

Answers to questions

Transport—electric bike trial (Question No 173)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total cost of the electric bike trial to date under relevant categories, including (a) the cost of each bike, (b) maintenance, (c) additional equipment and (d) any other relevant categories.
- (2) Can the Minister list any additional equipment provided to users in addition to the bike itself, and the cost of acquiring and/or installing the equipment.
- (3) Can the Minister provide the total number of electric bikes purchased for the trial, and the average amount of bikes at each directorate location.
- (4) Can the Minister provide how many individuals (a) use the bikes on a weekly basis, (b) use the bikes on a monthly basis and (c) have used the bikes in total during the trial.
- (5) What logs are kept of the trips between directorates using the bikes.
- (6) Can the Minister, if possible, identify the most frequently undertaken trip and the number of times that trip has been completed in the trial to date.
- (7) Can the Minister, if possible, identify the most rarely undertaken trip and the number of times that trip has been completed in the trial to date.
- (8) What other directorates and locations have been or are being considered for inclusion within the trial.
- (9) When will additional directorates be added to the trial.
- (10) Can the Minister provide the average cost to include an additional directorate in the trial.
- (11) Can the Minister provide data on directorate vehicle use prior and during the trial, including (a) the number of trips, (b) running costs, (c) parking costs, (d) maintenance costs, (e) taxi costs, (f) bus fares and (g) any other relevant comparative measures used to determine the effectiveness of the trial.
- (12) What are the plans to utilise the electric bike fleet after the completion of the new Civic building.

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

- (1) Costs of the trial are as follows, noting that all figures are GST exclusive.
 - (a) The cost of each electric bike was \$2545.55.
 - (b) The maintenance cost of each bike is \$131.82 per service (two services are

conducted per year).

(c) The cost of additional equipment included wheel and cable locks (\$127.28 per bike) and a rear basket (\$45.45 per bike). Each electric bike also had signage produced and installed at a total cost of \$573.64.

(d) Installation of a GPS unit and data platform subscription cost \$362.73 per bike initially, with an ongoing annual cost of \$271.80 per year.

- (2) Riders are provided with a bike helmet each time they loan out an electric bike. Eight helmets were purchased at a cost of \$45.45 each.
 - (3) Eight electric bikes were purchased; there are 4 pairs of bikes currently located at four Directorates (EPSDD, TCCS, EDU and CMTEDD).
 - (4)
 - (a) The trial is not currently monitoring weekly use of the electric bikes, rather it plans to monitor bike trip usage overall.
 - (b) It is estimated that more than 45 individuals use the electric bikes per month, with most users booking the electric bikes multiple times per month.
 - (c) There are currently 207 individuals across Government that have been inducted in using the electric bikes.
 - (5) A GPS tracking device has been fitted to each electric bike, providing a database of trip information for the trial.
 - (6) The trial was established to provide electric bikes for the trips most commonly undertaken along the corridor between Dickson and Civic. The electric bikes are currently located at four locations along that route, and around 30 trips per month on average have occurred along the route between Dickson and Civic.
 - (7) The trial was established to provide electric bikes for the trips most commonly undertaken along the corridor between Dickson and Civic. There have, however been some trips to alternative destinations; for example, one return trip was undertaken between Dickson and Woden.
 - (8) All directorates have been invited to participate in the Ebike Project Control Group (PCG) which meets quarterly. Information and updates on the trial are communicated regularly through whole of government channels such as the Carbon Neutral Government Implementation Committee (CNGIC) which meets quarterly.
 - (9) All directorates are already included in the electric bike Project Control Group.
 - (10) There are no plans to expand to other Directorates during the trial. The current electric bike assets can be rotated to other Directorates pending results of the initial trial or if additional bikes are purchased this cost is outlined at points 1 and 2 above.
 - (11) These outcomes will be determined as part of the evaluation of the trial.
 - (12) The electric bikes are assets purchased by ACT Government and will be retained by ACT Government after the trial is completed. The findings of the trial will be used to determine the potential locations of the bikes following the trial.
-

**Icon Water—board remuneration
(Question No 175)**

Mr Coe asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 12 May 2017 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) Can the Chief Minister please outline the process for determining the remuneration of
(a) members of the Board of Icon Water and (b) executives of Icon Water.
- (2) Are bonuses, including for performance, payable to (a) members of the Board of Icon Water and (b) executives of Icon Water.
- (3) If the answer to part (2)(a) and (b) above is yes, provide the (a) criteria and the approval process for the payment of bonuses to Board members, (b) criteria and the approval process for the payment of bonuses to executives, (c) total amount paid in bonuses to members of the Board in (i) 2013-14, (ii) 2014-15, (iii) 2015-16 and (iv) 2016-17 to date and (d) total amount paid in bonuses to members of the executive in (i) 2013-14, (ii) 2014-15, (iii) 2015-16 and (iv) 2016-17 to date.

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

1. (a) Under Clause 58 of the Icon Water Constitution, remuneration for Directors is determined by Icon Water's Voting Shareholders. In setting remuneration, consideration is given to the ACT Remuneration Tribunal's Determinations for Part-time Public Office Holders. In addition, the Voting Shareholders consider other factors including the current level of remuneration in the water and sewerage industry and the need to recruit and retain board directors with the expertise and skills necessary to meet the requirements of Section 12 of the Territory-owned Corporations Act.

(b) Icon Water has a robust and transparent remuneration framework for the Executive. The remuneration framework includes evaluations for each executive role, conducted by an independent remuneration consultant with specialist expertise in the utilities sector. As part of these evaluations, the independent expert also conducts remuneration benchmarking utilising data from the All Utilities index. In addition, the Board meets as the Remuneration Committee to discuss remuneration issues for the Managing Director.

Details of the Icon Water Board and executive remuneration are made publicly available each year in Icon Water's Annual Report to the ACT Government.

2. (a) Bonuses are not payable to Icon Water Board members.
(b) Bonuses are not payable to Icon Water Executives.
3. (a) Not applicable.
(b) Not applicable.
(c) Not applicable.
(d) (i) 2013-14 = \$214,720 (as published in ACTEW Corporation Annual Report to the ACT Government 2013-14).
(ii) 2014-15 – not applicable.
(iii) 2015-16 – not applicable.
(iv) 2016-17 to date – not applicable.

**Public housing—redevelopment
(Question No 194)**

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) Why is information about the proposed public housing developments in Monash, Mawson, Chapman, Holder and Wright not displayed on the ACT Government's 'Your Say' website as well as on, or instead of, the website of the Public Housing Renewal Taskforce.
- (2) Was consideration given to holding a multi-stage consultation process for the proposed sites in part (1) similar to the process followed for the consultation on the redevelopment of the Red Hill Public Housing precinct.
- (3) What lessons have been learned to date from the approach undertaken for consultation on the proposed sites in part (1).
- (4) Will future proposed developments be handled in a different way; if so, outline the approaches that may be followed in the future.

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

- (1) Information was made available on the Public Housing Renewal Taskforce's (the Taskforce) website as the most appropriate place for consultation seeking site-specific feedback from the community.
- (2) The Taskforce is currently undertaking a multi-stage consultation, as has been done with some previous sites.
- (3) Community feedback is a critical part of the public housing renewal program. The program is continuing to evolve to take account of feedback received. The Taskforce will undertake a full review of lessons learned at the completion of the process. The Taskforce has identified different venue requirements for any future consultation sessions.
- (4) The consultation approach for future sites will be developed based on the specific characteristics of each site. A site-by-site approach is important given the different features of various locations across Canberra.

**Community Services Directorate—employee assistance program
(Question No 202)**

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Community Services and Social Inclusion, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) Can the Minister provide for each quarter of the financial years (a) 2012-13, (b) 2013-14, (c) 2014-15, (d) 2015-16 and (e) 2016-17 to date, the (i) total headcount of the Community Services Directorate and (ii) number of staff who accessed the employee assistance scheme.

- (2) For each of the financial years in part (1), provide the total cost of the employee assistance scheme.
- (3) For each of the financial years (a) 2012-13, (b) 2013-14, (c) 2014-15, (d) 2015-16 and (e) 2016-17 to date, what was the average number of personal leave days taken (based on full-time equivalent work days) and the personal leave absence percentage rate for staff of the Community Services Directorate.

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

- (1) (i) The total headcount of the Community Services Directorate for each quarter of the financial years 2012-13 to 2016-17 to date appears below:

Reporting Date	Total CSD Headcount
September 2012	1336
December 2012	1358
March 2013	1304
June 2013	1320
September 2013	1287
December 2013	1311
March 2014	1314
June 2014	1331
September 2014	1304
December 2014	1300
March 2015	1272
June 2015	1244
September 2015	1190
December 2015	1122
March 2016	1106
June 2016	1046
September 2016	950
December 2016	904
March 2017	880
17 May 2017	881

- (ii) number of staff who accessed the employee assistance scheme.

Year	Number
2012-13	120
2013-14	176
2014-15	182
2015-16	273
2016-17 (YTD)	160

- (2) For each of the financial years in part (1), provide the total cost of the employee assistance scheme.

Year	EAP Service Cost
2012-13	\$ 40,435.00
2013-14	\$ 118,883.00
2014-15	\$ 139,763.00
2015-16	\$ 197,086.00
2016-17 (YTD)	\$ 120,846.00

- (3) Information on personal leave days taken and the personal leave absence percentage rate for staff of the Community Services Directorate for the financial years requested is available in the ACT Public Service State of the Service Report, which is publicly available. Please note that information for the 2016-17 financial year will be available after 30 June 2017.

(Question No 236)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Economic Development, upon notice, on 12 May 2017 (*redirected to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide the list of Commercial and Residential agents currently on the Panel in relation to contract number 2013.18426 for the Panel of Commercial and Residential Property Agents.
- (2) What is the total amount paid to each agent on the Panel for the financial years (a) 2013-14, (b) 2014-15, (c) 2015-16 and (d) 2016-17 to date.
- (3) For the amounts in part (2)(a) to (d) what percentage does each amount represent of the total spend under contract 2013.18426.
- (4) In the circumstance when Panel members have submitted invoices to a value in excess of \$25,000, have those invoices been published on ACT Government Notifiable Invoices Register.
- (5) If invoices exceeding \$25,000 have not been published on the ACT Government Notifiable Invoices Register, what is the reason for failing to publish.
- (6) What criteria are used to determine which agent on the Panel will be allocated work under the contract.
- (7) When will contract 2013.18426 expire.
- (8) Will contract 2013.18426 be extended or will a new process be held to appoint agents to the Panel of Commercial and Residential Property Agents.

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

- (1) Ten firms make up the panel. They are:
 ACTGALL Pty. Limited (trading as **Raine and Horne Commercial Canberra**);
 Canberra Wide Pty Ltd (**trading as Luton Properties**);
CBRE (V) Pty. Limited;
Colliers International Pty. Limited;
 CP Commercial Pty. Limited (previously trading as **Ray White**, now trading as **Civium**);
Independent Property Group Sales Pty. Limited;
Jones Lang LaSalle (ACT) Pty. Limited;
Knight Frank Australia Pty. Ltd;
 Manuka Realty Pty. Ltd (trading as **MMJ**); and
 Scithom Realty ITF Scithom Unit Trust (trading as **LJ Hooker**).
- (2) The table below details the amount paid to each agent on the Panel by financial year:

Firm	(a) 2013-14 (\$m)	(b) 2014-15 (\$m)	(c) 2015-16 (\$m)	(d) 2016-17 to date (\$m)
Raine and Horne Commercial Canberra	1.384	0.346	0.096	0
Luton Properties	0	0.012	0	0
CBRE (V) Pty. Limited	1.503	0.221	0.074	0.065
Colliers International Pty. Limited;	0.245	0.622	2.326	0.518
Ray White	0	0.351	0.289	0
Independent Property Group Sales Pty. Limited	1.046	1.450	0.926	0.119
Jones Lang LaSalle (ACT) Pty. Limited	0.037	0.383	0	0.103
Knight Frank Australia Pty. Ltd	0.158	0.112	0.056	0.144
MMJ	0.153	0.025	0	0.127
LJ Hooker	0.125	0.253	0.125	0

(3) The table below details the total spend as a percentage by financial year 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 to date for each Panel agent:

Firm	2013-14 (%)	2014-15 (%)	2015-16 (%)	2016-17 to date (%)	Percentage of total spend
Raine and Horne Commercial Canberra	10.3	2.6	0.7	0	13.6
Luton Properties	0	0.1	0	0	0.1
CBRE (V) Pty. Limited	11.2	1.6	0.6	0.5	13.9
Colliers International Pty. Limited;	1.8	4.6	17.4	3.9	27.7
Ray White	0	2.6	2.2	0	4.8
Independent Property Group Sales Pty. Limited	7.8	10.8	6.9	0.9	26.4
Jones Lang LaSalle (ACT) Pty. Limited	0.3	2.9	0	0.8	3.9
Knight Frank Australia Pty. Ltd	1.2	0.8	0.4	1.1	3.5
MMJ	1.1	0.2	0	0.9	2.3
LJ Hooker	0.9	1.9	0.9	0	3.8

(4) Yes.

(5) Not applicable.

(6) The LDA appoints sales agents based on specialist skills they offer relevant to the type and nature of the release, previous work allocation, past performance and value for money.

For major releases such as new subdivisions and englobo sales, appropriately skilled

agents on the panel were invited to submit their marketing proposals, the nature of services or products offered and a quote for services.

- (7) The panel is due to expire on 30 June 2017.
- (8) A Request for Tender for a new panel (*Panel of Commercial and Residential Agents*) was advertised on 24 March 2017 and closed on 27 April 2017. Submissions are currently being assessed and the panel is expected to be in place by 1 July 2017.

Legislative Assembly—tabling of government responses (Question No 241)

Mr Coe asked the Attorney-General, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) Why has the Government not tabled a response to the Justice and Community Safety Standing Committee's Report No. 12 of 2015: Crimes Legislation Amendment Bill 2011 and the Crimes (Offences against Police) Amendment Bill 2012 presented to the Assembly on 5 June 2012 during the Seventh Assembly.
- (2) Will a response to the report in part (1) be tabled in the Ninth Assembly; if so, what deadline will be set for the response to be tabled before the Assembly; if not, explain why no response will be forthcoming from the Government.

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

- (1) The Justice and Community Safety Standing Committee's Report No.12 of 2012 recommended that the *Crimes Legislation Amendment Bill 2011* and the *Crimes (Offences Against Police) Amendment Bill 2012* not be supported by the Legislative Assembly.
- (2) The *Crimes Legislation Amendment Bill 2011* lapsed at the end of the seventh Assembly and the *Crimes (Offences Against Police) Amendment Bill 2012* was negatived on 6 June 2012. In those circumstances, the Government does not consider that it is necessary or relevant to table a response to the report on these bills.

Land Development Agency—staffing (Question No 243)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Urban Renewal, upon notice, on 12 May 2017 (*redirected to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development*):

- (1) How many Land Development Agency employees under Attraction and Retention Incentive (ARIN) Arrangements will have those benefits transferred to their new roles in the (a) City Renewal Authority and (b) Suburban Land Agency.
- (2) Will any of the Land Development Agency staff transferring to the City Renewal Authority or the Suburban Land Agency be impacted by changed employment arrangements; if so, outline the nature of these changes.
- (3) Can the Minister identify whether any staff not previously employed by the Land Development Agency, will be subject to ARIN Arrangements in the (a) City Renewal

Authority and (b) Suburban Land Agency.

- (4) Can the Minister provide the anticipated annual cost in 2017-18 of the ARIN arrangements for staff transferred from the Land Development Agency to the (a) City Renewal Authority and (b) Suburban Land Agency.
- (5) Can the Minister provide the anticipated cost of engaging employees in part (3) in 2017-18 under ARIN Arrangements with the (a) City Renewal Authority and (b) Suburban Land Agency.

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

- (1) No Land Development Agency employees transferring to the City Renewal Authority or the Suburban Land Agency have Attraction and Retention Incentive arrangements.
- (2) Some changes will occur to certain executive roles however, it is expected that all public servants will remain employed under the *Public Sector Management Act 1994* and current Enterprise Agreements. Discussions continue about options available to affected executives.
- (3) This is not known at this stage and would be subject to approval by the appropriate delegate.
- (4) This is not known at this stage and would be subject to approval by the appropriate delegate.

Public housing—Oaks Estate (Question No 255)

Ms Lee asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) Has the ACT Government evaluated the effectiveness of the rehabilitation/reintegration program in Oaks Estate; is so (a) when, (b) by whom and (c) what was the outcome.
- (2) By what process did the St Vincent de Paul Society acquire the contract to head-lease public housing flats in Oaks Estate.
- (3) When was the contract started and what is its duration.
- (4) What assessment, if any, has been undertaken into this arrangement and have other alternatives been considered.

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

- (1) St Vincent de Paul Society was required to provide an outcome report every six months to ACT Health on the Mental Health Accommodation and Outreach support program in Oaks Estate. Outcomes were measured using the Living Skills Profile, a recognised outcome measurement tool, which collects data on entry and progress throughout support.
- (2) St Vincent de Paul Society approached Housing ACT in 2008 to obtain properties as

part of the delivery of their support programs for Canberrans with complex needs. At the time, Housing ACT identified underutilised assets within the public housing portfolio that could be used to support the delivery of these specialist programs.

- (3) The first Tenancy Agreement between St Vincent de Paul Society and Housing ACT to utilise Oaks Estate properties occurred in December 2009. The Tenancy Agreements remain in place.
- (4) Housing ACT is currently undertaking a review of head lease arrangements in consultation with all community organisations including St Vincent de Paul Society. This review is focusing on how best to ensure that current head lease arrangements meet the needs of the most vulnerable in the community. Further consultations with community providers will occur in the coming months.

Public housing—relocations (Question No 259)

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

Further to the public housing sites announced on 15 March (a) how many of the public housing residents on Northbourne Avenue require supportive housing as defined prior to the December 2015 Technical Amendment that included public housing within this category, (b) what proportion of public housing residents being relocated will be provided with supportive housing as defined prior to the 2015 Technical Amendment and (c) how many of the new residences will have non-standard design and functional modifications to accommodate the needs of tenants being relocated.

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

- (a) All public housing tenants on Northbourne Avenue require supportive housing as defined prior to the December 2015 Technical Amendment.
- (b) Please refer to the answer at (a).
- (c) The proposals announced on 15 March 2017 were all located on Community Facility-zoned land. These sites will be Class C Adaptable and constructed to comply with Australian Standard 4299 – Adaptable Housing (Class C).

For sites that are located on non-Community Facility-zoned land, the Territory Plan requires a minimum percentage of new multi-unit housing developments, comprised of 10 or more dwellings, to meet Australian Standard AS4299 – Adaptable Housing (Class C).

In addition to this, Housing ACT aims to achieve a minimum standard of 'Liveable Gold' consistent with the Liveable Housing Design Guidelines developed by Liveable Housing Australia.

This additional requirement reflects the fact that, like all people, public housing tenants are diverse in age, mobility and health, having different and changing lifestyle needs. The development of properties to the Liveable Housing standards supports the creation of a safe and equitable environment for all.

**Public housing—business activities
(Question No 260)**

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) Are public housing tenants permitted to conduct a business from their residence or adjacent areas on public housing property.
- (2) What types of business activities are permitted within public housing complexes.
- (3) What is the process for obtaining approval to conduct a business and what information must the tenant include in their request for approval.
- (4) What conditions and obligations are attached to such approvals.
- (5) Does Housing ACT provide any assistance or facilitate the conduct of tenants' business activities from or on public housing property.
- (6) What are the rights and entitlements of other residents in relation to the conduct of business activities (if in fact these are permitted).
- (7) What rights and recourses do residents have if they find themselves disturbed by the conduct of an approved or unapproved business activity within a public housing precinct.
- (8) What action is Housing ACT obligated to take when receiving complaints of possible or persistent illegal activities occurring in or being conducted from public housing premises.

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

- (1) While Housing ACT is in the business of providing housing outcomes for some of those most vulnerable in the ACT community, public housing tenants are not subject to any more restrictions than any other member of the community. As a result home businesses must comply with the ACT Government rules for home based businesses that can be accessed via the Access Canberra website and comply with their obligations under the residential tenancy agreement and if applicable, the rental rebate policy.
- (2) As noted above public housing tenants are not subject to any more restrictions than any other member of the community and as a result businesses compatible with being operated from the individual tenanted premises are allowed.
- (3) There is no formal application process that a tenant needs to undertake. However, premises are let to be homes not businesses and as such tenants looking to start a business should advise Housing ACT and ensure that they have met or are capable of meeting all the requirements of that business including licences and public liability insurance.

If the premises require modification in order for a business to be able to be undertaken, there is a formal application process via Housing ACT which needs to be undertaken before any modifications are done.

- (4) I refer the member to the answer to question 1.
- (5) Housing ACT does not have any small business incentives. However, Housing ACT is supportive of its tenants and their residents undertaking educational and lawful employment opportunities including the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of being self employed business operators.
- (6) Tenants who are running businesses from their tenancies are still required to meet their tenancy obligations which include not to cause a nuisance or interfere with the quiet enjoyment of neighbours and to keep the premises reasonably clean.
- (7) All complaints or concerns relating to public housing properties should be raised with the Housing ACT complaints unit.
- (8) All complaints and concerns raised about public housing properties are investigated and Housing ACT does not condone the use of its properties for illegal purposes, however, under the *Residential Tenancies Act 1997*, such use is only a breach of the tenancy agreement if the illegal use is to the detriment of the lessor's interest in the property. All illegal acts should be reported to the Police as the responsible agency to determine appropriate action.

Disability services—housing (Question No 264)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

In regard to Havelock Housing and the recent Report on Government Services that noted that supported services in the ACT are struggling to meet demand and should exit people from their services into community housing or other stable accommodation, what (a) is the status of the merger between Havelock Housing and Capital Community Housing, (b) effect will this merger have on current housing clients, particularly those with a disability and (c) reasons are there for the consistently high vacancy rate at Havelock Housing.

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

- (a) Capital Community Housing (CCH) ceased operating on 28 February 2017, with 90 properties with tenants in situ choosing to transfer to Havelock Housing Association (HHA), eight households in the process of transferring to Housing ACT, and one household transferring to CatholicCare.
- (b) The transfer of tenancy management and tenancy support for tenants from CCH to HHA was an arrangement initiated by the sector and supported by Housing ACT to minimise disruption to tenancy services caused by the closure of CCH. All tenants, carers and guardians maintain the right to exercise choice over current and future service delivery arrangements. Tenants in receipt of support packages from the National Disability Insurance Scheme continue to receive disability support without disruption.
- (c) As at 29 May 2017, Havelock House has only one vacancy. While the viability of the shared accommodation model is impacted due to the increasing complexity of people for whom this model is not suitable, HHA has worked hard over the past two years to

reduce the vacancies by offering a range of financial incentives to encourage applicants and referrals, improving the reputation of Havelock House, and securing significant grants to improve the appearance and safety of the building.

Planning—community facility zoning (Question No 268)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) What are the instances (with detail provided for date proposed, date completed, and reasons for using this land for this purpose) of where public or social housing has been, or will be, built on CFZ land.
- (2) For CFZ land generally (a) how much CFZ land remains undeveloped or without an existing Development Application proposed for it, (b) what is the order of priority for the types of community facilities built on CFZ land, (c) what are the implications of the continued use of CFZ land for residential use, (d) what are the implications for the use of CFZ land used for “social housing” for the potential for mixed-use or for private ownership, (e) what are the Government’s views on the optimal future uses of CFZ land, (f) what is the current geographic spread of CFZ land and (g) what proportion of future greenfield or brownfield developments will be put aside as CFZ.
- (3) Why was the decision to make the addition of “social housing” under the definition of “supportive housing” in 2015 a technical amendment rather than a Territory Plan Variation.
- (4) Does the Government consider the 2015 technical amendment a “significant change” to the Territory Plan; if not, why not.
- (5) What are the current Government definitions for (a) public housing, (b) social housing and (c) supportive housing and where in legislation do these definitions appear.
- (6) What are the reasons that the Government has chosen to use CFZ land for “social housing”.

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

- (1) As at April 2017, Housing ACT holds 342 dwellings on Community Facility-zoned (CFZ) land. This includes two developments completed by the Public Housing Renewal Taskforce on CFZ land in Chisholm and Monash. A third site on CFZ land in Nicholls is currently under construction by the Public Housing Renewal Taskforce.

The public housing renewal projects in Monash, Chisholm and Nicholls were first identified in late 2014. The project in Chisholm was completed in June 2016, the project in Monash was completed in November 2016, and the project in Nicholls is expected to be completed in mid 2017.

CFZ sites are selected for “social housing” in the same way as sites in other land use zones, including sites on residential-zoned land.

- (2) For CFZ land generally:

- (a) There are over 60 unleased blocks of CFZ land available for use across Canberra. Of these blocks, nearly half are located in Tuggeranong, Woden or Weston Creek, with a few sites available in central Canberra, Gungahlin and in the Molonglo Valley.
- (b) The order of priority for the types of community facilities built on CFZ land is generally determined by the future demand for different types of facilities and their population catchments. Community facilities can include schools, child care centres, libraries, community centres, emergency services, police, health care, cultural activities and places of worship. Facilities which may require larger sites, such as schools or aged care accommodation, may be prioritised over those more commercial community uses which are able to respond to market demand, such as child care centres and medical centres.

From the perspective of users and to ensure efficient use of resources, some community facilities will be best provided in clusters or hubs with other community facilities, or co-located with other retail and commercial facilities in local, district or regional shopping centres.

- (c) The implications of the continued use of CFZ land for residential use are as follows:

Generally, the supply of land that is unleased and available for community facilities in the ACT is diminishing. In addition, some of the unleased CFZ land has constraints relating to access, topography or environmental issues. More innovative approaches to community facilities, such as flexible and multi-purpose spaces, will ensure ongoing supply.

The type of residential uses permitted on CFZ land is specifically limited to support those people in need and is managed by a Territory approved organisation that provides a range of support services.

- (d) The implications for the use of CFZ land used for “social housing” for the potential for mixed-use or for private ownership are as follows:

The Territory Plan sets out a wide range of potential community and recreational uses on the CFZ land.

Private residential housing is not allowed on CFZ land.

Separate ownership of an individual supportive housing dwelling is not allowed.

- (e) The Government’s views on the optimal future uses of CFZ land are as follows:

In allocating land and places for community facilities, there is a need to ensure that people living in different parts of the ACT have equality of opportunity to access community facilities and services that meet their needs and preferences.

The distribution of community facilities needs to take into account that catchment sizes for different services vary, with some services being provided for the whole ACT, others for districts and some at the local level.

There is also a need to allow for flexibility to accommodate changes over time in the demographic profile of different areas, and changes in community service delivery arrangements, such as the NDIS.

- (f) As at May 2017, the geographical spread of CFZ land in each district, rounded to the nearest whole number, is as follows:
- i. Belconnen 514 ha
 - ii. Tuggeranong 262 ha
 - iii. Canberra Central 250 ha
 - iv. Gungahlin 140 ha
 - v. Woden Valley 130 ha
 - vi. Weston Creek 105 ha
 - vii. Molonglo 53 ha.
- (g) Planning for greenfield and brownfield developments considers the needs for identified parcels of CFZ land as well as any opportunities to collocate community uses in centres and close to public transport. The range of community facilities needed depends on the size and composition of the catchment population both now and into the future, and the availability and access to existing facilities in neighbouring established areas.
- (3) The Territory Plan provides the policy framework for the administration of planning in the ACT. The Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate administer the Territory Plan and must follow the requirements set out in the *Planning and Development Act 2007* (the Act).

Proposals for technical amendments to the Territory Plan must satisfy the requirements of the Act. If not, then a full Territory Plan variation is required.

Technical amendments allow for minor changes to be made to the Territory Plan. These include clerical, routine, language, technical, operational and minor policy updates to the Territory Plan.

A decision was made to add “social housing” to the common terminology under the definition of “supportive housing” in 2015 via a technical amendment, rather than a Territory Plan Variation. This occurred in technical amendment TA2015-16. The addition of “social housing” to the common terminology of “supportive housing” was considered to be a clarification of the language of the Territory Plan without changing the substance of the Territory Plan under section 87(2)(e) of the Act. This change was made to provide a further example of the type of permitted development that clarified the meaning and context of the definition of “supportive housing” in the Territory Plan. There was no change to the substance of the Territory Plan.

This category of technical amendment requires limited public consultation and the technical amendment was publicly notified in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

- (4) The Government does not consider the 2015 technical amendment (TA2015-16) a “significant change” to the Territory Plan. This is because the change was made to provide an additional example of the type of development permitted under the definition of “supportive housing” by listing “social housing” under Some Common Terminology in the Territory Plan. This list is considered to be helpful, but not exhaustive, in providing a level of clarity around the residential uses permitted within the category of “supportive housing”, provided they can still meet the requirements to be considered “supportive housing”. TA2015-16 did not change the definition of

“supportive housing”.

(5) The current Government definitions are as follows:

- (a) “Public housing” is a term in general usage around Australia. It is understood to mean housing owned by a State or Territory public housing authority, including properties managed by non-government agencies.

In the ACT, public housing is defined through a Disallowable Instrument under the *Housing Assistance Act 2007*. The Disallowable Instrument is the *Housing Assistance Public Rental Housing Assistance Program 2013 (No.1)*. The definition is as follows:

Public housing means rental housing properties held by the Commissioner for Social Housing (the housing commissioner), and available for the provision of rental housing assistance under this program.

- (b) “Social housing” is a term in general usage around Australia, such as in the former National Partnership Agreement on Social Housing. This term is considered to encompass public housing (as defined above), affordable housing and community housing, which is housing owned or managed by an organisation registered as a Community Housing provider. There is a National Regulatory System for Community Housing providers, for which further information is available at www.nrsch.gov.au/.

- (c) “Supportive housing” in the ACT is defined in section 13 of the Territory Plan under ‘Definitions’. The definition is as follows:

Supportive housing means the use of land for residential accommodation for persons in need of support, which is managed by a Territory approved organisation that provides a range of support services such as counselling, domestic assistance and personal care for residents as required. Although such services must be able to be delivered on site, management and preparation may be carried out on site or elsewhere. Housing may be provided in the form of self-contained *dwelling*s. This term does not include a *retirement village* or student accommodation.

- (6) All sites selected for the construction of replacement public housing as part of the public housing renewal program, including CFZ land, are selected based on an analysis of vacant and available Territory-owned land (that is, the land is suitably zoned in the Territory Plan and has not been identified for any other purpose). An assessment is then made of each site based on its size and features (such as slope and existing trees), its proximity to public transport, shops and services and other public housing, and the possible number of dwellings that could be constructed consistent with the Territory Plan.

Crime—statistics (Question No 271)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) What crime data exactly is regularly provided to Neighbourhood Watch.

- (2) Are there any restrictions or limitations on what crime data they can be given.
- (3) How recent is the data when it is given.
- (4) By what means is it communicated.

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

- (1) The crime data provided to Neighbourhood Watch ACT includes assaults, burglaries, stolen motor vehicles, theft and criminal damage. All data is broken down by patrol area, suburb, offence type, street name (excluding the house numbers) and date of the offence.
- (2) Yes. Crime data relating to sexual assaults is not provided due to the sensitive nature of the crime type and to ensure confidentiality for victims. For all reported offences, personal particulars such as date of birth, name, gender and age are also withheld to protect the dignity and identity of victims.
- (3) The data is provided monthly (usually within the first week of the month), capturing the whole of the previous calendar month.
- (4) ACT Policing provides the crime data via email to the President of the Neighbourhood Watch ACT.

Crime Legislation Bill 2017—notification (Question No) 272

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

Further to the answer to Question on Notice #16 during the Justice and Community Safety Annual Reports Hearings 2015-16 on 7 March 2017 (a) in what form was notification provided to the ACT Courts and Tribunal Administration about the proposed Crime Legislation Bill 2017 and (b) what was the distribution list of those who received notification.

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

- (a) The ACT Law Courts and Tribunal Administration received notification about the proposed Crimes Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 on 2 February 2017 as part of the Cabinet submission process.
- (b) Electronic access to the notification was provided to:
 - Counsel Assisting and Legal Manager Coroners Section
 - President ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal
 - Presidential Member ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal
 - Senior Manager Operations ACT Law Courts and Tribunal
 - Registrar Supreme Court
 - Senior Deputy Registrar Supreme Court
 - Principal Registrar ACT Law Courts and Tribunal

- Executive Officer to Principal Registrar
 - Senior Manager ACAT; and
 - Registrar Magistrates Court.
-

Alexander Maconochie Centre—detainees with disability (Question No 274)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

Further to the answer to question taken on notice #18 during the Justice and Community Safety Annual Reports Hearings 2015-16 on 7 March 2017, in relation to detainees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre with a disability, in particular the “Custodial Information System Briefcase which is not searchable in terms of producing a report to ascertain numbers”, when will such a database be introduced so such data can be searchable.

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

The new software will be introduced in a staged approach. ACTCS has begun the first phase of implementation and will continue to roll out subsequent phases until the system becomes fully operational in 2018.

Although this upgrade in software is anticipated to increase ACTCS’ ability to collect information, the disability status of detainees is a health record and should be provided by Justice Health.

Alexander Maconochie Centre—elderly detainees (Question No 275)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

Further to the answer to question taken on notice #19 during the Justice and Community Safety Annual Reports Hearings 2015-16 on 7 March 2017 (a) what planning is underway for the housing and care of elderly detainees and (b) has the ACT Government investigated what services and housing other jurisdictions have available to elderly detainees.

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

- (a) Elderly AMC detainees are case managed according to their specific accommodation and care needs which includes mental health, physical health, age and gender-related complexities.
 - (b) ACTCS communicates with other jurisdictions about corrections standards and considers opportunities to develop and enhance services delivered to all cohorts of detainees at the AMC.
-

Alexander Maconochie Centre—domestic violence programs (Question No 276)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

Further to the answer to question taken on notice #22 during the Justice and Community Safety Annual Reports Hearings 2015-16 on 7 March 2017, in relation to the Domestic Abuse Program, in particular the section that says offenders must “consent to their current female partner, whether victim of the offense or not, to be contacted for the purpose of completing a referral to the Domestic Violence Crisis Service” (a) does this ever mean that men cannot attend the Domestic Abuse Program because the referral is not desired by the female partner and (b) how does this apply to same-sex couples.

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

- a) Partners are able to choose whether they will accept support from the Domestic Violence Crisis Service during the course of the Domestic Abuse Program. A partner’s decision does not affect an offender’s eligibility to participate in the program.
- b) The Domestic Abuse Program is designed for and targeted at men who are convicted of a domestic violence offence against a female partner or spouse. The program has drawn on a gendered understanding of violence and abuse within relationships and addresses these issues from the perspective of power and control.

ACTCS runs the Out of the Dark Program for female offenders who have been victims of domestic violence, and more general programs that address issues of violence including the Violence Intervention Program. Some participants in the Out of the Dark Program may be victims of domestic or family violence as well as perpetrators of domestic or family violence.

ACTCS facilitates programs that address anti-social thoughts and actions including the Anger Management Program and Cognitive Self Change Program. These programs are available to perpetrators of violence within a same sex relationship and to female perpetrators.

Should an offender or detainee be assessed as requiring intervention but not be suitable for an existing program, they would be offered one on one counselling.

Substance abuse can be a factor in domestic violence and there are programs available for both male and female offenders that aim to address this, including the Harm Minimisation AOD Program, First Steps Alcohol and Drug Course and the Solaris Therapeutic Community Program (male detainees only).

Rural fire services—staff training (Question No 277)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

Further to the answer to question taken on notice #23 during the Justice and Community Safety Annual Reports Hearings 2015-16 on 7 March 2017, in relation to the 28 members of the Volunteer Brigades who are yet to complete the burn assessment of the Bush Firefighter course, when will those assessments take place.

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

As at 16 May 2017, there are 10 members of the Volunteer Brigades who are yet to complete the burn assessment of the Bush Firefighter course.

Assessment for these remaining 10 volunteer members will be dependent on appropriate weather conditions for a safe burn, access to suitable sites, and the availability of assessors and volunteers.

ACT Policing—surveillance warrants (Question No 278)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

Further to the answer to question taken on notice #26 during the Justice and Community Safety Annual Reports Hearings 2015-16 on 7 March 2017, in particular in relation to the “four instances of non-compliance with section 10 of the Act, which specifies who may issue a surveillance device warrant”, has any action been taken to (a) retrain officers to follow the set procedures and (b) tighten these processes; if not, will action be taken.

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

ACT Policing advises me that AFP members applying for ACT Surveillance Device Warrants are required to do so in line with AFP guidelines. All applications and affidavits are forwarded to a professional staff member performing the role of the ACT Special Projects Registrar (SPR) within ACT Policing Criminal Investigations for record keeping.

The ACT SPR receives training in order to ensure ACT Policing complies with relevant legislation in respect of Special Projects (SP), including ACT Surveillance Device Warrants. Accordingly, the “four instances of non-compliance with section 10 of the Act” were identified and self-reported by ACT Policing.

SP applications can only be legally made to and granted by individuals specifically designated as ‘authorised officers’. The list of authorised officers in respect of Commonwealth Surveillance Device Warrants is distinct from the list of authorised officers in respect of ACT Surveillance Device Warrants. The instances of non-compliance occurred when members of ACT Policing applied via the National SPR, who mistakenly drew on the Commonwealth list of authorised officers, rather than the ACT list.

No additional training was required to address the shortcomings; however ACT Policing has reiterated the distinction between authorised officer lists to its members. Additionally, the distinction has been communicated to the National SPR and other AFP members who may have cause to apply for ACT SP. Furthermore, the ACT SPR and National SPR are working together to establish complimentary, coherent procedures.

Alexander Maconochie Centre—security breaches (Question No 280)

Mrs Jones asked the Minister for Corrections, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

Further to the answer to question taken on notice #20 during the Justice and Community

Safety Annual Reports Hearings 2015-16 on 7 March 2017, in relation to contraband phones being intercepted, (a) why was there a significant spike in intercepted phones in April 2016 (14 phones intercepted), (b) why was there a spike in intercepted phones in February 2017 (6 phones intercepted) and (c) how many phones were intercepted, each month from July 2015 to March 2017, coming from (i) visitors, (ii) staff and (iii) over the fence.

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

- a) The spike in mobile phone seizures in April 2016 was due to intensive intelligence-driven targeting of detainees suspected of possessing or having access to a mobile phone. This resulted in 14 mobile phones being seized from persons and housing areas.
- b) The spike in intercepted phones in February 2017 was due to two separate over the fence packages being intercepted. A total of five mobile phones were seized between the two intercepts.
- c) Table of phone intercepts from July 2015 – April 2017:

2015	(i) Visitors	(ii) Staff	(iii) OTF	AMC/TRC	Total
July				1	1
August				2	2
September				3	3
October				1	1
November				2	2
December			4	2	6
2016					
January				3	3
February			1	2	3
March				1	1
April				14	14
May				2	2
June	1			2	3
July				1	1
August				3	3
September				3	3
October				1	1
November				3	3
December				3	3
2017					
January				1	1
February			5	1	6

March					0
April				5	5
Total/area	1	0	10	58	67

OTF – Over the Fence

AMC/TRC – found within the AMC or Transitional Release Centre

Arts—public artworks (Question No 290)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for the Arts and Community Events, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) Further to the Minister's answer to question taken on notice No 15 during the inquiry of the Standing Committee on Economic Development and Tourism into referred 2015-16 annual and financial reports on 28 February 2017 in respect of public artworks for which artsACT is responsible (excluding works acquired under the percent-for-art scheme), what was the total budget, for routine repairs and maintenance, in (a) 2012-13, (b) 2013-14, (c) 2014-15, (d) 2015-16 and (e) 2016-17.
- (2) How much was spent on routine repairs and maintenance in each of those years listed in part (1), including the year to date figure for 2016-17.
- (3) What was the program for routine repairs and maintenance for each of those years listed in part (1) and was the program completed as planned (including year to date for 2016-17); if not, why not.
- (4) Who was contracted or otherwise engaged to carry out the work for the years referred to in part (1).
- (5) How are work requirements assessed and by whom.
- (6) In relation to non-routine repairs and maintenance, how much was spent in (a) 2012-13, (b) 2013-14, (c) 2014-15, (d) 2015-16 and (e) 2016-17 (year to date).
- (7) What was the funding source for those years listed in part (6).
- (8) What was the nature of the work done for those years listed in part (6).
- (9) Who was contracted or otherwise engaged to carry out the work for those years listed in part (6).
- (10) In relation to each artwork, (a) when was it acquired, (b) how much did it cost, (c) who was the artist, (d) where did the artist live at the time of acquisition, (e) what is its current value and (f) when was that value assessed and by whom.

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

- (1) The total budget for public art repairs and maintenance for each year is as follows, noting that budget is for both routine and non-routine maintenance as identified in the budget papers:

- a. 2012-13: \$150,000
 - b. 2013-14: \$154,000
 - c. 2014-15: \$157,000
 - d. 2015-16: \$162,000
 - e. 2016-17: \$164,000
- (2) Repairs and maintenance expenditure for each year is as follows, noting that expenditure is a total of both routine and non-routine maintenance. Public art repairs and maintenance expenditure is recorded in total figures to enable reporting against the budget allocation :
- a. 2012-13: \$143,102
 - b. 2013-14: \$157,756
 - c. 2014-15: \$156,091
 - d. 2015-16: \$162,000
 - e. 2016-17: \$70,836.75 to 31 May 2017
- (3) The program for repairs and maintenance for artworks is documented by the artist in an artwork maintenance manual. Requirements for reactive maintenance (such as graffiti removal) are assessed on an as-needs basis by Cultural Canberra with input from artists, artwork conservators and other specialist consultants and contractors as required. The artwork repairs and maintenance program was completed as planned in previous financial years and as scheduled to date in 2016-17.
- (4) The contractors engaged to deliver the work for the years referred to in part (1) were as follows:
- Armature Design Support
 - Art & Archival
 - Artillion Pty Ltd
 - Auzpicious Arts
 - Bamstone
 - Blasted Glass Designs
 - Canberra Glassworks
 - Craig & Susan Barnes (Jim's Mowing)
 - Cribb's Contracting
 - David Jensz
 - DesignCraft
 - Don't Panic Plumbing
 - Ecowise
 - EP Electrical Services
 - Eric Martin and Associates
 - Geoff Farquhar-Still
 - Harris Hobbs Landscapes
 - HUB Group
 - Image LED Lighting
 - International Conservation Services
 - Kon Dimopoulos
 - Mag Welding Services
 - Matthew Harding
 - Nott Just Mowing
 - Philip Spelman Sculpture
 - Programmed Property Services

Pyramid Corporation P/L
 Redbox Design Group
 Sellick Consultants
 Sound Advice
 Tim Hodge Stonemason Sculptor
 Undercut Enterprises

- (5) The program for repairs and maintenance for artworks is documented by the artist in an artwork maintenance manual. Requirements for reactive maintenance (such as graffiti removal) are assessed on an as-needs basis by Cultural Canberra with input from artists and artwork conservators as required.
- (6) Refer total repairs and maintenance expenditure listed in (2). Public art repairs and maintenance expenditure is recorded in total figures to enable reporting against the budget allocation.
- (7) The funding source for non-routine repairs and maintenance is the same for routine repairs and maintenance and is as provided in the budget papers.
- (8) The nature of the work done for those years listed in part (6) included non-routine tasks such as graffiti and sticker removal, repair of vandalised works, electrical repairs (lighting), consultant advice as required, repair of damaged artwork plinth or surrounding pavement, treatment of rust and repair of subsurface drainage.
- (9) Refer (4) above.
- (10)
- a. Refer table below.
 - b. Refer table below.
 - c. Refer table below.
 - d. Refer table below.
 - e. Refer table below.
 - f. The artworks were most recently valued by art valuer, Helen Maxwell, in June 2015.

Artwork	(a) Installation Date	(b) Cost*	(c) Artist	(d) Artist Location*	(e) Current Value 2015
<i>ACT Bushfire Memorial</i>	2006		Tess Horwitz, Anthony Steel, Martyn Jolly	ACT	\$ 350,000
<i>ACT Memorial</i>	2006		Matthew Harding	VIC	\$ 400,000
<i>Ainslie's Sheep</i>	2001		Les Kossatz	VIC	\$ 200,000
<i>Angel Wings</i>	2008	\$ 129,000	Phil Price	NZ	\$ 200,000
<i>Aquila</i>	2007		Phil Spelman	ACT	\$ 75,000
<i>Blue Sky Shard & Magenta Fold</i>	2011	\$ 380,000	Jon Tarry	WA	\$ 425,000
<i>Bush Pack (nil tenure)</i>	2011	\$ 150,000	Amanda Stuart	ACT	\$ 120,000
<i>Casuarina Pods</i>	2001		Matthew Harding	VIC	\$ 75,000
<i>Centenary Column</i>	2014	\$ 220,210	Geoff Farquhar-Still	ACT	\$ 220,210
<i>Centricity, consisting of Ripple, Fingerprint and Crucible</i>	2002		Matthew Harding & Mark Woolston	VIC	\$ 130,000

<i>Chalchiuhtlicue (The Goddess of Water)</i>	2012		Jesus Mayagoitia	Mexico	\$ 35,000
<i>Choice of Passage</i>	2008	\$ 10,554	Phil Spelman	ACT	\$ 85,000
<i>Circuitry</i>	2000		Fiona Hooton	ACT	\$ 100,000
<i>Confucius</i>	2010		Jiaxiang Stone Carving Studio, Qufu	China	\$ 40,000
<i>Crossing Over</i>	2001		Wendy Mills	NSW	\$ 80,000
<i>Culture Fragment</i>	2011	\$ 115,000	David Jenz	ACT	\$ 65,000
<i>Decollette</i>	2000		Michael Le Grand	ACT	\$ 85,000
<i>Dinornis Maximus</i>	2008	\$ 125,000	Phil Price	NZ	\$ 200,000
<i>Droplet</i>	2012	\$ 200,000	Stuart Green	WA	\$ 218,000
<i>Egle Queen of Serpents</i>	1988		Ieva Pocius	SA/ Lithuania	\$ 45,000
<i>Eternity</i>	1981		John Robinson	UK	\$ 55,000
<i>Ethos</i>	1962		Tom Bass	NSW	\$ 350,000
<i>Exterior Mosaic</i>	1997		Andrew Townsend & Suzie Bleach	NSW	\$ 35,000
<i>Fenix 2</i>	2011		No Artist - Replica	N/A	\$ 10,000
<i>Fireline</i>	1997		Nola Farman	NSW	\$ 50,920
<i>Firestorm Story Tree</i>	2007		Bryan Carrick and Kambah community	ACT	\$ 125,000
<i>Gathering Place</i>	2002		Wellspring (Jennifer Jones & Phil Nizette)	ACT	\$ 90,000
<i>Ginninginderry Lights</i>	2015	\$ 99,500	Geoff Farquhar-Still	ACT	\$ 99,500
<i>Harmonies</i>	2008		Wellspring Environmental Art and Design	ACT	\$ 55,000
<i>Here and Now</i>	2011	\$ 184,100	Anna Eggert	ACT	\$ 200,000
<i>Honey Eater Rising</i>	2009		Wellspring Environmental Art and Design	ACT	\$ 45,000
<i>Illumicube</i>	1988		Kerry Simpson	ACT	\$ 250,000
<i>Lady with Flowers</i>	2011	\$ 146,273	Dean Bowen	VIC	\$ 205,000
<i>Living Space</i>	2003		Kunstforce (Geoffrey Farquhar Still & Angela Dufty)	ACT	\$ 50,000
<i>Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi</i>	2002		Ram V Sutar		\$ 50,000
<i>Narrabundah Site Marker</i>	1998		Andrew Townsend & Suzie Bleach	NSW	\$ 45,000
<i>Nest III</i>	2009		Richard Moffat	NSW	\$ 45,000
<i>New Blood (Gateway Artwork)</i>	2005		Paloma Ramos		\$ 25,000
<i>Other Side of Midnight</i>	2012	\$ 187,000	Anne Ross	VIC	\$ 210,000
<i>Oushi zokei, dream lens for the future</i>	2011	\$ 205,000	Keizo Ushio	Japan	\$ 250,000
<i>Patria es Humanidad (Our Country is Humanity)</i>	2013		Nelson Dominguez Cedeño with Geoff Farquhar-Still		\$ 40,000
<i>Poets Corner Busts</i>	2011	\$ 83,000	Cathy Weiszmann	NSW	\$ 155,000
<i>Prime Minister John Curtin and Treasurer Ben Chifley, ca 1945</i>	2011	\$ 176,093	Peter Corlett	VIC	320,000

<i>Rain Pools</i>	2008		Stephen Newton	QLD	\$ 150,000
<i>Reclamation Culture, Spirit & Place</i>	2007		Sandra Hill and Jim Williams with Tony Pankiw and Jenny Dawson	WA	\$ 110,000
<i>Red and Blue</i>	2008	\$ 14,042	Inge King	VIC	\$ 120,000
<i>Resting Place of the Dragonfly</i>	1989		Mary Kayser	ACT	\$ 40,000
<i>Running Lights</i>	2006		Thylacine Art Projects	ACT	\$ 230,000
<i>Sculptural Seats</i>			Phil Spelman and Pat Harry	ACT	\$ 10,000
<i>Sculpture No 23 (The Parcel)</i>	2007	\$ 12,688	Alex Seton	NSW	\$ 95,000
<i>Sculptured Form</i>	1972		Margel Hinder		\$ 500,000
<i>Seqvanae</i>	1978		Michael Kitching		\$ 90,000
<i>Sir Robert Menzies</i>	2012	\$ 130,847	Peter Corlett	VIC	\$ 167,000
<i>The Big Little Man</i>	2007	\$ 17,744	Dean Bowen	VIC	\$ 100,000
<i>The Cushion</i>	2001		Matthew Harding	VIC	\$ 110,000
<i>The Encounter</i>	2014		Hugo Morales		\$ 45,000
<i>The Fourth Pillar</i>	1997		Neil Roberts	NSW	\$ 140,000
<i>The Glebe</i>	2002		Hew Chee Fong & Loretta M Noonan		\$ 150,000
<i>The Goongarline</i>	2008		Malcom Utley	NSW	\$ 150,000
<i>The Master's Voice</i>	2001		Sonia Leber & David Chesworth	VIC	\$ 140,000
<i>The Meeting Place</i>	2007	\$ 20,000	Silvio Gallelli	NSW	\$ 360,000
<i>The Moai Statue</i>	1998		Pedro Atan and Matthew Harding		\$ 25,000
<i>Touching Lightly</i>	2010		Warren Langley	NSW	\$ 800,000
<i>Tree of Knowledge</i>	2010		Peter Latona	ACT	\$ 120,000
<i>Twilight</i>	2004		Christopher Chapman & Ivan Siebel	ACT	\$ 130,000
<i>Two to Tango</i>	2011	\$ 200,000	Michael Le Grand	ACT	\$ 230,000
<i>Untitled (O'Connor Shops)</i>	1998		Wellspring Environmental Design	ACT	\$ 25,000
<i>Untitled 2008</i>	2009		John-Pierre Rives		\$ 52,500
<i>Vessel of (Horti)cultural Plenty</i>	2010		Warren Langley	NSW	\$ 80,000
<i>We Are Fishes</i>	1998		Andrew Townsend	ACT	\$ 27,000
<i>Wind Sculpture</i>	1981		Ernst Fries		\$ 95,000
<i>Winds of Light</i>	2011		Peter Blizzard	VIC	\$ 80,500
<i>World Peace Flame Monument</i>	2001		Jim Williams		\$ 30,000
*artist commission or acquisition fees based on available records. Some artwork costs and artist's location not accessible within the time frame allowed for answering the question as records stored offsite and retrieval required.					

**Canberra Hospital—emergency evacuation
(Question No 291)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 12 May 2017:

- (1) What are the procedures associated with an emergency, such as, but not limited to, a fire emergency at Canberra hospitals.
- (2) What are the procedures associated with evacuation of staff and patients.
- (3) Who has a role in the evacuation of staff and patients and what are those roles.
- (4) At what point in an emergency is a decision made to evacuate staff and patients.
- (5) How are immobile patients evacuated when lifts are closed to use.
- (6) Are any staff permitted to evacuate without ensuring the safety or evacuation of patients; if so, what staff and why.
- (7) How often are evacuation drills conducted.
- (8) When was the last drill.
- (9) Are drill de-briefs held.
- (10) Are improvements made to procedures as a result of evacuation drills.
- (11) When was the last procedural improvement made and what was it.

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

- (1) There are a number of different emergency response codes used throughout Canberra Hospital consistent with the Australian Standards Australian Standard 4083 - 2010 Planning for emergencies - Health care facilities and the *Emergencies Act 2004* and form part of the business as usual operations. Canberra Hospital has a detailed Emergency Response framework in place.
- (2) The Canberra Hospital Code Orange Emergency Response Plan describes the method for evacuating patients, relatives, visitors and staff from the Canberra Hospital and how to return to normal business following such an emergency.
- (3) An Emergency Control Organisation (ECO) is in place at Canberra Hospital. Positions within the ECO consist of Zone, Floor, House and Chief Wardens. The role of each warden is described within the Canberra Hospital Code Orange Emergency Response Plan.

Any ACT Health employee may assist in the evacuation of staff and patients. Depending on the type and extent of the incident, evacuation may be supported by ACT Fire & Rescue and other ACT Government Directorates.

- (4) Evacuation of an area or building within Canberra Hospital may be prompted by many events, including any other event that presents an immediate risk to the health and safety of staff, patients and visitors.

At any time a staff team leader may instigate the movement of staff and patients to a safe area and await instructions. The decision to conduct an evacuation of a floor can be

made by the Floor Warden or person in charge facing that particular emergency. The authority to order a building evacuation rests with the Hospital Commander or the recognised delegate or under direction from ACT Fire & Rescue or AFP.

- (5) Canberra Hospital Code Orange Emergency Response Plan is centered on Horizontal evacuation and not evacuating a Patient Care building unless all internal provisions have been exhausted. Patient Care buildings are constructed with fire compartments. Horizontal evacuation is the evacuation from one fire compartment where the fire originates to an adjoining compartment on the same floor. Each fire compartments provides 120 minutes of refuge from a fire. The occupants may remain there until the fire is dealt with or await further evacuation to another similar adjoining compartment or down the nearest stairway.

This procedure provides time for non-ambulant and partially ambulant patients to be evacuated down stairways, and for ACT Fire & Rescue to respond and take necessary action.

Should it become necessary to evacuate an entire floor, ACT Fire & Rescue personal will assist with the evacuation of non ambulant patients in coordination with clinical staff.

- (6) All staff receive Fire & Emergency training that aligns with Emergency Response Plans. Staff that have roles within the ECO as described within the Canberra Hospital Code Orange Emergency Response Plan receive additional training. This training ensures that staff respond safely in alignment with the plan. Staff assist in an emergency situation if it is safe for them to do so.
- (7) Emergency Exercises, which include evacuation drills and simulations, are undertaken in each Canberra Hospital building annually.
- (8) The last drill completed was a warden training session that included a walk through Emergency Exercise on 15 May 2017.
- (9) Debriefs are held at the conclusion of all practical Emergency Exercises with the responsible staff.
- (10) Yes, results from the Emergency Exercises are reviewed with participants and fire safety support personnel, and improvements to response procedures are progressed.
- (11) The last procedural improvements were made in May 2017 in response to the April 2017 switchboard incident, and relate to ICT systems and process enhancements:
- a. Second back-up communication system utilising Territory Radio Network (TRN) handsets
 - b. Establishment of emergency response leaders and kits for ICT issues
 - c. Enhancement of telephones for the Canberra Hospital Emergency Operations Centre, including colour-coded pre-configured handsets
-