Government through the allocation of GST revenue under the 'Horizontal Fiscal Equalisation' process. The method for determining the funding allocation, administered by the Commonwealth Grants Commission, factors in many considerations and education is only one driver used to allocate funding to all states and territories.

ACT Government funding for all students attending ACT public schools, including students that reside in NSW, is allocated using the Directorate's Student Resource Allocation model which is a needs based funding model.

- (2) ACT public schools are funded based on a holistic approach using a needs based funding model. The funding is provided to meet the needs of the school and student cohort as a whole rather than individual students.

- (3) NSW students will be allocated to schools in the ACT in a similar manner to which ACT students are allocated to ACT schools. The region surrounding the ACT has been divided into a northern and a southern zone. Families living in the northern zone have access to schools located in Belconnen. Families living in the southern zone have access to schools located in Tuggeranong. More detailed advice as provided to parents can be found on the ACT Education Directorate website at the address below:

*[https://www.education.act.gov.au/school\\_education/enrolling\\_in\\_an\\_act\\_public\\_school/nsw-resident-enrolments](https://www.education.act.gov.au/school_education/enrolling_in_an_act_public_school/nsw-resident-enrolments)*

These arrangements are intended to ensure certainty for NSW families enrolling children in ACT public schools during a period of rapidly rising enrolments in the ACT public education system. Families enrolling from NSW in the schools identified in each zone will be subject to the same guidelines as ACT students. However, the ACT government will review the zones if required.

- (4) No. The recent changes to the guidelines regarding NSW residents attending ACT public schools will not impact funding.

### **Schools—New South Wales students (Question No 936)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 16 February 2018:

- (1) How many students considered NSW residents are enrolled in the ACT in (a) preschools, (b) primary schools, (c) high schools, (d) secondary colleges, (e) special schools and (f) mainstream schools' student with a disability.
- (2) How many students considered NSW residents are enrolled in the ACT Belconnen school network in (a) preschools, (b) primary schools, (c) high schools, (d) secondary colleges, (e) special schools and (f) mainstream schools' student with a disability.
- (3) How many students considered NSW residents are enrolled in the ACT North/Gungahlin school network in (a) preschools, (b) primary schools, (c) high schools, (d) secondary colleges, (e) special schools and (f) mainstream schools' student with a disability.
- (4) How many students considered NSW residents are enrolled in the ACT South/Weston school network in (a) preschools, (b) primary schools, (c) high schools, (d) secondary colleges, (e) special schools and (f) mainstream schools' student with a disability.
- (5) How many students considered NSW residents are enrolled in the ACT Tuggeranong school network in (a) preschools, (b) primary schools, (c) high schools, (d) secondary colleges, (e) special schools and (f) mainstream schools' student with a disability.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The table below provides the distribution of NSW resident persons enrolled in ACT public schools and disaggregated by schools network as at the Canberra Public Schools Census August 2017. Please note that there may be slight differences in totals from previously reported figure for 2017 due to different extraction dates for the data.

Question part	Region	Pre-school	Primary school	High school	Secondary college	Specialist School	Students with a disability in mainstream schools <sup>1</sup>
1	ACT public schools	98	630	603	444	27	55
2	Belconnen Schools Network	17	135	65	56		18
3	North Canberra/Gungahlin Schools Network	43	235	391	228	17	21
4	South Canberra/Weston Schools Network	29	159	88	64	10	9
5	Tuggeranong Schools Network	9	101	59	96		7

<sup>1</sup> Includes students who meet the ACT Student Disability Criteria, including those students not formally assessed at the time of the census.

### **Planning—zoning and lease conditions (Question No 937)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 16 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) Under what arrangements does the YMCA occupy the building in Yarralumla Bay.
- (2) What zoning and lease conditions apply to the building.
- (3) Have there been any breaches of these conditions noted by the directorate.
- (4) What penalties does the breach attract in the event of building owners being in breach of terms of the lease conditions.
- (5) What advice, if any, has been provided to the building owners in respect of any breach.
- (6) What action does the government intend to take should these breaches not be rectified.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The land is privately owned by the YMCA under the ACT's leasehold system.
- (2) A Crown lease was granted on 17 August 2004 to the YMCA over Blocks 1, 2 & 3 Section 18 Yarralumla, commencing on 17 August 2004 and terminating on 16 November 2027. The purpose reads as follows:

To use that part of the premises known as Block 1 only for the purpose of a club house for occupation exclusively by the YMCA Sailing club as its base of sailing operations on the adjacent Lake and within these premises affording areas for recreation instruction light refreshment management locker room and toilet facilities storage for ministration to and fabrication of members' club and visitors' craft and for associated light boat handling facilities and vehicular parking;



To use that part of the premises known as Blocks 2 and 3 only for the purpose of a boatshed and associated activities of the Lessee PROVIDED THAT the boatshed shall only be constructed or located on Block 2 and it is FURTHER PROVIDED THAT the Lessee shall permit members of the public to use Block 3 for the purposes of rigging and launching of sailing boats and activities associated therewith.

Blocks 1, 2 & 3 Section 18 Yarralumla is located within Designated Land of the Territory Plan.

- (3) Yes.
- (4) A controlled activity order may be issued under the *Planning and Development Act 2007* (PDA). A breach of a controlled activity order is a further 60 penalty unit offence.
- (5) The YMCA Canberra has advised Access Canberra that they are a part of a national review of their corporate structure, the outcome of which may fundamentally change the nature of their operation in Yarralumla Bay, and requested permission to continue to occupy the premises until the outcome of the review is known. In response to their request, the YMCA has been advised that they can continue operating as they have been until the outcome of their national review is completed or until 31 December 2018 whichever comes first.
- (6) Access Canberra is currently working with the YMCA to ensure that they will be compliant with their lease conditions after the review is completed.

In order to work with this organisation which has a long standing relationship with the community, Access Canberra is allowing them this period of time while the national review of their organisation is undertaken. Access Canberra is committed to regularly liaising with the YMCA to ensure that they achieve full compliance as soon as is practicable. The Government will consider any other enforcement under the PDA should they not cease the use within the identified timeframe.

---

### **Planning—COTA men's shed (Question No 938)**

**Ms Lawder** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) What was the building and site cost associated with the requirement for development approval for the COTA men's shed.
- (2) How many quotes or cost estimates did the directorate receive and did these quotes differ in scope.
- (3) Can the Minister provide a copy of any estimates or quotes received.
- (4) How did the plans that were costed differ from COTA's original plans.
- (5) Did the Government undertake any review looking at how to lower this cost.

- (6) Will the Minister seek funding in future Budgets to provide COTA with an appropriate men's shed.
- (7) When will COTA be able to erect a men's shed.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The Council on the Ageing (COTA) agreed in 2015 to host a men's shed on a site immediately adjacent to the Hughes Community Centre and provided their requirements in 2016 to the ACT Property Group (ACTPG). After extensive consultation with COTA and taking account of available budget of \$133,000, a design was completed for a traditional men's shed. However the requirements for approval for the facility estimated \$0.5m in building and site costs.
- (2) These estimates were based upon the architect advice.
- (3) The estimate is referred to in response (1) above.
- (4) The COTA agreed in 2015 to host a men's shed on a site immediately adjacent to the Hughes Community Centre. Subsequently the requirements for Development Approval included a carpark, this added considerably to the cost.
- (5) In consultation with the COTA, the ACTPG proposed an extension to the Hughes Community Centre building in the form of a multi- purpose meeting room, to meet the wider needs of the local community, including the needs of men in the older age group. This proposal is consistent with advice provided to the Government by Purdon Planning Pty Limited in June 2014, that men's sheds can and do serve wider purposes, such as recreational "talking sheds", virtual sheds, and special interest groups as well as a workshop. The COTA rejected the proposed additional multi-purpose meeting room.
- (6) The Government does not comment on future budget deliberation.
- (7) This is a matter for COTA.

---

### **National disability insurance scheme—worker screening policy (Question No 940)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Disability, Children and Youth, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) Has the ACT agreed to become a part of the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) Worker Screening Policy; if so, (a) how will the policy be implemented across the ACT, (b) when is the implementation of the National NDIS Worker Screening Policy intended to be completed and (c) what gaps in the ACT legal framework will the National NDIS Worker Screening Policy address.
- (2) How will the National NDIS Worker Screening Policy compliment or alter the current ACT worker screening arrangements.
- (3) What, if any, legislative changes will the ACT need to implement to comply with the National NDIS Worker Screening Policy.

- (4) Has there ever been any examples in the ACT where workers engaged by registered NDIS providers to deliver high-risk support and services, or services that involve more than incidental contact with a participant, have not been required to undergo background check.

**Ms Stephen-Smith:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT has agreed-in-principle to the Intergovernmental Agreement on Nationally Consistent Worker Screening for the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS).
  - (a) Implementation of Nationally Consistent Worker Screening (NCWS) will be undertaken with close reference to current ACT legislative and policy settings. Details regarding implementation will be decided upon finalisation of the Intergovernmental Agreement and subsequent policy.
  - (b) NCWS is to become operational in New South Wales and South Australia on 1 July 2018. It is intended that it will become operational in the ACT, Northern Territory, Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania on 1 July 2019. Western Australia is to commence NCWS on 1 July 2020.
  - (c) The ACT currently has a rigorous background checking system. The NCWS model will complement current systems by including continuous monitoring for a subset of screened workers.
- (2) NCWS will complement current systems such as the Working with Vulnerable People Background Checks by including a continuous monitoring of workers employed by NDIS registered agencies.
- (3) Until finalisation of the detail surrounding NCWS, it is not possible to be specific about legislative changes. It is likely that some legislative changes will be required for the harmonisation of the worker screening and working with vulnerable people background checking. These will largely be around data and other information sharing and some modifications to the decision making framework to accommodate the requirements of the NDIS.
- (4) Workers delivering such services are required to obtain a Working with Vulnerable People card. Under the *Working with Vulnerable People (Background Checking) Act 2011*, the delivery of such services by a person who has not obtained a card (except for a family member) is an offence committed by the worker and the employer.

---

### **Tourism—event funding (Question No 941)**

**Mr Wall** asked the Minister for Tourism and Major Events, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) How many applications have been received to date for grant funding through the Major Event Fund.
- (2) What is the total value of funding applied for within each application referred to in part (1).

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

The following tables detail the applications that have been approved to date for grant funding through the Major Event Fund and the total value of funding applied for within each application.

Under the Major Event Fund (replaced Special Event Fund in 2017), a total of 7 applications have been received for support. Of those 6 applications have been assessed and approved to receive funding, as outlined below. Two recipients (National Gallery of Australia and Summernats) receive funding under multi-year MOU arrangements.

**Major Event Fund – Funding request summary**

The tables below provide a summary of applications received or pending to date, against the 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20 Major Event Fund:

2017-18

<b>Funding Recipient</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Funding requested</b>	<b>Funding approved</b>
NGA – Hyper Real and Cartier	Approved – multi year	\$500,000	\$500,000
Summernats 2018	Approved – multi year	\$200,000	\$200,000
NMA - Songlines	Approved	\$200,000	\$100,000
NMA – <i>Rome: City and Empire</i>	Approved	\$500,000	\$100,000
Night Noodle Markets	Approved	\$300,000	\$100,000
<b>Total provisional requests / commitments to date</b>		<b>\$1.8 million</b>	<b>\$1.0 million</b>
<b>Total available funds for the 2017-18 MEF</b>			<b>\$1.0 million</b>

2018-19

<b>Funding Recipient</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Funding requested</b>	<b>Funding approved</b>
NGA	Approved – multi year	\$500,000	\$500,000
Summernats 2019	Approved – multi year	\$200,000	\$200,000
NMA – <i>Rome: City and Empire</i>	Approved	\$500,000	\$100,000
AWM – Remembrance Day	Approved	\$151,700	\$150,000
Major Theatre Fund	Application yet to be received	\$100,000	-
<b>Total provisional requests / commitments to date</b>		<b>\$1,451,700</b>	<b>\$950,000</b>
<b>Total available funds for the 2018-19 MEF</b>			<b>\$1.0 million</b>

2019-20

<b>Funding Recipient</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Funding requested</b>	<b>Funding approved/ suggested</b>
NGA	Approved – multi year	\$500,000	\$500,000
Summernats 2020	Approved – multi year	\$200,000	\$200,000
Major Theatre Fund	Application yet to be received	\$100,000	-
<b>Total provisional requests / commitments to date</b>		<b>\$800,000</b>	<b>\$700,000</b>
<b>Total available funds for the 2018-19 MEF</b>			<b>\$1.0 million</b>

**Tourism—event funding  
(Question No 942)**

**Mr Wall** asked the Minister for Tourism and Major Events, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to funding for National Attractions in the ACT, what is the total amount of ACT Government funding provided for the (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17 and (c) 2017-18 financial years to the (i) National Library of Australia, (ii) National Gallery of Australia, (iii) Museum of Australian Democracy, (iv) National Archives of Australia, (v) National Museum of Australia, (vi) National Film and Sound Archive, (vii) Questacon, (viii) Old Parliament House and (ix) Royal Australian Mint.
- (2) How much of the funding for each institution referred to in part (1), was allocated for a special exhibition or event.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Calculating the total funding provided across the whole of the ACT Government for the listed National Attractions, for the stated financial years potentially requires collation of an extensive amount of information ranging from investment in a major event to hiring of a meeting room, across a diverse range of departments. It is anticipated the majority of engagement occurs through the Economic Development Directorate through Tourism and Events. The information relating to these business units is detailed in question 2 below.
- (2) The following information is collated with reference to funding provided by VisitCanberra through the Major Events Fund and from data provide by Events ACT in delivering major events such as Enlighten.

**2015/16**

- (i) National Library of Australia - \$200,600
- (ii) National Gallery of Australia - \$200,000
- (iii) Museum of Australian Democracy - \$5,000
- (iv) National Archives of Australia - \$0
- (v) National Museum of Australia - \$200,000
- (vi) National Film and Sound Archive - \$0
- (vii) Questacon - \$0
- (viii) Old Parliament House - \$0
- (ix) Royal Australian Mint - \$0

**2016-17**

- (i) National Library of Australia - \$0
- (ii) National Gallery of Australia - \$500,000
- (iii) Museum of Australian Democracy – \$5,000
- (iv) National Archives of Australia - \$0
- (v) National Museum of Australia - \$200,000
- (vi) National Film and Sound Archive - \$0
- (vii) Questacon - \$0
- (viii) Old Parliament House - \$0
- (ix) Royal Australian Mint - \$2,000

**2017-18**

- (i) National Library of Australia - \$6,000
  - (ii) National Gallery of Australia - \$500,000
  - (iii) Museum of Australian Democracy - \$4,500
  - (iv) National Archives of Australia - \$0
  - (v) National Museum of Australia - \$200,000
  - (vi) National Film and Sound Archive - \$0
  - (vii) Questacon - \$1,200
  - (viii) Old Parliament House - \$0
  - (ix) Royal Australian Mint - \$2,000
- 

**Transport—light rail  
(Question No 943)**

**Mr Wall** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) How much ACT Government funding has been allocated to the Light Rail Business Link (LRBL) program in the (a) 2015-16 and (b) 2016-17 financial years.
- (2) How many businesses have been recipients of funding through LRBL in the (a) 2015-16 and (b) 2016-17 financial year.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) ACT Government's allocated funding for the Light Rail Business Link Program in 2015-16 was \$500,000 and in 2016-17 allocated funding was \$500,000.
  - (2) The Canberra Business Chamber (CBC), manager of the Light Rail Business Link program, does not provide direct funding to businesses through the program. It provides support to local business and industry sectors to maximise business opportunities generated by Light Rail construction and future operation. The program also assists individual traders and business precincts that maybe impacted by light rail construction. Support provided by the program to individual businesses includes tailored one-on-one business strategy advice, free places in customised business development programs and representation on specific issues to Canberra Metro and Transport Canberra. The Light Rail Business Link program also provides support to business precincts and industry sectors through promotion, collaboration, communication and advocacy.
- 

**Schools—New South Wales students  
(Question No 947)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to NSW students attending ACT public schools, when and how were new and continuing students' parents informed about the restrictions on NSW student enrolments.

- (2) Who within the Education Directorate made the decision as to which schools would accept NSW student enrolments.
- (3) Will these restrictions have any impact upon currently enrolled NSW students to continue studying at their current ACT public school.
- (4) Will the restrictions inhibit NSW students continuing from their current ACT (a) primary school to a nearby ACT high school or (b) high school to a nearby ACT college.
- (5) In which ACT public schools are NSW parents able to enrol their children to study.
- (6) Why were these schools selected to allow NSW student enrolments.
- (7) Was the geographic position of the schools taken into consideration prior to the decision to limit NSW student enrolments; if not, why not; if so, was the proximity to the NSW/ACT border or to major employment hubs considered.
- (8) Was school performance taken into consideration prior to the decision to limit NSW student enrolments.
- (9) Which, if any, of the permitted schools, perform above the ACT average in NAPLAN, ATAR or other academic performance measures.
- (10) What were the student numbers and capacity statistics for the schools NSW students were permitted to attend for the academic years of (a) 2014, (b) 2015, (c) 2016 and (d) 2017.
- (11) Which, if any, of the schools where NSW students are permitted to enrol are now, or have in the past four years, been operating at or below 80 percent capacity.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Students that were going to be subject to the new arrangements from NSW families enrolling in ACT schools for the first time were advised by email and letters on 22 November 2017 of the new arrangements. Continuing students were not immediately impacted and were consequently not separately informed.
- (2) The Director General has responsibility for establishing priority enrolment areas.
- (3) The answer to this question is available in the Frequently Answered Questions on the Directorate's website at:  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/school\\_education/enrolling\\_in\\_an\\_act\\_public\\_school/nsw-resident-enrolments/frequently-asked-questions](https://www.education.act.gov.au/school_education/enrolling_in_an_act_public_school/nsw-resident-enrolments/frequently-asked-questions)
- (4) The answer to this question is available in the Frequently Answered Questions on the Directorate's website at:  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/school\\_education/enrolling\\_in\\_an\\_act\\_public\\_school/nsw-resident-enrolments/frequently-asked-questions](https://www.education.act.gov.au/school_education/enrolling_in_an_act_public_school/nsw-resident-enrolments/frequently-asked-questions)
- (5) Schools identified to accept NSW students can be found on the ACT Education website through the link below.  
[https://www.education.act.gov.au/school\\_education/enrolling\\_in\\_an\\_act\\_public\\_school/nsw-resident-enrolments](https://www.education.act.gov.au/school_education/enrolling_in_an_act_public_school/nsw-resident-enrolments).

- (6) The pathway schools were selected on the basis of their ability to provide the greatest possible confidence of continuing capacity to accept NSW students, providing clarity and stability for NSW families.
- (7) The principle factor in considering schools to accept NSW students was their likely continuing capacity over time to accept these out of area enrolments. Geographic position of and transport routes to the schools was considered in determining the zones within NSW for each school pathway. For example, schools in the southern zone were selected towards the north east of Tuggeranong as being closer to the NSW border and to the direction of travel for NSW students. Also taken into account was the fact that the majority of NSW students (over 3,000) receive free bus transport from NSW to schools in the ACT. ACT schools adjacent to major employment hubs, and along principal transport routes, have significantly less capacity to accept out of area students and, over the medium term, no capacity to accept NSW students in preference to ACT students.
- (8) School performance is not a relevant factor in considering the location of schools with sufficient capacity to accept NSW students. All ACT public schools provide access to a great education.
- (9) Every ACT public school provides students with high quality learning opportunities, facilitated by knowledgeable, skilled teachers, with access to excellent resources and learning environments. Mean NAPLAN scores are poorly understood and often misapplied. These scores are a poor indicator of the quality of teaching and learning occurring at a school because they reflect a moment in time and fail to account for key factors like the starting achievement level of students. Many knowledgeable experts, such as Professor John Hattie of the University of Melbourne, who is also the Chair of the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, recognise that a much better measure of a school's quality is its ability to facilitate robust learning progress for all students ('gain'). A measure of student gain is shown on the *My School* website alongside mean achievement scores. Information on colleges can be found at the Board of Senior Secondary Studies website at the following link [http://www.bsss.act.edu.au/year\\_12\\_and\\_vocational\\_data/year\\_12\\_study](http://www.bsss.act.edu.au/year_12_and_vocational_data/year_12_study).
- (10) Student numbers for all ACT schools between 2007 and 2017 can be found on the ACT Education Directorate website through the following link. [https://www.education.act.gov.au/publications\\_and\\_policies/publications\\_a-z/census](https://www.education.act.gov.au/publications_and_policies/publications_a-z/census). School capacity for each ACT public school for 2016 can be found on the same website by following the link below. <https://www.education.act.gov.au/search?query=capacity>.
- (11) All of the NSW pathways schools have been operating below 80 percent capacity over the past the past four years. This provides some assurance that the NSW pathway schools will be able to guarantee places for NSW students for the duration of their schooling.

---

### **Roads—Coppins Crossing (Question No 948)**

**Ms Lawder** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):



- (1) In relation to the William Hovell, Coulter Drive and Coppins Crossing intersection, was a business case undertaken prior to the redevelopment of the Coppins Crossing redevelopment; if so, can the Minister provide a copy of the business case.
- (2) Was the design for the redevelopment an external design; if so, who was the designer.
- (3) How many people/companies tendered for the design process.
- (4) What was the scope of the design.
- (5) Were any other options considered; if so, what were the other options,
- (6) Was a fly over option considered.
- (7) What consideration was undertaken in relation to the future traffic congestion and traffic flow.
- (8) Was any future modelling undertaken; if so, can the Minister provide a copy.
- (9) Who approved the design and development of this intersection redevelopment and what level are they employed at.
- (10) Did the design of the intersection redevelopment go to cabinet; if so, on what date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Yes, a business case for "Improving our Suburbs – New Molonglo Valley Infrastructure" was prepared for Cabinet and subsequently, appropriation was approved in the 2016/17 budget. That business case is "Sensitive: Cabinet" and I am not inclined to release it.
- (2) The new layout of the intersection of William Hovell Drive and Coppins Crossing Road (to be renamed John Gorton Drive) was chosen following feasibility studies by engineering consultants SMEC (in 2008 and 2013) and Aecom (in 2015). Aecom's 2015 study involved detailed traffic modelling and reconfirmed SMEC's earlier findings. Calibre Consultants were appointed in 2016 to undertake the detailed design of the intersection, based on the recommendations from the earlier SMEC and Aecom studies. All three of these companies are internationally based consultants with extensive experience in the Canberra region over many years and have been involved with numerous other traffic modelling studies and intersection designs.
- (3) Five design consultancies tendered for the detailed design phase of the intersection, which was subsequently awarded to Calibre Consulting.
- (4) The scope of the design phase services was to review the earlier Feasibility Study, prepare Preliminary Sketch Plan drawings, undertake Value Management and Safety in Design reviews of the design, produce Final Design drawings and prepare tender documents for the construction phase.
- (5) Intersection types which were examined as part of the earlier Smec and Aecom studies included realigning Coppins Crossing Road (John Gorton Drive) to provide a typical 4-way at-grade signalised intersection and also a grade separation of Coppins Crossing Road (John Gorton Drive) and William Hovell Drive. The proposed layout

(currently under construction) also includes an ultimate future northward extension of John Gorton Drive, linking back to Coulter Drive a few hundred meters to the north.

- (6) Yes, a grade separation (ie a fly-over) was considered. However, the traffic modelling indicated that the proposed layout (currently under construction) together with the future northern connection to Coulter Drive mentioned above, would continue to operate satisfactorily beyond 2041 without the need for a grade separation. A requirement of the Development Application process was to demonstrate and ensure that a grade separated intersection could fit within the footprint of the intersection (which it does) if it were ever required in the future.
- (7) Traffic modelling of the various options out to 2041 was undertaken.
- (8) According to that modelling, the proposed layout (with the future northern connection to Coulter Drive) would continue to operate satisfactorily beyond 2041, without the need for grade separation. Should a grade separation be required some time beyond that, it could be constructed within the footprint of the intersection currently under construction.
- (9) The Director Capital Works, Transport Canberra and City Services approved the design. The Development Application Notice of Decision was approved by an authorised delegate of the ACT Planning and Land Authority within the (then) Environment and Planning Directorate.
- (10) No.

### **Government—commercial lessees (Question No 949)**

**Ms Lawder** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) What 16 community halls are included in the announcement made by the ACT Greens on 12 February 2018 that the Labor Government would be renewing peppercorn leases of 16 community halls across the ACT.
- (2) Can the Treasurer provide a list of which organisations are the recipients of the leases.
- (3) What was the reason for the decision to increase their rates to begin with.
- (4) What are the reasons for the decision to offer five year peppercorn leases.
- (5) What will be the financial cost of the decision to grant these peppercorn leases and has this cost been calculated in the 2017-18 Budget or budget review.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) and (2) See list below.

<b>Community Hall</b>	<b>TENANT</b>
Tharwa Community Precinct	Under Offer - Tharwa Community Association Limited
Causeway Hall	Causeway Residents Association
Oaks Estate Community Hall	Under Offer - Oaks Estate Progress Association
Palmerston Community Centre	Northside Community Service Inc

Community Hall	TENANT
Kaleen Community Hall	Kaleen Community Association Inc
Nellie Hall	North Belconnen Community Hall Association Inc
Corroboree Park Community Hall	Northside Community Service Inc
Griffith Neighbourhood Hall	Southside Community Services Inc
Torrens Community Hall	Torrens Community Hall Association Inc
Bonython Neighbourhood Hall	Tuggeranong Link of Community Houses and Centres
Chisholm Community House	Tuggeranong Link of Community Houses and Centres
Downer Community Centre	Downer Community Association
Nicholls Community Centre	Community Services of Gungahlin
Humpy Hall	South Belconnen Community Association Inc
Ginninderra Community Hall	The Gospel Salvation Assembly Inc
Tuggeranong 55 Plus Club Centre	Tuggeranong 55 plus Club Inc

- (3) The Community and Other Tenancies, Application and Allocation Policy 2007 is the existing policy that can be found at [https://apps.treasury.act.gov.au/act\\_property\\_group](https://apps.treasury.act.gov.au/act_property_group). The Government has recently determined that Community Halls will continue under peppercorn arrangements.
- (4) The five year term is consistent with the *Leases (Commercial & Retail) Act 2001* that these tenancies fall under.
- (5) The cost for ACT Property Group to maintain the 16 standalone community halls over the past three years averages out at \$4,965.63 per year per property, excluding capital costs. This is a community service obligation and will be reported in the 2017/2018 Annual Report.

### **Government—men’s sheds (Question No 950)**

**Ms Lawder** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) Why has there been no funding or site allocated for the South Canberra Veterans’ Shed.
- (2) Have there been discussions between the South Canberra Veterans’ Shed and the ACT Property Group about acquiring land for a men’s shed.
- (3) When did these conversations begin.
- (4) What requirements did the South Canberra Veterans’ Shed have/request.
- (5) What options did the ACT Property Group provide to the South Canberra Veterans’ Shed.
- (6) Are there any plans for future funding of a Veterans’ Shed in South Canberra; if so, when will this be finalised.
- (7) When will South Canberra Veterans’ Shed get a permanent home location.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The South Canberra Veterans Shed (SCVS) met with Minister Gentleman on 8 March 2017, seeking assistance to find land to build or relocate their 'Shed' and obtain temporary storage. They were advised at that time to contact ACT Property Group (ACTPG) to discuss their requirements so that a suitable facility could be identified. That contact has not yet been made nor has the SCVS submitted an application to ACTPG to register on the Accommodation Register. Consequently they have not been notified or shown any suitable properties that may have become available over the past 12 months.

SCVS was also encouraged to contact the Government's Direct Sales Team for information about their eligibility to apply for land that is designated for 'community activity'. As at 5 March 2018 there has not been an application submitted by the group.

The Vietnam Veterans and Veterans Federation ACT Inc in Page is an example of an organisation who obtained their land through the aforementioned process.

- (2) – (7) Refer to response (1).

### **Schools—transportable classrooms (Question No 954)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) How many transportable classrooms have been installed at Amaroo School.
- (2) How many students can be accommodated in a transportable classroom.
- (3) When was the installation of transportable classrooms commissioned.
- (4) What is the cost of installing each transportable classroom.
- (5) What is the estimated lifespan of a transportable classroom.
- (6) What was the criteria for determining a transportable classroom was needed.
- (7) What data or information is examined prior to the decision to install transportable classrooms.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There are currently seven transportable buildings at Amaroo School providing 12 learning spaces as follows
  - a) Two transportable buildings for the preschool providing two learning spaces;
  - b) Three transportable buildings, each providing two learning spaces for the primary students providing six learning spaces; and
  - c) Two transportable, each providing two learning spaces for secondary students providing four learning spaces.

- (2) For capacity planning purposes an average of 25 students are nominally accommodated in each primary learning space and 19 students accommodated in each secondary school learning space. Standard transportable classrooms are designed to accommodate up to 30 students.
- (3) The first transportable classroom at Amaroo School was provided for the commencement of the 2005 school year. The other transportable classroom buildings have been progressively added since that time.
- (4) The cost of installing a new single level two learning space transportable classroom building is generally in the range of \$0.6 - \$1.0million. However the cost is variable and is influenced by:
  - a) Number of buildings being purchased and market conditions at the time of procurement of the buildings;
  - b) Whether the building is new or being relocated from another site;
  - c) Whether the building is single or double storey;
  - d) If the building is being relocated, the level of building refurbishment required;
  - e) The extent of other works required such as infrastructure services augmentation and associated works including supplementation of existing parking provision, and additional shade structures and outdoor play areas.
- (5) The estimated lifespan of a transportable classroom building is 15-20 years. This is largely dependent on building use, level of maintenance and the number of times the building is relocated.
- (6) Transportable classroom buildings are provided where short to medium term school capacity is insufficient to meet student enrolment demand from within the school Priority Enrolment Area (PEA).
- (7) The major information sources considered leading up to the decision to install a transportable classroom buildings are:
  - a) Enrolment projections prepared annually by the Directorate which give a forward indication of enrolment demand for all schools;
  - b) School Census data with particular attention paid to the PEA status of current and prospective enrolments; and
  - c) School site information to ensure adequate space for buildings, outdoor play and capacity of building services.
  - d) School community feedback.

---

### **Schools—transportable classrooms (Question No 955)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) How many transportable classrooms have been installed at Aranda School.
- (2) How many students can be accommodated in a transportable classroom.

- (3) When was the installation of transportable classrooms commissioned.
- (4) What is the cost of installing each transportable classroom.
- (5) What is the estimated lifespan of a transportable classroom.
- (6) What was the criteria for determining a transportable classroom was needed.
- (7) What data or information is examined prior to the decision to install transportable classrooms.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) There are two transportable buildings at Aranda Primary School.
- (2) For capacity planning purposes an average of 25 students are nominally accommodated in each learning space. Standard transportable classrooms are designed to accommodate up to 30 students.
- (3) Transportable class rooms were installed at Aranda Primary School in 2001 and in 2017 for the start of the 2018 school year.
- (4) The record of the cost of the delivery of the transportable building 2001 is not available.

The total project budget for the delivery the transportable building in 2017 was \$1.0 million excluding GST.

- (5) The estimated lifespan of a transportable classroom building is 15-20 years. This is largely dependent on building use, level of maintenance and the number of times the building is relocated.
- (6) Transportable classroom buildings are provided where short to medium term school capacity is insufficient to meet student enrolment demand from within the school Priority Enrolment Area (PEA).
- (7) The major information sources considered leading up to the decision to install a transportable classroom buildings include:
  - a) Enrolment projections prepared annually by the Directorate which give a forward indication of enrolment demand for all schools;
  - b) School Census data with particular attention paid to the PEA status of current and prospective enrolments; and
  - c) School site information to ensure adequate space for buildings, outdoor play and capacity of building services.
  - d) School community feedback.

---

### **Schools—transportable classrooms (Question No 956)**

**Ms Lee** asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) In relation to transportable classrooms in all ACT public schools, which schools have had transportable classrooms installed in the academic years of (a) 2014, (b) 2015, (c) 2016, (d) 2017 and (e) 2018.
- (2) For each of the schools outlined in Part (1)(a) to (e), when were the transportable classrooms installed.
- (3) For each of the schools outlined in Part (1)(a) to (e), what was the school's additional student enrolment for (a) 2014, (b) 2015, (c) 2016, (d) 2017 and (e) 2018.

**Ms Berry:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) See Table 1
- (2) See Table 1
- (3) See Table 1

Table 1. Shows the schools and the installation years of the transportable classrooms and the total student enrolment count of the year prior installation, total enrolment count of the year installation of the transportable and the total change from year to year.

School (1a-e)	Year of installation/ relocation (2a-e)	Enrolments in prior year as at Feb Census	Enrolments in installed year as at Feb Census	Change in enrolment (3a-e)
Amaroo School	2014	1606	1677	71
Aranda Primary School	2017	608	620	12
Campbell Primary School	2018	382	Not available <sup>1</sup>	n/a
Cranleigh School	2014	108	128	20
Garran Primary School	2016	599	596	-3
Garran Primary School	2018	624	Not available <sup>1</sup>	n/a
Gold Creek School	2017	664	707	43
Neville Bonner Primary School	2016	486	588	102
Neville Bonner Primary School	2017	588	756	168
Ngunnawal Primary School	2014	592	656	64
Telopea Park School	2018	Primary 560 High 856	Not available <sup>1</sup>	n/a

<sup>1</sup> Note. February 2018 Student Enrolment Census data is currently being collated.

### **Municipal services—fix my street portal (Question No 957)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) How many requests in total for the ACT were received via Fix My Street in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 respectively.

- (2) How are residents who report issues via Fix My Street communicated with and informed of the action taken, or not taken, on their requests.
- (3) Are there standard timeframes in place for providing updates to residents following the initial contact and prior to closing an incident or report.
- (4) What are the final actions taken once a request has been completed or finalised.
- (5) Are there processes in place to analyse the data from Fix My Street to inform future planning and decision making.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The ACT Government has received the following number of requests through the Fix My Street Web form:
  - (a) 2017: 27515 requests
  - (b) 2018: 7353 requests (until 15 March 2018)
- (2) Residents who provide their contact details are contacted by the responsible business unit.
- (3) The timeframes depend on the nature of the selected topics.
- (4) The final actions are for the line area responsible to reply to the resident where appropriate.
- (5) Yes.

### **Sport—powerboat permits (Question No 958)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) Under the provisions of the Lakes Act 1976 is a permit required to use a powerboat on Canberra's urban lakes and ponds; if so, how many requests for a powerboat permit have been received in the past five years.
- (2) How many requests for a powerboat permit have been approved in the past five years.
- (3) What are the conditions placed upon the ACT Water Ski Association Inc for their license to operate in ski areas.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A permit or licence is required to use a powerboat on Canberra's urban lakes and ponds.

Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) issues permits for electric powered boats which include small size low powered craft. This type of powerboat poses little risk to other users and the environment. TCCS has received 610 applications for this type of permit in the past five years.



The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) issues licences for the use of petrol powerboats as it involves consideration of wider issues (e.g. noise pollution). EPA has received 20 applications for this type of licence from 2013 to 2018.

- (2) There have been 610 electric boat permits issued since 1 December 2012 by TCCS and 17 licences for petrol powerboats issued by the EPA over the past five years, with 12 of these licences remaining in force.
- (3) The licence to operate a powerboat issued to the ACT Water Ski Association Inc by the EPA is attached which contains all the conditions.

### **Municipal services—Amaroo (Question No 959)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Amaroo via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Amaroo in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Amaroo in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Amaroo resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Amaroo that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

- (1)
  - (a) Please see Attachment A.

- (b) Please see Attachment B.
- (2)
- (a) Please see Attachment A. This response is restricted to requests submitted through the standard categories available to the public within the Fix My Street web form on the Access Canberra website. To be able to provide a report with the non-standard categories mentioned in the question would require the manual interrogation of each individual request, by Access Canberra staff, which would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.
- (b) Please see Attachment B. This response is restricted to requests submitted through the standard categories available to the public within the Fix My Street web form on the Access Canberra website. To be able to provide a report with the non-standard categories mentioned in the question would require the manual interrogation of each individual request, by Access Canberra staff, which would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.
- (3)
- (a) Please see Attachment A. This response is restricted to requests submitted through the standard categories available to the public within the Fix My Street web form on the Access Canberra website. To be able to provide a report with the non-standard categories mentioned in the question would require the manual interrogation of each individual request, by Access Canberra staff, which would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.
- (b) Please see Attachment B. This response is restricted to requests submitted through the standard categories available to the public within the Fix My Street web form on the Access Canberra website. To be able to provide a report with the non-standard categories mentioned in the question would require the manual interrogation of each individual request, by Access Canberra staff, which would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.
- (4) Due to the extensive scope of the requests that fall into the category of “other”, this information would require an unreasonable diversion of resources to provide an answer to this question.

*(Copies of the attachments are available at the Chamber Support Office).*

---

### **Municipal services—Belconnen (Question No 960)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Belconnen District North via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Belconnen District North in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Belconnen District North in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v)

damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

(3) How many requests for Belconnen District North resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

(4) What were/are the nature of requests for Belconnen District North that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Belconnen District North is not a category supported by Fix My Street.

### **Municipal services—Bonner (Question No 961)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

(1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Bonner via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Bonner in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

(2) How many reports were made for Bonner in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

- (3) How many requests for Bonner resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Bonner that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

### **Municipal services—Casey (Question No 962)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Casey via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Casey in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Casey in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Casey resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic

lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Casey that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

### **Municipal services—Crace (Question No 963)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Crace via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Crace in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Crace in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Crace resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Crace that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

**Municipal services—Evatt  
(Question No 964)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Evatt via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Evatt in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Evatt in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Evatt resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Evatt that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

**Municipal services—Forde  
(Question No 965)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Forde via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Forde in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

- (2) How many reports were made for Forde in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Forde resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Forde that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

### **Municipal services—Franklin (Question No 966)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Franklin via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Franklin in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Franklin in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

- (3) How many requests for Franklin resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Franklin that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

### **Municipal services—Giralang (Question No 967)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Giralang via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Giralang in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Giralang in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Giralang resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.



- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Giralang that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

### **Municipal services—Gungahlin (Question No 968)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Gungahlin via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Gungahlin in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Gungahlin in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Gungahlin resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Gungahlin that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

**Municipal services—Hall  
(Question No 969)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Hall District via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Hall District in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Hall District in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbecues, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Hall District resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbecues, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Hall District that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Hall District is not a category supported by Fix My Street. Details in relation to Hall have been provided in response to QON 959.

**Municipal services—Harrison  
(Question No 970)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Harrison via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Harrison in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

- (2) How many reports were made for Harrison in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Harrison resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Harrison that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

### **Municipal services—Jacka (Question No 971)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Jacka via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Jacka in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Jacka in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes,

sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

- (3) How many requests for Jacka resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Jacka that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

### **Municipal services—Kaleen (Question No 972)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Kaleen via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Kaleen in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Kaleen in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Kaleen resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix)

election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Kaleen that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

### **Municipal services—Lawson (Question No 973)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Lawson via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Lawson in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Lawson in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Lawson resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Lawson that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

**Municipal services—McKellar  
(Question No 974)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for McKellar via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning McKellar in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for McKellar in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for McKellar resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for McKellar that fall into the category of "other" for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

**Municipal services—Mitchell  
(Question No 975)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Mitchell via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Mitchell in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Mitchell in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Mitchell resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Mitchell that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

### **Municipal services—Moncrieff (Question No 976)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Moncrieff via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Moncrieff in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Moncrieff in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi)

illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

- (3) How many requests for Moncrieff resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Moncrieff that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

### **Municipal services—Ngunnawal (Question No 977)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Ngunnawal via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Ngunnawal in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Ngunnawal in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Ngunnawal resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds,



(vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.

- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Ngunnawal that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

### **Municipal services—Nicholls (Question No 978)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Nicholls via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Nicholls in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Nicholls in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Nicholls resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Nicholls that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

### **Municipal services—Palmerston (Question No 979)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Palmerston via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Palmerston in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Palmerston in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Palmerston resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Palmerston that fall into the category of "other" for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

### **Municipal services—Throsby (Question No 980)**

**Mr Milligan** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Regulatory Services*):

- (1) In relation to the number and response to resident requests for Throsby via Fix My Street, how many requests were received from residents concerning Throsby in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.
- (2) How many reports were made for Throsby in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (ivx) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (3) How many requests for Throsby resulted in action being taken by the ACT Government to rectify the issue in (a) 2017 and (b) 2018 for (i) abandoned shopping trolleys, (ii) abandoned vehicles, (iii) air pollution, (iv) damaged bicycle paths, footpaths, shared paths and on-road cycle lanes, (v) damaged/dangerous trees, (vi) damaged recreation facilities such as public barbeques, parks and playgrounds, (vii) damaged survey infrastructure (survey marks), (viii) domestic garbage and recycling collections, (ix) election campaign signage, (x) graffiti, (xi) illegal parking, (xii) litter and dumping, (xiii) mobile speed camera location suggestion, (xiv) nature strips, (xv) noise pollution, (xvi) overgrown grass in public places, (xvii) pot holes, sign damage, traffic lights and other road related issues, (xviii) road safety and traffic concerns, (xix) stormwater drains, (xx) street lights, (xxi) street sweeping and (xxii) other.
- (4) What were/are the nature of requests for Throsby that fall into the category of “other” for (a) 2017 and (b) 2018.

**Mr Ramsay:** The answer to the member’s question is as follows:

Please see response to QON 959.

---

**Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate—  
workplace bullying  
(Question No 981)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) Can the Chief Minister provide for (a) 2016-17 and (b) 2017-18 to date, a breakdown by agency or authority under the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate (CMTEDD) the total number of (i) informal complaints or issues raised regarding workplace bullying, (ii) formal complaints submitted regarding workplace bullying, (iii) informal complaints which resulted in a formal intervention, (iv) formal complaints which resulted in a formal intervention, (v) informal complaints which have not been resolved and (vi) formal complaints which have not been resolved.

- (2) Did any agency or authority fail to provide regular information to work safety committees on the number of reports regarding workplace bullying during (a) 2016-17 and (b) 2017-18 to date; if so, can the Chief Minister provide the name of the agency or authority and any reasons given for the failure to provide information.
- (3) Were any common factors identified in the informal or formal complaints received by the CMTEDD during (a) 2016-17 and (b) 2017-18 to date; if so, can the Chief Minister provide what factors were identified, and what strategies have been implemented to specifically address each factor.
- (4) Can the Chief Minister provide the retention and separation rates for the CMTEDD during (a) 2016-17 and (b) 2017-18 to date, including transfers to other agencies or authorities in the ACT Public Service.
- (5) Can the Chief Minister provide the total (a) number and (b) value of payments made to CMTEDD employees for end of employment related reasons, including termination, redundancy, or any other reason.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Refer to table below:

<b>COMPLAINTS</b>	<b>2016/17</b>	<b>2017/18 YTD</b>
informal complaints or issues raised regarding workplace bullying	24	8
formal complaints submitted regarding workplace bullying	8	8
informal complaints which resulted in a formal intervention	1	0
formal complaints which resulted in a formal intervention	8	8
informal complaints which have not been resolved	0	0
formal complaints which have not been resolved	0	2

- (2) CMTEDD provides regular de-identified accident/incident reports, including reports of bullying and harassment received through Riskman, to the Directorate Work Health Safety Committee.
- (3) Of the **informal reports** of bullying and harassment in 2016/17, 17 of the 24 reports were from Parking Inspectors regarding members of the public harassing and/or intimidating them. Seven of the eight reports in 2017/18 have also been of the same nature.

CMTEDD is undertaking a review of occupational violence that occurs for Parking Operations employees. This includes consultation with workers in the development of an occupational violence risk register aimed at identifying and mitigating potential levels of risk that parking operations employees face. Parking Inspectors are currently provided with training in personal communication which includes de-escalation techniques.

- (4)

<b>RETENTION AND SEPARATION</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18 to date</b>
Retention rate	91.31%	92.16%
Separation rate	8.69%	7.84%
Number of transfers to other agencies*	61	55

\*This figure is not included in the separation rate.

(5)

<b>SEPARATION VALUES</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18 to date</b>
Total Number of Final Payments	352	180
Total Value of Final Entitlements Paid	\$7,927,004.17	\$4,448,998.17

### **Icon Water—meter reading (Question No 982)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) How many complaints have been received in relation to incorrect or faulty water meter readings in the financial years of (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16, (d) 2016-17 and (e) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of complaints made in relation to incorrect or faulty water meter readings by suburb during (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16, (d) 2016-17 and (e) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) Can the Treasurer provide a detailed explanation of the process that is undertaken by the (a) ACT Government and (b) Icon Water after a water meter reading inaccuracy complaint is received to determine whether the meter readings were incorrect.
- (4) Can the Treasurer provide a detailed explanation of what (a) reporting and (b) dispute processes are in place under Icon Water's shared services agreement with ActewAGL in relation to meter reading.

**Mr Barr:** The following answers to the Member's questions have been sought from Icon Water Limited (Icon Water), which operates as an independent corporation:

- (1) There were 496 queries from customers regarding incorrect or high bills over the financial years of 2013-14 (102), 2014-15 (75), 2015-16 (83), 2016-17 (130) and 2017-18 (106) to date. Of these, a total of 14 complaints were confirmed to be due to incorrect or faulty water meter readings.
- (2) The response to this question is attached.
- (3a) If the ACT Government receives a constituent complaint regarding Icon Water, the correspondence is referred to Icon Water for investigation and response.

Customers may also lodge a complaint with the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal, the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission or the ACT Government Utilities Technical Regulator. The complaint is then referred to Icon Water for investigation and response.

- (3b) Upon receipt of a complaint, Icon Water will arrange for the meter to be re-read. Icon Water will also accept a photograph from the customer which clearly shows the water meter number and reading dials. If the meter has been misread, the correct reading is entered into the system and a new bill generated.

Icon Water's Standard Customer Contract includes provisions for the management of complaints, meter readings and the testing of metering equipment in accordance with the Water Metering Code 2000, under the *Utilities Act 2000* (ACT).

- (4) As advised in Icon Water's response to a question taken on notice (QTON 5) in the Public Accounts Committee hearing on 10 November 2017, the specific details of the contractual arrangements between Icon Water and ActewAGL in relation to incorrect meter readings are commercially sensitive.

As advised to the Select Committee on Estimates 2017-18 on 3 July 2017, every quarter there is reporting that occurs between Icon Water and ActewAGL through two committees. There is a standard reporting of KPIs that is scheduled under the terms and conditions of the contract, and those KPIs and any other matters, are discussed in those forums (p1047 of Estimates Transcript 03 July 2017  
<http://www.hansard.act.gov.au/hansard/2017/comms/estimates12a.pdf>)

The Customer Services and Community Support Agreement and the Corporate Services Agreement are available on Icon Water's website at  
<https://www.iconwater.com.au/About/Who-are-we/Service%20contracts/Contracts.aspx>

*(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office)*

## **Government—tourism policy (Question No 985)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Economic Development, upon notice, on 23 February 2018 (*redirected to the Minister for Tourism and Major Events*):

- (1) Further to question taken on notice No 23 during the Standing Committee on Economic Development and Tourism's inquiry into referred 2016-17 annual and financial reports, can the Minister provide a breakdown of the 37 media and 12 influencers or travel bloggers by (a) organisation, (b) dates, (c) hosted, (d) value of travel, (e) value of accommodation and (f) value and category of any other associated costs or payments.
- (2) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the value of (a) travel, (b) accommodation and (c) any other relevant category of investments made for media and influencers or bloggers by VisitCanberra during (i) 2014-15, (ii) 2015-16, (iii) 2016-17 and (iv) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) What is the total number of times VisitCanberra has been approached by (a) journalists, (b) influencers and (c) travel bloggers during (i) 2014-15, (ii) 2015-16, (iii) 2016-17 and (iv) 2017-18 to date.
- (4) What is the total number of times VisitCanberra has been approached by (a) journalists, (b) influencers and (c) travel bloggers that have deemed investment to be of merit in during (i) 2014-15, (ii) 2015-16, (iii) 2016-17 and (iv) 2017-18 to date.
- (5) Can the Minister outline what requirements or guidelines are followed in order to determine the merit of a proposal in the cases where VisitCanberra is approached by journalists, influencers, or travel bloggers about promotional opportunities.

- (6) If available, can the Minister provide a copy of these requirements or guidelines and any additional supplementary material.
- (7) What is the total number of times VisitCanberra has successfully pitched story ideas to (a) journalists, (b) influencers and (c) travel bloggers during (i) 2014-15, (ii) 2015-16, (iii) 2016-17 and (iv) 2017-18 to date.
- (8) Can the Minister outline what requirements or procurement guidelines are followed in the cases where VisitCanberra pitches story ideas to journalists, influencers, or travel bloggers.
- (9) If available, can the Minister provide a copy of these requirements or guidelines and any additional supplementary material.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The average cost to the ACT Government of each visit in 2016-17 was \$332 per domestic visit and \$1270 for international media/influencers visit.
- (2) A summary of visit costs for the requested financial years is as follows:

**2014-15**

Domestic visits                      \$14,893 for 27 media/influencers (average \$552 pp)  
 International visits                \$16,991 for 9 visits (20 people – average \$850 pp)  
 Additional industry contribution was \$16,8651

**2015-16**

Domestic visits                      \$22,916 for 27 media/influencers (average \$848 pp)  
 International visits                \$220 for 2 visits (average \$110 pp)  
 Additional industry contribution was \$16,012

**2016-17\***

Domestic visits                      \$5653 for 17 media/influencers (average \$332 pp)  
 International visits                \$47,000 for 37 media/influencers (average \$1270 pp)  
 Additional industry contribution was \$26,492

\*Singapore Airlines flights commenced 21 September 2016

**2017-18 to date**

Domestic visits                      \$4977 for 10 visits (average \$497 pp)  
 International visits                \$14,103 for 15 visits (average \$940 per visit)  
 Additional industry contribution was \$14,478

It has not been possible to confirm with every journalist/influencer about their willingness to publicly release information about their visit to Canberra. As a result a detailed breakdown of information for every visit has not been provided.

- (3) VisitCanberra receives approaches by media and influencers each week. Requests range from Canberra images or footage, editorial, story ideas and angles, interview

subjects, media contacts at tourism attractions or a quote/response from the ACT Government on a tourism-related matter. Some may be visit requests to visit Canberra to experience the city first-hand under the Visiting Journalist and Influencer Program.

- (4) It has not been possible to confirm with every journalist/influencer about their willingness to publicly release information about their visit to Canberra. As a result a detailed breakdown of information for every visit has not been provided.
- (5) VisitCanberra evaluates approaches based on a number of factors including:
- relevance to target markets of consumers we are trying to influence to visit (see Destination Marketing Strategy 2015-20),
  - reach and audience of the publication/program/digital channel to determine Return on Investment.

Having a commissioned piece/guaranteed placement for a story is a condition of assistance under the Visiting Journalist and Influencer Program. Financial assistance can cover domestic travel, accommodation or product experience fees. VisitCanberra provides story lead ideas, information and access to our free online image library to those we cannot assist financially.

VisitCanberra works cooperatively with Tourism Australia on international media and influencer visits through its International Media Hosting Program. On these visits, VisitCanberra shares ground costs with Tourism Australia. Tourism Australia covers international and domestic travel fares to Canberra.

- (6) VisitCanberra and Tourism Australia's guidelines are available online as content on web pages. Screen shots are provided at Attachment A.

These guidelines can also be viewed at the following websites  
<https://tourism.act.gov.au/marketing/media-centre/> or  
<http://www.tourism.australia.com/en/media/resources-for-media/international-media-hosting-program.html>

VisitCanberra's visiting journalist media program is based on a program established by Tourism Australia and of which all state and territory tourism organisations have their own program.

When hosting media, VisitCanberra complies with the ACT Government's Travel and Hospitality Guidelines which require approval of the delegate (Director General of Economic Development).

- (7) VisitCanberra pitch stories or content to travel media and influencers on a weekly basis. VisitCanberra uses the Travmedia media release system (for travel and lifestyle media) to send out information as well as individual pitches or contact.

VisitCanberra also attends events such as the annual Travmedia International Media Marketplace (25 individual appointment with editors, freelancers, broadcasters and digital influencers) as the Canberra tourism industry representative. They pitch new destination products and experiences and attend networking sessions.

VisitCanberra also attends the Australian Tourism Exchange (ATE) Media Marketplace each year which is a similar format to the Travmedia event.



(8) Pitching story ideas to journalists is undertaken by VisitCanberra's media team and has no cost associated with it. When a Public Relations company is required to undertake media outreach services, this is procured under the ACT Government's Creative Services Panel. VisitCanberra currently has a PR Services contract until the end of June 2018 procured through this panel.

(9) Refer to the documentation at **Attachment A**.

(A copy of the attachment is available at the Chamber Support Office).

---

### **Asbestos—property sales (Question No 986)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the number of blocks identified as containing Mr Fluffy loose fill asbestos by suburb, including the (a) number of residential blocks identified with Mr Fluffy loose fill asbestos, (b) number of properties where the owners eradicated or are expected to eradicate the loose fill asbestos independent of the Government's scheme, (c) number of properties vacated by the previous owners, (d) number of blocks purchased by the Government, (e) number of properties where the owners have agreed to vacate the properties, (f) number of vacant properties owned by the Government but are yet to be demolished, (g) number of blocks that are in the process of being sold and their status, such as listed, and contracts exchanged, (h) number of blocks sold by the Government and the average sale price, (i) total amount expended by the Government to purchase the properties, (j) total amount expected to be expended by the Government to purchase all the properties, (k) total amount received for the Government's sale of the blocks, (l) total amount expected to be received for the Government's sale of the blocks, (m) number of blocks where the previous owners have purchased back the block including the total value of these blocks and (n) number of blocks where the stamp duty was payable on the transfer of vacant blocks and the amount of money received by the Government from stamp duty.

**Mr Gentleman:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

Acquisition and sales statistics are regularly reported in the *Quarterly Report: Implementation of the Loose Fill Asbestos Insulation Eradication Scheme*. The Scheme has continued to report regularly to the Assembly, through the website <http://www.asbestostaskforce.act.gov.au/> and as required via media requests.

The Taskforce has been mindful both of the accountability expected by the community, but also the privacy of the affected householders. The most up to date information is available at [http://www.asbestostaskforce.act.gov.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0004/1176385/ARTDemolitionSchedulemap-20180309-ProgressMap.pdf](http://www.asbestostaskforce.act.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/1176385/ARTDemolitionSchedulemap-20180309-ProgressMap.pdf)

Further, I have attached a spreadsheet of data in response to your questions. This data has been broken down to a suburb level where available.

With respect for the privacy of homeowners, information requested under questions b, e and m, this has been provided as a total only and has not been provided at a suburb level.

Similarly for questions j and l, data is unable to be provided at a suburb level.

All data provided is accurate as at 28 February 2018. For further updates, please continue to monitor the quarterly reports and the website.

### **Taxation—payroll tax waivers (Question No 987)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) Further to question taken on notice No 9 on 10 November 2017 as part of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts' inquiry into referred 2016-17 annual and financial reports, can the Treasurer provide in relation to \$746 523.41 payroll tax write off (a) a breakdown of which companies were liquidated, resulting in outstanding payroll tax being written off and (b) the amount of outstanding payroll tax written off per liquidated company.
- (2) Further to question taken on notice No 9 on 10 November 2017 as part of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts' inquiry into referred 2016-17 annual and financial reports, can the Treasurer provide in relation to \$746,523.41 payroll tax write off (a) a breakdown the total number of companies by industry area where the companies liquidated resulting in outstanding payroll tax being written off and (b) the total amount of outstanding payroll tax written off per industry area.
- (3) Can the Treasurer provide a breakdown of all debt written off by the ACT Revenue office during (a) 2014-15, (b) 2015-16, (c) 2016-17 and (d) 2017-18 to date by (i) category, (ii) amount and (iii) reason for write off.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) and (2)

As noted in the answer to question taken on notice No 9 on 10 November 2017 as part of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts' inquiry into referred 2016-17 annual and financial reports, a write off of payroll tax debt in 2016-17 of \$746,523.41 was due to the liquidation of a number of related companies grouped for payroll tax purposes.

Under the *Taxation Administration Act 1999*, the disclosure of information that either does, or is likely to, directly or indirectly, identify a particular taxpayer is not permitted. Providing further details, such as company names or industries, would contravene these privacy provisions.

- (3) A breakdown of debt written off by revenue line is in the following table. The amounts in each tax line relate to multiple taxpayers. It is not possible to provide a reason for each write-off as to do so would breach the privacy provisions of the *Taxation Administration Act 1999*.

Revenue line	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD to February 2018)
Payroll tax	752,267.71	457,158.35	905,768.67	58,614.74
Duties/Other	9,666.63	17,406.27	75,510.16	9,847.32
First Home Owner Grant	1,739.60	0.00	7,000.00	0.00
General rates	10,753.17	5,268.79	110,574.64	130,534.87
Land rent	72,615.90	0.00	451,345.12	120,908.48
Land tax	0.00	6,742.84	21,599.12	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>847,043.01</b>	<b>486,576.25</b>	<b>1,571,798.12</b>	<b>319,908.41</b>

### Transport—light rail (Question No 992)

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) Have any variations been made to the project agreement with Capital Metro PC Pty Limited for the Capital Metro Project since it was first made; if so, can the Minister outline the nature of those variations.
- (2) Have the obligations set out in the agreement for the Capital Metro Project, including for delivery phase reports, been met to date; if not, can the Minister outline the nature of any obligations which have not been completed in accordance with the agreement.
- (3) Has a subcontractor forum been established; if so, how frequently are meetings of the subcontractor forum expected to be held and how many meetings of the subcontractor forum have actually been held.
- (4) Has a union forum been established; if so, how frequently are meetings of the union forum expected to be held and how many meetings of the union forum have actually been held.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Three Deeds of Amendment have been agreed with Canberra Metro to incorporate minor changes to the Project Agreement. The nature of those changes is as listed below:
  - a. Topographical errors.
  - b. Clarifying the definition of insurance component.
  - c. Defining the process for reviewing Project Plans.
  - d. Amending the access date to Constitution Avenue and Coranderrk Street.
  - e. Amending the access date for Land Access at Flemington Road changing the access date to the Area 1 and Area 2 of the intersection of Manning Clark and Flemington Road.
  - f. Commencement of review period to accommodate rostered days off (RDO's).
  - g. Amending the provisions of landscaping items.
  - h. Amendments to clause 10.9 of the Project Agreement.
  - i. Defining the process for the timing, submission and certification of design documentation.
  - j. Amending the name and address of the Project Co Representative
  - k. Amending the contract Project Co entity name under the Project Agreement.

- l. Amendment to the operation of the LRV radio system.
  - m. Amendment to the tolerances of traction power reticulation.
  - n. Defining the process for the progressive accreditation of the Safety and Systems Assurance plan.
  - o. Amending the vertical and horizontal platform alignment parameters.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The subcontractor forum was established in May 2017 and is held at least quarterly. It is convened and chaired by Canberra Metro, as required under the Project Agreement. There have been 3 subcontractor forums to date.
- (4) The IR Forum was established by Canberra Metro in September 2016 and is generally held monthly. There have been 13 Construction IR Forums and 3 Operations and Maintenance IR Forums to date.

**ACTION bus service—fleet  
(Question No 995)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) How many new buses have been (a) purchased or (b) leased for the Transport Canberra fleet in the financial years of (i) 2016-17 and (ii) 2017-18 to date.
- (2) How much has been spent on (a) purchasing or (b) leasing the buses listed in part (1).
- (3) How many more buses does the ACT Government expect to (a) purchase or (b) lease for the remainder of the 2017-18 financial year.
- (4) What is the estimated cost of (a) purchasing or (b) leasing the buses listed in part (3).
- (5) What is the age of the Transport Canberra bus fleet, broken down into five-year brackets.
- (6) How many buses in the Transport Canberra fleet do not feature air conditioning or climate control systems.
- (7) When will the buses listed in part (6) be replaced.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) A total of 27 buses have been purchased for the Transport Canberra bus fleet in the financial year 2016-17 and 8 buses have been purchased in 2017-18 to date. Two buses were leased in 2017-18.
- (2) A total of \$12.1million (Ex GST) has been spent of purchasing the 27 buses delivered in 2016-17 and \$3.6 million (ex GST) was spent on purchasing the buses delivered in 2017-18. To date \$153,000 has been spent on the currently leased buses in 2017-18

- (3) The ACT Government expects to purchase 17 buses for the remainder of the 2017-18 financial year.
- (4) It is estimated that the total cost to purchase these buses will be \$7.9 million (ex GST)
- (5) The age of the operational Transport Canberra bus fleet of 434 buses at 1 March 2018 is as follows:

Age	Models	Number in Fleet
0 - 5 years	Carbridge Toro Electric, Volvo Hybrid, Scania K320UB, Scania K360UA	128
5 - 10 years	Scania K360UA, MAN A69 18.320, Scania K320UB, MAN A69 18.310 CNG,	140
10 - 15 years	Scania L94UB CNG, Irisbus Agoraline	74
15 - 20 years	Dennis Dart SLF	4
20 - 25 years	Dennis Dart SLF, Renault PR100.3,	24
25 - 30 Years	Renault PR100.2	64

- (6) Currently 94 buses operating in the Transport Canberra fleet do not have climate control comprising of:
- 64 Renault PR100.2 - Average age 26 years
  - 24 Renault PR100.3 - Average age 24 years
  - 6 Dennis Dart SLF - Average age 19 years
- (7) It is expected these 94 buses will be replaced by December 2022 to comply with the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*.

### **ACTION bus service—fares (Question No 998)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) What was the process leading to the decision to increase public transport fares in the ACT as from 20 January 2018.
- (2) Have public transport fares in the ACT increased above the inflation rate; if so, why.
- (3) Who approved the increase in public transport fares.
- (4) Why was the announcement about the increase in public transport fares delayed until mid-January 2018.
- (5) How much additional revenue is expected to be generated by the increase in public transport fares.
- (6) When will the public transport fares in the ACT next be reviewed.

- (7) Why has the 12 month trial of free off peak MyWay travel for seniors and concession card holders been extended.
- (8) What was the total cost of the 12 month trial of free off peak MyWay travel for senior and concession card holders.
- (9) What is the expected annual cost of continuing the trial of free off peak MyWay travel for senior and concession card holders.
- (10) How many cash transactions were made on public transport in (a) 2016-17 and (b) 2017-18 to date.
- (11) Is any consideration being given to phasing out cash transactions on public transport in the ACT.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) The fares were increased by CPI only and were approved by the Minister for Transport and City Services.
- (2) No.
- (3) The Minister for Transport and City Services approved a routine increase to public transport fares from 20 January 2018, following advice from the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate.
- (4) The announcement of the fare change was not delayed. Transport Canberra widely publicised this routine fare change ahead of time, including providing information online, at major bus interchanges and through the media. It is expected that the changes will generate around \$0.5 million in additional revenue over 12 months.
- (5) It is yet to be determined when public transport fares will again be reviewed, though generally they occur on an annual basis.
- (6) This trial is continuing while Transport Canberra continues to evaluate the scheme.
- (7) The estimated revenue forgone from the first 12 months of the scheme was around \$800,000. The estimated revenue forgone for future years is \$800,000 in current values, adjusted for changes in patronage and fare levels over time.
- (8) See Question 8.
- (9) a) 1,291,618 (excluding transfers)  
b) 754,471 (excluding transfers), as at 1 March 2018.
- (10) No plans are currently in place to phase out cash fares.

---

**ACTION bus service—staffing  
(Question No 999)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) What was the number of staff employed under the ACTION Enterprise Agreement 2013-17, as at 15 December 2017.
- (2) In relation to the staff identified in part (1), what is the number of staff employed by ACTION on a continuous basis for the time frames of (a) 1 day to 1 year and 264 days, (b) 2 years to 4 years and 364 days, (c) 5 years to 9 years and 364 days, (d) 10 years to 14 years and 364 days, (e) 15 years to 19 years and 364 days, (f) 20 years to 24 years and 364 days, (g) 25 years to 29 years and 364 days, (h) 30 years to 34 years and 364 days, (i) 35 years to 39 years and 364 days, (j) 40 years to 44 years and 364 days, (k) 45 years to 49 years and 364 days, (l) 50 years or over.
- (3) In relation to the staff identified in part (1), what is the number of staff broken down by the grades of (a) Administrative Services Officer class, (b) Senior Officer, (c) General Services Officer, (d) Technical Services Officer, (e) Senior Officer (Technical), (f) ACTION Transport Officer, (g) Bus Operator (Training), (h) Bus Operator, (i) APS Store Staff, (j) GSO Workshop Staff, (k) Workshop Staff (TO), (l) Workshop Apprentice, (m) Special Needs Service, (n) GSO Stores Staff and (o) Graduate Administrative Assistant.
- (4) What is the number of staff employed by pay point listed from pages 200 to 210 of the ACTION Enterprise Agreement 2013-2017, for each of the grades listed in part (3).

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

(1) 977.

(2)

<b>Length of Service Range ACTION Employees as at 15 Dec 2017</b>	
180	Under 2 years*
163	Over 2 years & under 5 years
277	Over 5 years & under 10 years
143	Over 10 years & under 15 years
67	Over 15 years & under 20 years
21	Over 20 years & under 25 years
35	Over 25 years & under 30 years
54	Over 30 years & under 35 years
19	Over 35 years & under 40 years
15	Over 40 years & under 45 years
2	Over 45 years & under 50 years
1	Over 50 years
977	Total Headcount ACTION

\* Transport Canberra has interpreted the question to be the number of staff employed by ACTION on a continuous basis for 1 day to 1 year and 364 days, rather than 264 days.

(3)

<b>Q3 Staff Numbers by Grade</b>	
Classification Category	Number of Staff
(a)-Administrative Services Officer class	0
(b)-Senior Officers	0
(c)-General Service Officer	0
(d)-Technical Services Officer	0
(e)-Senior Officer (Technical)	4
(f)-ACTION Transport Officer	37
(g)-Bus Operator (Training)	66
(h)-Bus Operator	708
(i)-APS Store Staff	2
(j)-GSO Workshop Staff	101
(k)-Workshop Staff (TO)	6
(l)-Workshop Apprentice	10
(m)-Special Needs Service	38
(n)-GSO Stores Staff	5
(o)-Graduate Administrative Assistant	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>977</b>

<b>Number of Staff by Increment Point</b>							
Salary Classification	FTE	Annual Salary	Total	Salary Classification	FTE	Annual Salary	Total
<b>BGSO72</b>		\$75,812	1	<b>GSO5B4</b>		\$56,375	8
<b>BGSO74</b>		\$78,741	3	<b>SGSO64</b>		\$73,093	4
<b>BO</b>		\$73,448	705	<b>SOB.3</b>		\$133,197	1
<b>BOT</b>		\$66,212	68	<b>SOCT.1</b>		\$100,462	1
<b>EAPY11</b>		\$26,879	3	<b>SOCTA2</b>		\$108,140	2
<b>EAPY2</b>		\$39,427	1	<b>TGSO62</b>		\$73,145	1
<b>EAPY3</b>		\$48,838	2	<b>TGSO64</b>		\$75,102	9
<b>EAPY4</b>		\$58,248	4	<b>TGSO72</b>		\$78,488	5
<b>EASO53</b>		\$78,711	2	<b>TGSO73</b>		\$79,812	2
<b>EGSO41</b>		\$61,170	1	<b>TGSO74</b>		\$81,212	35
<b>EGSO42</b>		\$61,964	23	<b>TGSO84</b>		\$87,553	2
<b>EGSO43</b>		\$62,748	1	<b>TGSW71</b>		\$80,070	1
<b>EGSO44</b>		\$63,587	3	<b>TGSW74</b>		\$84,219	4



Number of Staff by Increment Point							
Salary Classification	FTE	Annual Salary	Total	Salary Classification	FTE	Annual Salary	Total
<b>EGSO54</b>		\$67,829	2	<b>TO2.1</b>		\$59,230	1
<b>EGSO96</b>		\$91,925	1	<b>TOA36</b>		\$82,205	1
<b>EGSO97</b>		\$93,924	4	<b>TOA41</b>		\$83,842	1
<b>EGSW42</b>		\$64,449	1	<b>TOA42</b>		\$86,134	2
<b>EGSW52</b>		\$68,275	2			\$89,294	1
<b>GSO2B1</b>		\$49,228	6	<b>TOA45</b>		\$95,083	1
<b>GSO2B4</b>		\$51,173	13	<b>TRAN2</b>		\$85,587	5
<b>GSO4A2</b>		\$50,070	1	<b>TRAN3</b>		\$95,201	28
<b>GSO5.1</b>		\$52,198	1	<b>TRAN4</b>		\$104,101	4
<b>GSO5B1</b>		\$52,573	1				
		\$53,362	5				
<b>GSO5B2</b>		\$54,395	1				
		\$54,395	2				
<b>GSO5B3</b>		\$55,431	1				
<b>Grand Total</b>				<b>977</b>			

**ACTION bus service—disability access  
(Question No 1000)**

**Miss C Burch** asked the Minister for Transport and City Services, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) What percentage of the Transport Canberra bus fleet is currently Easy Access, wheelchair accessible.
- (2) Was the target of 80 percent of the fleet being Easy Access, wheelchair accessible by 31 December 2017 achieved; if not, (a) why wasn't the target met and (b) when does Transport Canberra expect that the target level of 80 percent will be achieved.
- (3) When will 100 percent of the Transport Canberra bus fleet be Easy Access, wheelchair accessible.
- (4) What factors influence whether an accessible bus is assigned to a particular route when determining rosters for daily bus routes.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) As at 1 March 2018, 80 percent of the Transport Canberra bus fleet is wheelchair accessible.

- (2) The target of 80 percent of the Transport Canberra bus fleet being wheelchair accessible by 31 December 2017 was achieved in accordance with the requirements of the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*.
- (3) It is expected 100 percent of the Transport Canberra bus fleet will be Easy Access, wheelchair accessible by 31 December 2022 in accordance with the target requirements of the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*.
- (4) There are no routes that guarantee wheelchair accessible buses, however, priority is given to routes that service hospitals and aged care facilities. Customers are able to request wheelchair accessible buses on select services, which are then assessed on a case by case basis.

### **Housing—rates (Question No 1010)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) What was the annual cost of administering the residential rates system for each of the last three financial years, including costs of valuations, issuing of rates notices etc (a) in dollars and (b) as a percentage of residential rates revenue.
- (2) With regard to appeals of the valuations used for levying residential rates, how many appeals were lodged each year for the three most-recent financial years.
- (3) What percentage of appeal rates do these represent, as a percentage of rateable residential properties.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) It is not possible to separate the cost of administering the residential rates system from total cost of administering the ACT Revenue Office. Total expenses for the ACT Revenue Office for the past three financial years are in the table below.

	<b>2014-15 (\$'000)</b>	<b>2015-16 (\$'000)</b>	<b>2016-17 (\$'000)</b>
<b>ACT Revenue Office Expenses</b>	15,082	15,824	17,669

- (2) and (3) The number of appeals lodged with the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal (both as a number and as a percentage of residential properties) in relation to land values for residential properties for the past three financial years, are shown in the table below.

	<b>Appeals</b>	<b>Percentage of total properties</b>
2014-15	2	0.001
2015-16	0	0
2016-17	0	0
2017-18 (YTD to February 2018)	3	0.002

**Housing—land tax  
(Question No 1013)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) Is land tax currently payable on a residential property occupied free of charge by a family member of the owner.
- (2) How long has this arrangement been in place.
- (3) Are there any plans to change this arrangement.
- (4) Is land tax currently payable on a residential property occupied by a family member of the owner, where rent is paid.
- (5) How long has this arrangement been in place.
- (6) Are there any plans to change this arrangement.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) No.
- (2) Since 30 June 1995.
- (3) No.
- (4) Yes.
- (5) The *Land Tax Act 2004* and predecessors have never contained an exemption for this arrangement.
- (6) No.

---

**Canberra Hospital—accreditation  
(Question No 1014)**

**Ms Le Couteur** asked the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) What accreditations does The Canberra Hospital (TCH) currently hold as an accredited health service.
- (2) Are any of these accreditations up for review in this calendar year; if so, which ones.
- (3) Are there any further accreditations TCH is seeking to be accredited under; if so, which ones.
- (4) What are the consequences for non-accreditation.

- (5) Is the Minister satisfied that TCH is on track to pass all accreditations checks this year.
- (6) What concerns does ACT Health have over TCH's ability to pass these accreditations.
- (7) What tracking and reporting mechanisms are in place to ensure ongoing compliance with any accreditations.
- (8) After reports in The Canberra Times over concerns at TCH, what areas of improvement are there to ensure meeting or exceeding expectations in the lead up for reaccreditation moving forward.
- (9) How are fridge temperatures monitored and maintained in accordance with accreditation.

**Ms Fitzharris:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) ACT Health, inclusive of Canberra Hospital, holds current accreditation against the:
  - National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards
  - Home Care Common Standards
  - BreastScreen Australia National Accreditation Standards
  - Diagnostic Imaging Accreditation Scheme (DIAS)
  - ACT Pathology Laboratories AS4633:200 ISO15189"2003
  - National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA)/Royal College of Pathologists of Australasia (RCPA) accreditation scheme

ACT Health is also a currently Accredited Breastfeeding Friendly Workplace.

- (2) Canberra Hospital is undergoing re-accreditation against the following in 2018:
  - National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards (National Standards)
  - Home Care Common Standards, developed by the Australian Government and state and territory governments – assessed by the Australian Aged Care Quality Agency
- (3) Canberra Hospital is seeking no further accreditations at this time.
- (4) Canberra Hospital is currently accredited against the National Standards until 13 July 2018. Re-accreditation is occurring through an organisation wide re-accreditation survey 19-23 March 2018 by the accreditation agency Australian Council on Health Care Standards (ACHS). ACHS will assess ACT Health's implementation of the 10 National Standards. Assessment involves awarding either a 'satisfactory met' or 'not met' to the actions within the National Standards. If ACT Health receive a 'not met' against any of the National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards actions, ACT Health has 90 days to take corrective action at which time re-accreditation is awarded.
- (5) Canberra Hospital has undertaken a range of preparatory works to ensure the organisation will be re-accredited against the National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards and Home Care Common Standards.
- (6) Canberra Hospital underwent a re-accreditation assessment 'mock survey' from 4-15 December 2017 to prepare the organisation for the reaccreditation survey in March 2018. ACT Health has initiated weekly meetings to oversee the progress of activity in preparation for reaccreditation against the National Standards.

- (7) The Tier 1 ACT Health Governance Committee, Executive Directors Council Safety and Quality (EDCSQ) oversees accreditation compliance against the National Standards. The National Standards Governance Committee (NSGC) reporting to EDCSQ was refreshed in May 2017 to provide governance, leadership and support specific to implementation of the National Standards.
  - (8) ACT Health is committed to the delivery of person-centred safe, effective quality care maintaining a cycle of continuous improvement in the delivery of health care. ACT Health has a strong culture of quality improvement evidenced by the soon to be launched Quality Strategy and annual ACT Health Quality Awards. A number of service improvements are occurring to further improve the safety and quality of care.
  - (9) Canberra Hospital has a policy which outlines how medication fridge temperatures are to be monitored and maintained in accordance with National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards requirements. The process includes daily review of medication fridge temperature range and compliance reporting. Recognising the importance of continued quality improvement, ACT Health is implementing a range of work which will further improve compliance with the National Safety and Quality Standards through implementation of an organisation wide automated fridge temperature monitoring system.
- 

### **Housing—rates (Question No 1015)**

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) Can the Treasurer provide, for each financial year since 2012-2012 and for each year of the forward estimates, the (a) number of dwellings that paid the fixed charge of the ratings system and (b) total amount of revenue generated through the fixed charge, broken down by (i) houses, (ii) rural properties, (iii) units and (iv) commercial properties.
- (2) What are the residential conveyance duty rates for each year since 2011-12 and across each of the forward estimates, broken down by each threshold in Table 6.2.6 in 2017-18 Budget Paper 3.
- (3) How many transactions are expected to occur for each year of the budget estimates and how many took place each financial year since 2011-12 to date
- (4) Can the Treasurer provide the population of Canberra for each year since 2001 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) (a) The number of private residential properties that paid the fixed charge between 2011-12 and 2017-18 is shown in [Table 1](#) below. It does not include forward estimates as the Government does not forecast growth in rateable dwellings. General rates revenue is set in aggregate which takes into account the expected growth in overall population.

**Table 1: The number of properties paying the General Rates fixed charge (2011-12 to 2017-18)**

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
ACT residential	136,813	140,657	144,685	150,414	152,551	155,355	158,198
- Units	32,430	34,083	36,329	38,906	41,164	44,035	45,796
- Houses	104,383	106,574	108,356	109,679	110,499	110,417	111,452
Rural	178	174	175	171	168	173	172
Commercial	5,697	5,731	5,784	5,997	6,018	6,033	6,053

Note: Units and houses may not sum to ACT residential due to minor exclusions and reporting variations.

Figures are estimates based on properties in the general rates database and may differ to actual outcomes.

- (b) The total amount of revenue generated through the fixed charge, broken down by category, is presented in [Table 2](#) for the years 2011-12 to 2017-18. As the Government does not forecast growth in rateable dwellings, forward estimates by category of dwelling cannot be provided.

**Table 2: Fixed charge revenue, by category (\$ '000, 2011-12 to 2017-18)**

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
ACT residential	75,931	78,065	90,573	101,529	111,362	118,847	121,021
- Units	17,999	18,916	22,742	26,262	30,050	33,687	35,034
- Houses	57,933	59,149	67,831	74,033	80,664	84,469	85,261
Rural	22	22	24	25	25	26	27
Commercial	7,167	6,952	10,116	11,484	12,818	13,484	14,406

Note: Units and houses may not sum to ACT residential due to minor exclusions and reporting variations.

Figures are estimates based on properties in the general rates database and may differ to actual outcomes.

- (2) Residential conveyance duty rates for each year since 2011-12, and for the forward estimates period are listed in [Table 4](#) below.
- (3) The number of residential property transactions which took place from 2011-12 to 2016-17 is presented in [Table 3](#) below. The Budget and forward estimates of residential conveyance duty take a number of factors into consideration including economic conditions, annual growth in the Wage Price Index and the population, the turnover to stock ratio, house price growth and judgement. As these factors are applied at an aggregate level it is not possible to provide the forecast number of residential property transactions.

**Table 3: Number of residential property transactions, 2011-12 to 2016-17**

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Residential property transactions	12,762	11,642	11,891	12,368	13,438	14,107

Source: ACT Revenue Office

- (4) The Estimated Resident Population (ERP) data for the ACT can be found on the ABS website ([www.abs.gov.au](http://www.abs.gov.au)). The relevant ABS catalogue reference is 3101.0, Table 4.

## Housing—rates (Question No 1016)

Mr Coe asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) For each year in the current Budget's forward estimates, what (a) are the ratings factors and underlying assumptions for each threshold level of residential and commercial properties, (b) is the estimated number of residential dwellings and (c) is the estimated number of commercial properties.

- (2) For each financial year from 2011-12 to date, what is the number of (a) rateable units, (b) rateable houses, (c) non-rateable units, (d) non-rateable houses and (c) commercial properties.
- (3) For each financial year since 2011-12 to date and across the forward estimates, what was the total average unimproved value for (a) units, (b) houses and (c) commercial properties.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) With regard to general rates, revenue is set in aggregate taking into account expected growth in overall population.
- (a) Rating factors, number and value of properties by threshold are adjusted to achieve the required revenue outcome.
- (b) The Government does not forecast growth in rateable properties in determining general rates.
- (c) See response to (1)(b).
- (2)
- (a) See Table 1.
- (b) See Table 1.
- (c) Data on non-rateable units is not readily available for these periods.
- (d) Data on non-rateable houses is not readily available for these periods.
- (e) See Table 1.
- (3) See Table 2. No values are provided beyond 2017-18 as the Government does not forecast growth in rateable properties in determining general rates.

Table 1: Number of rateable properties from 2011-12 to 2017-18

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Residential							
Units	32,430	34,083	36,329	38,906	41,164	44,035	45,796
Houses	104,383	106,574	108,356	109,679	110,499	110,417	111,452
Commercial	5,697	5,731	5,784	5,997	6,018	6,033	6,053

Note: Figures are estimates based on properties in the general rates database and may differ to actual outcomes.

Table 2: Total average unimproved value from 2011-12 to 2017-18 (\$m)

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Residential							
Units	3,997	4,463	4,903	5,119	5,333	5,543	5,728
Houses	34,285	37,347	39,049	39,605	40,271	41,040	42,987
Commercial	3,770	3,682	3,377	3,335	3,394	3,522	3,540

Note: Figures are estimates based on properties in the general rates database and may differ to actual outcomes.

Average unimproved value for units for all years is as defined in the *Rates Act 2004* (R29, 1 September 2016).

## Housing—rates (Question No 1017)

**Mr Coe** asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

- (1) What are the number of residential unit dwellings, in each financial year from 2011-12 to date and across the each year of the forward estimates, where the residential

average unimproved value was (a) less than \$150 000, (b) between \$150 001 and \$300 000, (c) between \$300 001 and \$450 000, (d) between 450 001 and \$600 000 and (e) more than \$600,001.

- (2) Can the Treasurer provide the total (a) number of residential properties that had a discount rates applied for on time payment and (b) value of the discounts during (i) 2011-2012, (b) 2012-2013, (c) 2013-2014, (d) 2014-2015, (e) 2016-2017 and (f) 2017-18 to date.
- (3) Can the Treasurer provide (a) the total number of residential properties that incurred interest for late rates payments and (b) the total value of the interest accrued during (i) 2011-2012, (b) 2012-2013, (c) 2013-2014, (d) 2014-2015, (e) 2016-2017 and (f) 2017-18 to date.

**Mr Barr:** The answer to the member's question is as follows:

- (1) Under the *Rates Act 2004*, if a parcel of land is a unit subdivision, the land making up the parcel is taken to continue to be a single parcel of land. Average unimproved values are determined for this single parcel of land. As such, individual residential unit dwellings do not have unimproved land values. The table below shows the number of dwellings within each value category, calculated by multiplying the residential proportion of the average unimproved value of a unit subdivision parcel of land by the unit entitlement of the unit. Figures are correct as of 1 January each year.

Residential proportion of AUV of parcel of land multiplied by unit entitlement	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
\$0 to \$150,000	25,698	24,576	24,921	26,909	28,682	31,312	32,783
\$150,001 to \$300,000	5,526	8,047	9,770	10,282	10,699	10,898	11,002
\$300,001 to \$450,000	869	1,052	1,185	1,237	1,271	1,284	1,378
\$450,001 and \$600,000	234	279	304	327	352	373	433
\$600,001 and above	103	129	149	151	160	168	200

- (2) The table below shows the number of residential properties that received a general rates early payment discount and the value of the discount.

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD to Feb 2018)
No. of properties	53,008	54,020	55,377	56,365	54,888	53,291	49,821
Value of early payment discount (\$'000)	2,151	2,422	2,729	3,034	3,327	2,296	1,194

- (3) The table below shows the number of residential properties that incurred interest for late general rates payments and the value of the interest incurred.

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18 (YTD to Feb 2018)
No. of properties	31,113	31,709	33,072	33,297	36,462	37,079	32,763
Value of interest incurred (\$'000)	1,400	1,432	1,518	1,638	1,793	1,604	524



## Housing—utility pricing (Question No 1018)

Mr Coe asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 23 February 2018:

Can the Minister provide data on how (a) water, (b) sewerage and (c) electricity prices have increased in the ACT since 2007-08 to date.

Mr Barr: The answer to the member's question is as follows<sup>1</sup>:

### a) Water Prices

Table 1 outlines the water prices that applied in the ACT in 2007-08, under an inclining block tariff structure, incorporating a fixed charge and three volumetric tiers.

**Table 1:** ACT Water Prices – 2007-08

	2007-08 \$
Fixed Water Supply Charge - per annum	75
Tier 1 Price (0 – 100 kilolitres (kL) usage per annum) – per kL	1.145
Tier 2 Price (101 – 300 kL usage per annum) - per kL	2.31
Tier 3 Price (301+ kL usage per annum) – per kL	3.21

From 1 July 2008, the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission (ICRC) reformed the water tariff structure to two volumetric tiers and daily pricing<sup>2</sup>. Table 2 outlines prices from 2008-09 to 2017-18.

**Table 2:** ACT Water Prices – 2008-09 to 2017-18

	2008-09 \$	2009-10 \$	2010-11 \$	2011-12 \$	2012-13 \$	2013-14 \$	2014-15 \$	2015-16 \$	2016-17 \$	2017-18 \$
Fixed Water Supply Charge – per annum	85	89.55	92.08	95.63	99.83	100.00	102.56	101.14	101.48	104.21
Tier 1 Price (0 - 0.548 kL of usage per day) - per kL	1.85	1.95	2	2.33	2.43	2.55	2.64	2.60	2.61	2.68
Tier 2 Price (0.549 kL+ of usage per day) – per kL	3.70	3.90	4.01	4.66	4.86	5.10	5.29	5.22	5.24	5.38

<sup>1</sup> The price data provided in all tables is nominal. That is, prices as published for the relevant year.

<sup>2</sup> Under daily pricing, the allocation of water in each consumption tier is determined as a daily allowance, rather than on an annual basis as per the approach until 2007-08. The daily allowance of 0.548 kL for tier 1 pricing equates to 200 kL of usage per annum.

### b) Sewerage Prices

Table 3 below outlines the sewerage fixed supply charge in the Territory from 2007-08 to 2017-18.

**Table 3:** ACT Sewerage Prices – 2007-08 to 2017-18

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fixed Sewerage Supply Charge - per annum	413.76	443.82	484.25	516.11	555.39	600.65	492.02	505.41	523.18	529.38	537.34

c) Electricity prices

Tables 4 and 5 below outline electricity prices from 2007-08 to 2017-18 in the Territory for the two most common ActewAGL Retail Standing Offers – being for those small customers with Single Rate meters (Table 4) and those customers with Time of Use Meters (Table 5). These standing offer tariffs are subject to price regulation by the ICRC.

It is important to note that customers are free to negotiate market offers directly with ActewAGL Retail or other electricity providers active in the ACT. This may result in unit prices paid by consumers that differ significantly from those outlined below.

**Table 4:** ACT Electricity Prices - 2007-08 to 2017-18 (Single Rate Meter including GST– Actew AGL Standing Offer)

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Supply charge - Cents/day	48.84	51.70	53.13	53.90	56.10	66.55	73.48	75.79	75.79	80.41	96.14
All usage - Cents/kWh	13.31	14.19	15.246	15.598	16.665	19.69	20.13	18.304	17.27	18.282	21.758

**Table 5:** ACT Electricity Prices - 2007-08 to 2017-18 (Time of Use Meter including GST – ActewAGL Retail Standing Offer)

	2007-08 <sup>3</sup>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Supply charge - Cents/day	N/A	51.70	53.13	53.90	56.10	66.55	73.48	75.79	75.79	80.41	96.14
Peak usage - Cents/kWh	N/A	17.82	19.25	19.69	21.23	24.42	24.86	21.868	23.375	24.926	28.688
Shoulder usage - Cents/kWh	N/A	13.86	14.3	14.465	15.40	18.70	19.25	17.16	15.785	16.775	20.515
Off-peak usage - Cents/kWh	N/A	10.78	10.593	10.736	11.154	13.75	14.08	12.793	11.55	12.606	16.126

<sup>3</sup> The first Time of Use based plans were introduced 1 July 2008, following metering reforms that required all new or replacement meters to report consumption on the basis of peak, off-peak and shoulder usage.