



Debates

WEEKLY HANSARD

Legislative Assembly for the ACT

NINTH ASSEMBLY

30 JULY 2020

www.hansard.act.gov.au

Thursday, 30 July 2020

Ngunnawal language in the Assembly.....	1701
Ms Sue Salthouse (Motion of condolence).....	1705
Petitions: Planning—Weston parkland—petition 5-20 (Ministerial response)	1717
Motion to take note of petitions	1718
Mental Health Amendment Bill 2020.....	1719
Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee.....	1722
Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee.....	1723
Ministerial arrangements	1733
Questions without notice:	
Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate— staffing	1734
Planning—Coombs peninsula	1734
ACT Health—child sex offences.....	1735
ACT Health—child sex offences.....	1736
ACT Corrective Services—intensive correction orders	1737
Access Canberra—data security	1737
Trade unions—CFMMEU fines	1738
Children and young people—parental contact	1738
Public land—bike tracks.....	1739
Building—COVID-safe construction sites	1740
Hospitals—waiting times	1741
Health—elective surgery	1742
Government—community support	1743
Supplementary answers to questions on notice:	
ACT Health—child sex offences.....	1745
Health—elective surgery	1745
Leave of absence.....	1745
Papers.....	1745
Industrial relations—long service leave.....	1746
Housing—affordability	1756
Planning and Urban Renewal—Standing Committee.....	1769
Economic Development and Tourism—Standing Committee	1770
Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee	1770
Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee.....	1771
Planning and Urban Renewal—Standing Committee.....	1771
Executive business—precedence	1771
Public Health Amendment Bill 2020 (No 2)	1771
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Amendment Bill 2020	1775
Electricity Feed-in (Renewable Energy Premium) Amendment Bill 2020	1781
Adjournment:	
Mr John van Waterschoot—tribute	1786
Roads—traffic calming.....	1787
Schedule of amendments:	
Schedule 1: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Amendment Bill 2020.....	1789

Answers to questions:

Municipal services—tree management (Question No 2075— revised response).....	1791
Justice—COVID-19 (Question No 3002)	1792
Roads—projects (Question No 3010).....	1794
Children and young people—care and protection (Question No 3011)	1797
Environment—Hall park upgrade project (Question No 3012)	1803
Ginninderry—vegetation (Question No 3014)	1804
Education Directorate—staffing (Question No 3021).....	1806
Homelessness—COVID-19 (Question No 3022).....	1807
Roads—speed cameras (Question No 3024)	1812
Government—contracts (Question No 3025).....	1815
Housing ACT—tenant records (Question No 3026)	1817
Housing ACT—energy efficiency (Question No 3027).....	1820
Housing ACT—maintenance (Question No 3028)	1821
Gaming—point of consumption tax (Question No 3029)	1823
Municipal services—play space upgrades (Question No 3030).....	1824
Youth homelessness—government funding (Question No 3031).....	1825
ACT Health—expenditure (Question No 3032).....	1828
Hospitals—emergency department performance (Question No 3034)	1831
Planning—status of projects (Question No 3037).....	1834
Trees—removal (Question No 3038)	1835
Children and young people—care and protection (Question No 3039)	1835
Municipal services—fix my street (Question No 3040).....	1837
Transport—integrated network (Question No 3046).....	1838
Energy—gas connections (Question No 3047)	1839
Environment—Mugga Lane tip (Question No 3048).....	1839
Suburban Land Agency—sales (Question No 3049)	1844
Suburban Land Agency—sales (Question No 3050)	1844
Planning—development applications (Question No 3051)	1845
ACT building levy—revenue (Question No 3052)	1847
Canberra Hospital—engineering reports (Question No 3053)	1847
Planning—Ginninderry (Question No 3055)	1848
Heritage Festival—COVID-19 (Question No 3056).....	1848
Children and young people—adoptions (Question No 3057)	1849
Children and young people—adoptions (Question No 3058)	1850
Children and young people—respite care (Question No 3059)	1851
Children and young people—parental contact (Question No 3060)	1852
Children and young people—parental contact (Question No 3061)	1853
Planning—Lawson (Question No 3062)	1854
Planning—McKellar shops (Question No 3063).....	1855
ACT Health and Canberra Health Services—performance reports (Question No 3064)	1856
Transport Canberra—bus shelters (Question No 3065)	1857
Municipal services—footpaths (Question No 3066).....	1857
Green waste services—relocation (Question No 3068)	1857
National Multicultural Festival—planning (Question No 3069).....	1858
Arts—cultural diversity (Question No 3070)	1859
Roads—traffic calming (Question No 3071).....	1859

Roads—accident black spots (Question No 3072)	1861
Aranda—footpaths (Question No 3073).....	1862
Alexander Maconochie Centre—Pacific Islander detainees (Question No 3074)	1862
Government—consultants and contractors (Question Nos 3075-3103, 3105-3112).....	1864
Government—consultants and contractors (Question No 3104).....	1866
Government—promotional materials (Question Nos 3113-3141, 3143-3150).....	1872
Government—promotional materials (Question No 3142)	1873
ACT Policing—motorcycle gangs (Question No 3151).....	1875
Vehicles—registration (Question No 3152)	1877
Parking—revenue (Question No 3153)	1878
Housing—redevelopment (Question No 3154).....	1879
Municipal services—mowing (Question No 3155).....	1880
Environment—wombat conservation (Question No 3156)	1881
Government—hygienic paper supplies policy (Question No 3157).....	1883
Environment—Ginninderra Creek (Question No 3158).....	1884
Municipal services—fix my street (Question No 3159).....	1885
Waste—recyclable materials diverted to landfill (Question No 3161)	1885
Parking—Gungahlin (Question No 3163).....	1886
Access Canberra—vehicle registrations (Question No 3164).....	1887
Waste—bulky waste collection (Question No 3166)	1888
Legislative Assembly—viewing data (Question No 3173).....	1890
COVID-19 stimulus packages—demographic breakdown (Question No 3174)	1891
Environment Protection Authority—complaints policy (Question No 3175)	1892
Environment—pest management (Question No 3176).....	1893
Sport—ovals (Question No 3183)	1893
Planning—Kippax group centre flooding potential (Question No 3184).....	1894
Children and young people—breach of court order complaints (Question No 3185)	1897
Children and young people—parental support services (Question No 3187)	1897
Transport—infrastructure (Question No 3188)	1899
Transport—ticketing systems (Question No 3190)	1900
Roads—William Hovell Drive (Question No 3194)	1901
Questions without notice taken on notice:	
Schools—COVID-19.....	1902
Canberra Hospital—infrastructure	1902
Mental health—acute care capacity.....	1903
Children and young people—parental contact	1904
Children and young people—parental contact	1904
Public housing—renewal program	1904
Hospitals—specialist waiting lists.....	1905
Planning—master plans	1905
Planning—Gungahlin cinema.....	1906

Thursday, 30 July 2020

MADAM SPEAKER (Ms J Burch) (10.00): Members:

Dhawura nguna, dhawura Ngunnawal.
Yanggu ngalawiri, dhunimanyin Ngunnawalwari dhawurawari.
Nginggada Dindi dhawura Ngunnaawalbun yindjumaralidjinyin.

The words I have just spoken are in the language of the traditional custodians and translate to:

This is Ngunnawal country.
Today we are gathering on Ngunnawal country.
We always pay respect to Elders, female and male, and Ngunnawal country.

Members, I ask you to stand in silence and pray or reflect on our responsibilities to the people of the Australian Capital Territory.

Ngunnawal language in the Assembly

MADAM SPEAKER: Members, with indulgence, can I say just a few words and then invite the leaders to share in this moment. It gives me great pleasure to recognise members of the Elders Council and those involved in the Ngunnawal community. Today saw the first acknowledgement made in this Assembly in Ngunnawal language. Previously in this Assembly the Speaker made a formal recognition that the Assembly is meeting on the Ngunnawal people's traditional lands, and that the Ngunnawal people are traditional custodians. This is reflected in *Hansard* and in the minutes of each day's sitting.

On Thursday, 28 November, this Assembly went a step further. On that day, a motion was moved jointly by Mr Rattenbury, Mr Milligan and Ms Stephen-Smith that called upon the Assembly to resolve that the Speaker would use a Ngunnawal language introduction at the beginning of each and every sitting day, and that this would be recorded in the minutes and in *Hansard*. In a display of tripartisan unity, the Assembly welcomed the motion and agreed to it. Today it has been my great honour and privilege to be the first Speaker to have spoken in Ngunnawal language in this Assembly.

I would like to commend the work of my colleagues and all of the parties in drafting the motions, and the co-sponsors who introduced it to the chamber. It was acknowledged during the debate on 28 November that this was the first time in the history of this Assembly that a motion was co-sponsored by all three parties. It was further acknowledged that, while we may not always agree on things in this place, on this matter, on the recognition of the Ngunnawal people and the importance and value of their custodianship, their culture and their language, we were one and we were united.

The Assembly's resolution also represents the first time that any parliament in Australia has agreed to speak the opening acknowledgement in a traditional

Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander language. I take this opportunity to encourage my colleagues in other parliaments to take up the challenge and to do the same.

I want to thank the United Ngunnawal Elders Council, and its co-chairs, Roslyn Brown and Fred Monaghan, who have generously given of their time to consult with us on the correct form of words, and have provided guidance throughout this process. I would also like to thank Ngunnawal man Cheyne Halloran and linguist Louise Baird, who provided me with much linguistic training. Working with them proved to be a unique experience.

To Warren, who has joined us today, thank you for being here. It is important. Again I reflect on how all of us as one recognised your peoples, your heritage and your culture, and we will continue to do that each day and each time we sit. I hope that this initiative of the Assembly is seen as a further indication of the high regard in which we hold you, as the custodians of this land, and the recognition we give you. With that, with indulgence, I invite the party leaders to speak.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (10.05): Yuma, Madam Speaker. Dhawura nguna, dhawura Ngunnawal. I would like to thank you for your acknowledgement in the language of the Ngunnawal, and acknowledge the very important presence of elders with us today.

This is a historic moment for this Assembly: the first time Ngunnawal language has been used in this place to formally open parliament and to acknowledge the continuing connection to this land that we all have the privilege of living on. I would like to thank all members across the chamber for their support of this acknowledgement.

Madam Speaker, we need to do more to preserve language. According to the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, more than 250 First Australian languages, including 800 dialectical varieties, were spoken on this continent at the time of European settlement in 1788. Due to previous government policies, many languages have been lost. Often, people were banned from speaking their language. Today this parliament recognises that language is intrinsic to culture and identity, and to the cultural heritage of all people in the ACT. There is a need to recognise, to support, to revive and to protect the languages of the traditional custodians and occupants of the land.

Through the 2019-28 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander agreement, the ACT government is supporting the aspirations of the Ngunnawal traditional custodians, and showcasing culture in public spaces, including entry to our city by road, rail and air. Today is a further step in the journey to honour and celebrate the richness and diversity of the world's oldest living culture. Thank you again for this initiative, Madam Speaker, and I thank the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the Greens party and all members of this place for their support for this today.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (10.07): Madam Speaker, the Assembly stands united with the Ngunnawal people, and we are pleased to be part of

this historic occasion. Today we show our respect for the Ngunnawal people, their culture, and their language, which belongs to past, current and future generations.

Aboriginal people have called this land home for tens of thousands of years. They were the first inhabitants of this region and were its original custodians. Their spiritual connection to the land runs deep. The Canberra Liberals are pleased to hear the Ngunnawal language spoken in the chamber in recognition of this rich history.

Throughout this term, we have spoken about the importance of language, and how it intertwines with cultural identity. Stories, knowledge and tradition can be passed down through generations. Language is an irreplaceable part of cultural inheritance. It is important that we remember and honour the Aboriginal heritage of the region through language and action.

The Ngunnawal people are generous, and they continue to play an important role in shaping Canberra and surrounds. Last year, on our 30th anniversary, this place was bestowed a rare honour: a handmade possum-skin cloak, skilfully crafted by 16 Ngunnawal women. This gift is on permanent display outside the chamber and symbolises respect between the Ngunnawal people and the wider Canberra community. It is a daily reminder of our duties and responsibilities as lawmakers, and of the history of the territory.

This gift was an important symbolic gesture of reconciliation, and we, as leaders of the ACT Assembly, need to reciprocate with action as well as words. We need to take steps to close the gap and to work with and empower Aboriginal community members to help them achieve the outcomes they want for themselves and for future generations.

The Canberra Liberals believe in investing in community leaders and supporting Indigenous people to make their own decisions and to shape their future. We have powerful and passionate Ngunnawal people who know the real issues that their communities are facing. They know that the ACT has some of the worst results in the nation when it comes to measuring the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canberrans. We have fallen short—well short—in areas like health, wellbeing, justice, education, community services, business development, land management, housing and governance. This can no longer be tolerated. We must be doing everything we can to continue working with Aboriginal people to implement policies that advance the inherent dignity of each member of our Indigenous communities. The Canberran Liberals believe we need to promote and create these opportunities, to educate all Canberrans about Aboriginal knowledge, traditions and heritage.

I acknowledge the hard work that my colleague James Milligan has done to help us better understand what we can do to support the Aboriginal communities in Canberra. I thank the Ngunnawal people for sharing their language, history and culture with the ACT community.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (10.11): Madam Speaker, it is with a genuine sense of the moment that I rise today to speak to the fact that you just did an

acknowledgement of country in Ngunnawal language. It is a groundbreaking occasion and one that will pave the way for future sitting days.

I would like to acknowledge the elders of the traditional custodians, the Ngunnawal people. I say to you, “yuma”, “hello” in Ngunnawal language. As a member of this Legislative Assembly, I pay my deepest respects to you and I pay my respects to the generations of elders who have come before you. I thank you for your ongoing nurturing of emerging elders so that we may continue to learn from your first nations wisdom and understanding. I thank you for your contribution to the community; for the ongoing education that you provide regarding your language, your land and your culture; and for sharing your experiences of the impacts of racism, colonisation and dispossession. I say to you that I hear you and I am grateful for your voice.

Madam Speaker, this truly is an important occasion. As the Ngunnawal language is spoken in the chamber, we honour and pay our respects to our first nations traditional custodians in a tangible way. We express our yindjamurra, a Ngunnawal word that means more than respect, that is wholesome and all-encompassing in its first nations interpretation, and we acknowledge the ongoing connection of the Ngunnawal people to this land, this special meeting place where clans have met for thousands of years.

As members of the Assembly, we are taking a leadership role in the community by using Ngunnawal language in the chamber, demonstrating actions of reconciliation and recognition on the public record, helping to bring deeper understanding to a wider cross-section of our community.

There are Ngunnawal people still alive today who were held forcibly on the missions in our region and not allowed to speak in language. It was forbidden and they were punished for doing so. It meant that those who were fluent stopped using the language and that it was not passed down to following generations. I can only imagine how significant it is for our local elders to hear Ngunnawal words spoken in this place, and I hope that it goes a small way to repair the hurt and the harm that was done in the past.

We are fortunate that in these times there is a shift and that, across the country, first nation languages are beginning to receive the focus and respect they need. It will, however, continue to be a struggle, as many words have been lost. Some may never be recovered and that is a source of shame. That is what history has done and that is what we must, as much as we can, seek to rectify. This acknowledgement of country in Ngunnawal language is one small way we can help to keep language alive and relevant. It is one small way in which we recognise that connections to language are central to identity and culture.

The ACT Greens developed a reconciliation action plan, and what has occurred today is one of the things we set out to achieve in that plan. The exercise of developing and having a plan has ensured that we stay on track in our reconciliation journey and that we have followed through.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate that you have consulted with Ngunnawal elders and have gracefully, if not somewhat anxiously, undertaken lessons in how to pronounce

these important words. I thank you for your cooperation and I acknowledge the respect and commitment that you, too, demonstrate to the Ngunnawal people. That is something we all share. The fact that the motion that came before the Assembly in November last year was initiated by us but co-sponsored by all three parties, which was a first in the history of the Assembly, shows that, in spite of our political differences, on the issue of recognition of our local Aboriginal people, the Ngunnawal people, we are united, as we should be.

I look forward to continuing this journey, and hope that in the next Assembly, if not this one, more cultural awareness training is provided to members and more of us learn to pronounce and use these and other Ngunnawal words. I look forward to all of us regularly using at least the word “yuma” in our everyday vernacular, a simple “hello” in Ngunnawal language. It is the very least we can all do, especially when many of us know how to say hello in several languages other than English, such as Dutch, French, German, Tongan, or Korean. This is something we could all seek to bring into our daily practice. In doing this, we carry on the legacy of the 2019 International Year of Indigenous Languages, helping to keep language alive and relevant. This is one small way in which we recognise that connections to language are central to identity and culture.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I thank you again for the significant and symbolic action you have taken today. I trust that the Ngunnawal elders take pride in what has been achieved, and feel heard and respected by members of the Legislative Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: Given the significance and the importance of what has just occurred, I suggest we take a small break; the bells will ring in about 15 minutes.

At 10.16 am, the sitting was suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The bells having been rung, Madam Speaker resumed the chair at 10.38 am.

Ms Sue Salthouse

Motion of condolence

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (10.38): I move:

That this Assembly expresses its shock and dismay at the sudden and tragic loss of ACT Senior Australian of the Year and 2015 Canberra Citizen of the Year, Sue Salthouse, and tenders its profound sympathy to her family, friends and colleagues in their bereavement.

I rise to express great sadness at the passing of Sue Salthouse, who was tragically killed in a motor vehicle accident on 20 July. Sue was a passionate advocate for people with disability, particularly women with disability, and demonstrated a commitment to social justice issues throughout her life.

Sue was 45 years old when a horseriding accident led to what she described as a surprise entry into the disability sector. Through her own experience she lived the systemic inequality facing people with disability and over the next 25 years became one of Canberra's and Australia's most prominent and respected disability advocates.

Sue advocated on behalf of women with disability at a local, national and international level and held several notable roles throughout her career, including as convenor and chair of Women with Disabilities ACT, and as President of Women with Disabilities Australia.

Sue also served as co-chair of the ACT's National Disability Insurance Scheme Expert Panel, shaping the territory's nation-leading transition to the NDIS. Sue was a member of the Independent Advisory Council to the Board of the National Disability Insurance Agency and was involved with the Council of Australian Governments Summit on Reducing Violence Against Women. Sue worked hard to advance the interests and rights of people with disability and their families and was highly regarded across the many government and non-government bodies that she advised or worked with.

Sue showed an unwavering commitment to promoting an inclusive Canberra: a city that supports people with disability to achieve whatever they want, including in the workplace. Her longstanding work in the community was recognised when she was named 2014 ACT Senior Woman of the Year; 2015 Canberra Citizen of the Year; and, this year, ACT Senior Australian of the Year. In accepting that 2020 ACT Senior Australian of the Year award, Sue said the award gave her renewed strength: strength to continue campaigning for change and to continue campaigning for the importance of education, economic security and respect for people with disability.

Sue will be remembered not only for her many years of leadership but as a mentor who empowered many other women to realise their own leadership potential. I know there are many determined to continue her important work. I am sure all members will attest to the fact that it is impossible to do justice to Sue's far-reaching impact and many achievements for our community in just one speech in this place. It is a reflection of that impact that so many members across the political divide will speak today to honour her life. I know that a couple of my colleagues who are unwell today will take the opportunity to speak in future Assembly sittings.

Madam Speaker, I extend my sincerest condolences to Sue Salthouse's family, friends and acquaintances. She leaves our city with an indelible legacy. She will be sorely missed.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (10.43): The opposition joins all other members of the Assembly in paying tribute to Sue Salthouse. Sue was born in McKinnon, Melbourne, in 1949. She attended Kilvington Baptist Girls Grammar, where she took on several leadership roles, including being head prefect in 1966. Upon completing high school, she enrolled at the University of Melbourne to study agricultural sciences. She was encouraged by the green revolution of the 1960s and wanted to follow her love for science while advancing her understanding of the environment.

While she enjoyed her work in the environmental science field, Sue had a travel bug and decided to get a job that would enable her to travel. She enrolled at La Trobe University, and in 1972 she completed a Diploma of Education. She completed a period teaching at Lorne Elementary School in Victoria before moving to Alice Springs High School. It was through her experiences in teaching that she discovered the power of education as an instrument of change, particularly when it came to discrimination.

Following her stint in Alice Springs, Sue travelled overseas to Kathmandu to trek in the Himalayas. It was here that she met her husband, a widower with three children. The family spent three years living in Nepal, and another three years in Italy, before returning home to Canberra. Upon their return here, Sue stayed home to look after her family, and returned to teaching in the early 1990s, following the end of her marriage.

In April 1995, at 45 years old, Sue was involved in a horseriding accident that would leave her disabled. After discovering the inequalities and disadvantages faced by people with disabilities, Sue became a champion for change and became a prominent figure in the disability sector. She was particularly concerned with how the intersecting issues of gender and disability discrimination affected women with a disability. Recently she had spoken about the vulnerability of elderly disabled women during the current coronavirus.

Sue served many roles in her time as a disability advocate, including as chair of Women with Disabilities ACT; President of Women With Disabilities Australia; Director of Women in Adult and Vocational Education; Director of Rights & Inclusion Australia; ACT representative on a 2015-16 COAG advisory panel; member of the governing council of the University of Canberra; immediate past chair of the ACT Disability Reference Group; and much, much more.

As has already been said, Sue was the 2014 ACT Senior Woman of the Year; in 2015 she was a finalist for Australian of the Year and was Canberra Citizen of the Year. Sue made an immense contribution to the territory. Her sudden passing shocked Canberra. There has been an outpouring of grief, with many people sharing wonderful stories about the impact she had had on their lives. People have praised her in many ways because of the years of work that she gave to her community. One of many refugees who benefited from her help was a young Afghan man who lost his legs in an explosion in Afghanistan. He is in Canberra thanks to her efforts.

Sue was not only concerned with improving the disability sector; she also worked passionately to ban landmines, which disable so many people internationally. Sue never let her disabilities define her. She reached out to others with disabilities and became a powerful advocate. She was described by those who knew her as a dynamic and enthusiastic woman. Fierce, powerful and strong, she was a powerhouse.

Sue leaves behind a remarkable legacy that will enable generations of Australians to live a better life. Her passing has shocked the community, and she will be profoundly missed. Canberra was privileged to have her. My thoughts, and those of my colleagues, are with her friends and family and all who grieve for her during this immensely difficult time.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (10.48): On behalf of the ACT Greens, it is with great sadness that I join my Assembly colleagues in expressing my sincere condolences on the sudden and tragic death of Sue Salthouse, a fierce and determined advocate for women with disabilities and many other causes.

As we all know, Sue was our current ACT Senior Australian of the Year. She was Canberra Citizen of the Year in 2015, was given the 2015 ACT Chief Minister's inclusion award for advancing human rights and was the ACT Senior Woman of the Year in 2014. These awards recognised her resolute efforts to bring about social change. Being the humble woman that she was, I am sure she had no idea of the breadth of the positive impact that she had in our local community, in our nation and across the world, despite these awards, always expressing that there was more work to do.

This condolence motion pays our final respects to her for a life well and truly lived. While she may not be here to hear it, I hope that her family and friends take comfort in knowing that she was a vital and integral contributor to making this world, this nation and this city a better place to live in. Just last month, Sue was encouraging nominations for the next Australian of the Year awards, saying, in her own words:

This is our chance to recognise our fellow Aussies, who are contributing to the community just because they see a need and because making a difference for fellow Aussies is what we do.

That post was accompanied by a photo of a woman in a wheelchair, with the wording "This is what determination looks like" across the image. The woman, of course, was Sue. It was a picture and a post that best captured her and her essence.

Sue made a difference because she saw a need. That is what she did, and she was determined in doing it. After surviving a life-defining fall from a horse in 1995, Sue became a fierce advocate for women with disabilities, realising that they were often not at decision-making tables and therefore not considered, and that their issues were not well understood. She understood, too, the intersecting of women's lives and worked hard to address the lack of housing security, affordability and accessibility for women with disabilities. She highlighted their high vulnerability to exploitation and abuse, the need for disability friendly and accessible information and the lack of not only women leaders but women leaders with disability, among other issues. Her input ranged from local to national and international levels.

Sue backed her arguments with evidence. She saw the need for gender disaggregation of data and was quite the expert at understanding and analysing it. In 2010 she received an Edna Ryan award for her outstanding contribution to feminist community activism. I am told that she was thrilled with this award, as it was a mainstream award acknowledging her feminism, not her disability.

Sue was active right up to her sudden passing. On World Elder Abuse Awareness Day last month, ANROWS, Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety, featured a message from her about the need for better protection for the aged

and ageing, particularly during and post COVID-19. In the last few weeks and months, she was also speaking out against militarism and the impact of war, and the rights of refugees and asylum seekers; supporting investigative journalism; and sharing her pledge to learn about first nations people as an act of reconciliation. Her 70th birthday last year was a fundraiser for the Canberra Rape Crisis Centre. I am told she was dressed in gold and danced energetically to the women African drummers.

As ACT Senior Australian of the Year, Sue spearheaded a letter from a range of Australians of the year, calling for immediate bipartisan action on climate change. She understood that our environment is central to our wellbeing.

Sue was President of Women with Disabilities Australia for four years and was subsequently given life membership. She used that platform to set up and nurture Women with Disabilities ACT, which is now a flourishing, vital and vibrant organisation in its own right. She worked hard with its CEO, Clare Moore, to understand that all women were included in their work, including girls, feminine-identifying and non-binary people with disabilities. Just this month, they released a report on perspectives of the impact of COVID-19 titled *The responsibility has fallen on us*.

Sue's contributions are so varied and so vast that I doubt whether any of us here can encapsulate them all, as the Chief Minister noted. They included providing advice to both the ACT and the federal government about the introduction of the NDIS, as co-chair of the ACT Disability Expert Panel and a member of the NDIS independent advisory group. She was a member of the Council of Australian Governments, COAG, Advisory Panel on Reducing Violence against Women and their Children and a member of the Australian Communications Consumer Action Network. Her input has influenced the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Most of all, Sue was a woman of zest, energy and optimism, and immense caring. All she wanted for each of us was to share respect and compassion with each other. She was not a glory seeker but was ever mindful of encouraging and supporting younger and older women to find and use their voice. In this way, her work and her legacy will continue. Yes, Sue, there is more work to be done, and you have ably set it up so that others can continue that work. Sue was a true social justice and human rights defender and a Canberra legend. There are many in Canberra and beyond who have learnt from her, benefited from her wisdom and resolved to make this a better world—which it definitely is because she was in it.

I offer my sincerest condolences to her family: stepchildren Karyn, Ruth and Alex, and daughter Luisa; their partners, Adam, Ta and Chris; and her grandchildren, Jenara and Yilani. I also express my condolences to those of you who worked with her and were mentored by her. I hope that in some small way your loss is offset by knowing how much she meant to so many people. May we all continue to honour her by remembering to use respect and compassion with each other as we work for a better world.

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for Advanced Technology and Space Industries, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and

Land Management, Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister for Urban Renewal) (10.55): I would like to echo the sentiments of my colleagues here in the chamber as we remember the life and celebrate the achievements of Sue Salthouse. Sue embodied a true sense of community. Her work was never about her; her focus was always on those around her.

Before beginning a lifetime of advocacy work, Sue was a language teacher, creating community connections and understandings of different lives. She was a mentor to many, especially during the decades she spent working in the disability sector. When Sue became a member of the disability community, the community became her family. She would spend the rest of her life fighting for people with a disability, with a focus on women with disabilities. Sue's work was part of a long feminist tradition of community care and solidarity. She worked relentlessly to ensure that women with complex needs and vulnerabilities were recognised and cared for.

Sue fostered and grew a sense of community in her role with Women with Disabilities ACT. Sue was a proud and influential member of Women with Disabilities Australia, serving as the president of the board for five years. Her contributions in shaping the organisation and bringing it onto an international stage were recognised when she was awarded life membership in 2014. Sue was a co-chair of the ACT Disability Expert Panel, advising on the national disability insurance scheme, and was part of something that changed the lives of many people in the ACT and across Australia.

Sue's work in advocacy and advising governments provided insight into what many Australians experience but rarely hear about. Sue was a brilliant representative of her community on the international stage, ensuring that specific needs and issues facing women with disabilities were recognised in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Her work in the sector was formalised with numerous appointments to boards and committees, advocating for the rights of the disabled, and recognised in countless awards. These awards include being the ACT Senior Citizen of the Year for 2014 and the Canberra Citizen of the Year for 2015. She was a tireless campaigner. Our conversations were always enjoyable and always about social justice and equity.

Those of us who were fortunate enough to know Sue will fondly remember her love for life and her determination that nothing would slow her down. Having her own custom-made motorcycle was proof of that determination. Her interests ranged from social justice issues to communications, and she was a woman with fierce intellect and extraordinary compassion.

We send our thoughts to all of those who loved Sue, especially her family, her friends, her sisters and her colleagues in the disability sector. Our Canberra community has lost a warrior and a friend. It is now up to us to carry out Sue's important work by providing support for those who she fought hard to represent.

MS ORR (Yerrabi—Minister for Community Services and Facilities, Minister for Disability, Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety and Minister for Government Services and Procurement) (10.58): Madam Speaker, I rise today in

honour of the late Susan Salthouse and wish to use this opportunity to extend my sincerest sympathies to Sue's family and loved ones during this time.

It goes without saying that I was deeply saddened by the passing of Sue on 20 July this year. It is evident today that Sue made a widespread and profound impression not only on the disability sector but in all areas of government. This speaks volumes about Sue's enduring and all-encompassing commitment to improving the lives of people with a disability.

Sue's life changed in 1995, following a horseriding accident that resulted in an incurred disability. Following Sue's appointment as ACT Senior Australian of the Year for 2020, she expressed her pride in belonging to the disability community. Sue explained that she viewed her circumstances as an opportunity to address systemic issues affecting people with disability, particularly women, a role that she wholeheartedly embraced.

Since 1996 Sue had been actively engaged in policy analysis, project development, social research and individual advocacy across disability rights. The quality of Sue's work and leadership is embedded in the advice given to government and non-government organisations which has led to the creation of fundamental policies and initiatives to address systemic issues for people living with a disability.

Sue served as co-chair of the ACT Disability Expert Panel, now known as the Disability Reference Group. This group played a fundamental role in the development and preparation of the NDIS in the ACT and enhanced the quality of service delivery for participants. Sue's leadership in this group set the foundations for the success of the ACT's transition into the NDIS.

Sue went on to commence a role as a member of the NDIS Independent Advisory Council. She had a significant role in shaping the finer details and the operationalisation of the NDIS scheme upon its inception in the ACT. She played an integral role in the establishment of the NDIS ACT trial site by providing advice on the design, delivery and improvement of the scheme to guarantee the best possible outcomes for participants.

Sue was involved in several high-profile submissions at an international level, including the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women in 2006 and 2010. In 2011 she advised the United Nations periodic review, which resulted in the concluding observations including specific reference to women with disabilities.

Sue was always devoted to amplifying the voices of vulnerable groups in an effort to effect positive social change. She excelled at it. In recognition of her work and advocacy, Sue received a considerable number of prestigious awards and distinctions for her enduring commitment to improving the lives of people living with a disability.

In 2010 Sue received the Edna Ryan award for her role in community activism. In 2011 she won the inclusion award in recognition of her work in educating others about the importance of inclusion for people with disabilities. Sue was the 2014 ACT

Senior Woman of the Year. In 2015 she was recognised as Canberra Citizen of the Year. Most recently, Sue became the 2020 ACT Senior Australian of the Year.

As we have seen today, Sue has worked alongside many ministers in this government, members of the opposition and members of all parties. What a great privilege it has been to know and work with Sue in my time as Minister for Disability. Sue has been described as a respected colleague by others working in the disability space and was recognised for her generosity and for always taking the time to educate and mentor others while lifting them up.

When I first met in Sue, in her capacity as convenor for Women with Disabilities ACT, I was instantly impressed by the depth of her knowledge, her compassion and her enthusiasm. It became increasingly evident that Sue was an esteemed force within the disability sector through her high-level understanding of systemic human rights issues such as the intersection of gender and disability.

Sue displayed a passion to ensure that the barriers impeding people with disabilities were eliminated. Her work centred around advising government and non-government organisations, providing information to guide initiatives that would afford people with disabilities the same rights to economic participation and security through employment and education opportunities and housing arrangements as other people have.

Today we recognise Susan Salthouse and say thank you to her for the immeasurable value of her work. She will be dearly missed. I commend the motion to the Assembly.

MS LAWDER (Brindabella) (11.04): I rise to support the motion today and add my condolences to those that have already been offered from a range of people. I think we are all absolutely on the same page that Sue Salthouse was a tireless worker and an inspirational leader in the disability sector, particularly for women but not only for women. Her dedication, passion and generosity changed many lives and will continue to change lives through her ongoing legacy. She was a fantastic mentor to others. She believed in supporting and encouraging other people with disability and other women. Generally, across the board, she was a very supportive person.

Sue was the chair of Women with Disabilities ACT and was an inaugural board member and chair of the Australian Communications Consumer Action Network, ACCAN, which is where I first met her. She was also a former president of Women with Disabilities Australia, and an Our Watch ambassador. She was a member of the NDIS Independent Advisory Council, director of Rights & Inclusion Australia, and much more.

Sue Salthouse received more awards and distinctions than I can possibly list. They include the 2010 Edna Ryan award for community activism; the 2011 inclusion award in recognition of working towards an inclusive attitude for people whatever their disability; being the 2014 ACT Senior Woman of the Year; being the 2015 Canberra Citizen of the Year, for personal efforts and significant contribution, working to improve the lives of and opportunities for people with disability, in particular, women

with disability; being the 2015 CoAct local hero award, for exemplary work done in local areas; and being the 2020 ACT Senior Australian of the Year.

Sue's work with ACCAN included being a board member and chairperson, following ACCAN's first AGM in 2009. She stayed on as a member of the board until 2012. She also offered support to ACCAN's standing advisory committee on disability issues. She was chair of the committee from 2009 to 2010. In recognition of her pivotal role with ACCAN, she was awarded life membership of ACCAN in 2019. Sue worked hard to provide guidance to other people involved in the telecommunications area. This is where her longstanding involvement with the deaf community must be recognised. She understood that deaf people needed and deserved access to telecommunications.

But Sue's interests were even wider than people with disability. Twenty years ago, she received a grant and wrote a research paper about access to telecommunications for women with disabilities living in rural, remote and regional communities. Twenty years ago, we talked about this as the digital divide. That research paper talked about things like access to online banking and all sorts of other new communications and telecommunications that were not yet mainstream as we see them today.

Many, many people in the deafness community, the disability community and the Canberra community generally will be forever grateful for Sue's work. I would like to add my condolences to her family, friends and colleagues. She was an encouraging and knowledgeable mentor for many people and a caring and compassionate person overall.

Sue and I often joked about the fact that we are on different sides of the political fence. But as an indication of the type of person she was, on many occasions when I was campaigning four years ago at the Tuggeranong Hyperdome, and Sue was maybe having a cup of coffee at the cafe across the road, she would send over a cup of tea and a cake to me while I was campaigning. This is a measure of the type of person that Sue was. She supported other people, and politics was not her number one criterion for doing so.

Sue will be sadly missed. I absolutely laud her contribution, which will be ongoing in our community.

MS STEPHEN-SMITH (Kurrajong—Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Children, Youth and Families and Minister for Health) (11.10): "Good leaders build more leaders." This is the opening line of Christina Ryan's and Carolyn Frohmader's obituary for Sue Salthouse, published in the *Canberra Times* on 26 July. Many people have said many things about Sue over the past week and a half since we heard the terrible news of her passing, but this has been a constant theme.

Sue built people up, nurtured, mentored, educated without judging, and always—always—made people feel more than rather than less than. Whether it was Women with Disabilities ACT's Pitch your Passion event or consultation on a policy question

of national or international significance, Sue's contribution was always sought, her presence was always valued and her mark was always felt.

I want to acknowledge two of my staff who asked to contribute to this speech, because Sue left her mark on them too. To Tim and James, thank you for your beautiful words and I hope I do them justice. As Tim and James wrote—their first line—Sue was loved. The room simply bent around her. People wanted to meet, chat and catch up, to listen and to learn. With poise and grace, she held court wherever she went—not because of her ego but because of the respect and love that people had for her.

What mattered to Sue were her family and friends and a life lived in service to the community, working to improve things for the next person and the person after them—indeed, for the planet. Without Sue, the steep climb to equality, inclusion and sustainability will be a little harder, the journey a little colder, lacking the solace offered by her dry, warm wit.

In engaging in policy and activism, Sue was determined and quick and could read a room better than most. She appreciated the challenges everyone had in that room, but she would always push for a tangible outcome. If she could not get half of what she wanted, she would still try for 20 per cent and plant the seed for the rest. Christina Ryan and Carolyn Frohmader put it another way:

She was the epitome of the phrase 'the personal is political'—taking the individual experiences of women with disabilities, and utilising collective, feminist leadership practices to interrogate the social and political structures that enable the discrimination against disabled women to flourish. Sue was not interested in playing political games. She was interested in outcomes.

And outcomes she achieved. Let me quote Christina and Carolyn again, talking about her time on the board of Women with Disabilities Australia, including four years as president:

Sue helped to take WWDA from a being a small organisation of women with disabilities concerned primarily with building individual confidence and self-esteem, to a highly respected national and international human rights organisation enabling and representing the collective interests of women with disabilities.

That is not to say that they stopped the business of building individual confidence and self-esteem. Indeed, one of Sue's many legacies is the number of young and emerging disability leaders in Canberra, particularly women, girls, feminine-identifying and non-binary people. I have no doubt that they will carry forward Sue's work and continue to be inspired by her tenacity.

One of the many things that struck me about Sue was her capacity not just to teach but to learn and expand her own world view. Sue was open about how she and Women with Disabilities ACT had had to rethink their language and ways of doing things to welcome gender diverse members and ensure they felt safe in the WWD ACT

community. But she was absolutely committed to doing this and welcomed the knowledge WWD ACT's diverse feminine-identifying and non-binary members brought and shared.

Canberra's disability community, particularly the sisterhood of Women with Disabilities, is one of the strongest and most vibrant groups of people I have ever had the privilege of meeting and working with. Sue had been at the very heart of this community for more than 20 years. I know her loss is still incomprehensible to many.

Madam Speaker, I think that one of the reasons Sue's death was such a shock, apart from its suddenness, is that Sue was so very alive. I was fortunate enough to be invited to Sue's 70th birthday party at the Street Theatre. I almost did not go. I am so very glad I did, because that event was Sue through and through: welcoming, warm and full of hope and optimism, surrounded by diverse and interesting friends and her loving family.

To her family—Karyn, Ruth and Alex, Luisa, Jenara and Yilani, Adam, Ta and Chris, I am so sorry. Canberra has lost a beloved community leader but you have lost so much more. To Sue's other family, Women with Disabilities Australia and Women with Disabilities ACT, I hope I will soon be able to catch up with you to celebrate everything about Sue.

Sue, we will miss your intelligence, wit and warmth. Your death has left a big hole in many lives, but your life has improved the lives of thousands of others. Vale.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (11.17): Madam Speaker, I seek leave of the Assembly to incorporate into *Hansard* the speech on the condolence motion of the Attorney-General, Minister Ramsay.

Leave granted.

The incorporated speech read as follows:

MR RAMSAY: Over 30 years Sue Salthouse made a significant impact on every community she touched and an unforgettable impact on every person she touched. Like many, I am one of those people. I had the profound privilege of working with Sue before being elected to this place, through our joint work in elements of the community sector. We connected more strongly again through our nominations as part of the 2015 Australian of the Year awards, when she was nominated for ACT Australian of the Year. While that particular recognition was not given to her that year, it was an absolute highlight when, as Minister for Seniors, I was able to make a beeline for her at the ACT Australian of the Year Awards last year to congratulate her on being named the ACT Senior Australian of the Year for 2020. It was a delightful conversation that night as Sue added to her many well-deserved pieces of public recognition. Many of them have already been mentioned this morning.

Sue was a leader who never saw or positioned herself above the many causes she championed. Her life was one of dedicated commitment in the service of others. At a time when we see many destructive examples of leaders who divide and self-promote, Sue lived the opposite. Her brand of leadership brought people together. Sue's leadership empowered people. Her comrades in Women with Disabilities ACT called her a master collaborator, a mentor, generous, compassionate, fearsome. Singularly, these are precious skills; when held together by one person, they are a rare gift. And that was Sue: a rare gift.

Sue Salthouse was also brave. She faced up to power and raised her voice on behalf of those who could not and where there was personal risk involved in doing so. The legacy of change she leaves behind in her work and friendships is evidence that she did not work alone. People worked side by side with Sue, not behind her. In my current role, the privilege of continuing to work alongside Sue has been an absolute highlight. It is a privilege that has been shared by many others as well. That is Sue's character.

From the Council on the Ageing, I have this tribute:

Sue Salthouse was a passionate and effective disability and social justice advocate. Sue was a well deserving recipient of the 2020 ACT Senior of the Year award. Her tremendous contributions are an example of the significant contributions made by Senior Canberrans to our community.

From ADACAS, Michael Bleasdale offers this tribute:

Our friendship developed from our shared interest in housing and the built environment and our involvement in the push for the application of universal housing design across all markets in Australia, and was conducted largely at a distance until I had the opportunity to come and work in Canberra in 2018. That gave me the opportunity to meet much more often with Sue, not only at the numerous work functions, forums and presentations that she seemed to be endlessly leading, but also at private meetings at her unit, at cafes and restaurants, where we would plot and plan and imagine things better. And this I think is one of the more unique characteristics of Sue, her enormous capacity for friendship, which I was the beneficiary of for the short time I had the chance to be here in Canberra at the same as she was.

When I think of Sue I think of the words "true" and "champion", words which are often elided to mean something much less than what Sue was. She was authentic, honest and faithful, to the cause and to her friends and family, and she was a champion, for ideas and for people, and someone who stepped in front to take on leadership and speak truth to power.

Women with Disabilities ACT spoke of her as "careful, strong, funny, smart, encouraging, kind, determined, listener, respectful"—and much more.

Most recently, last month and earlier this month, I had the privilege of working again with Sue to progress community consideration of the Crimes (Offences Against Vulnerable People) Legislation Amendment Bill 2020. Her incredible skills as a visionary realist were again demonstrated to me through this work. My notes quote her as saying: "This is a game changer for women with a disability

where deliberate forms of abuse are common.” As always, Sue was focused on outcomes from this work, challenging people to “find solutions”, because “we don’t want to start from square 1 again”. Her ability to help find solutions in this consultation is one of the many legacies she will leave behind and something that I will miss deeply. It will be particularly significant when we debate this bill in coming weeks.

Sue’s passing is a significant loss to the Canberra community. Along with others here and people across the community, I pass on my deepest condolences to Sue’s family and her many, many friends. We have lost Sue too early, but her impact will continue for decades to come.

Question resolved in the affirmative, members standing in their places.

Petitions

Ministerial response

The following response to a petition has been lodged:

Planning—Weston parkland—petition 5-20

By **Mr Gentleman**, Minister for Planning and Land Management, dated 27 July 2020, in response to a petition lodged by Ms Le Couteur on 18 June 2020 concerning a proposed car park adjacent to Cooleman Court.

The response read as follows:

Dear Mr Duncan

Thank you for your letter of 18 June 2020 providing petition No 5-20 lodged by Ms Caroline Le Couteur regarding Block 2 Section 75 Weston (the land). The land is zoned as CFZ—Community Facilities Zone and responds to the needs identified by the community through various consultation processes.

In relation to any development applications, the process for community consultation is outlined in the *Planning and Development Act 2007* (the Act). To assist in responding to the Assembly, I have sought the advice and input from the independent planning and land authority (the authority).

I am advised that a development application for the land (DA-202037191) was lodged with the authority on 20 May 2020. The development application was publicly notified from 28 May to 19 June 2020. The decision on this development application is a matter for the authority.

I am also advised that the authority received 56 representations. Petition No 5-20 forms part of the representations received during the formal public notification period. I am also informed by the authority that they are aware of the issues raised in the petition, and representations received during the public notification period will be considered as part of the authority’s assessment.

I trust this information is of assistance.

Motion to take note of petitions

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to standing order 98A, I propose the question:

That the response so lodged be noted.

MRS JONES (Murrumbidgee) (11.18): I thank the minister for his response to this petition, sponsored by Ms Le Couteur, on an issue that is very concerning to members of my electorate. The plan to pave Cooleman park is another example of Mr Steel's and this government's tin ear. The inability to discuss with and consider the views of local residents in my electorate is like the situation with the Curtin horse paddocks, just on a smaller scale. However, it is just as damaging.

The Save Coolo Park community group says in its introductory Facebook video:

The ACT government wants to put a car park on Coolo Park because people in Molonglo still don't have their own shops. Coolo Park will be levelled, covered in bitumen and mature trees will be removed. Coolo Park is filled with native trees that are critical to local biodiversity, urban cooling and community wellbeing. Coolo Park is a community asset that provides a safe path to the shops and buses.

And, I would add, for at least two suburbs of people who I have been speaking to on the phone of late. The group goes on to say:

Your local park or oval or playground could be next.

They say that we should stop this type of urban infill in Canberra. The biggest issue for Cooleman Court is the lack of a supermarket—a proper sized supermarket—for the Molonglo Valley.

One of the worst aspects of this plan is the fact that the minister has referred to it as temporary. There is nothing temporary about removing mature trees, scraping down and flattening what is now a contoured nature park. Once it is gone, it will never come back. That is the disgraceful lie at the heart of this plan.

Let us not pave every inch of our local natural area to put up a parking lot. Let us stand up for Stirling, Waramanga, in particular, and Fisher residents, who walk and cycle along the path. Let us keep this little piece of calm in a very busy shopping precinct and address the real problem, which is that the whole of the Molonglo Valley currently comes to shop in Weston Creek.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (11.21): I must say that I basically agree with everything my fellow member for Murrumbidgee, Mrs Jones, has just said. As the petition which I was fortunate enough to table in this Assembly showed, so do an awful lot of the people of Murrumbidgee.

Another thing that I would like to point out is that recently, as a result of a motion of mine, the government did an independent review of the development of Molonglo.

One of the things it said was that the shops in Molonglo basically do not exist and the government needs to look at action to give the people of the new area of Molonglo adequate shopping facilities. This is the actual solution to the problem in Cooleman Court. Producing a so-called temporary car park will turn out to be a permanent blight on the landscape and only a temporary solution to the shopping problem in Molonglo.

I urge the government to look at what the people in Murrumbidgee want, particularly the people of Weston who live near Cooleman Court, and the people of Molonglo, who are getting pissed off, who are tired of waiting so long for not just decent shopping facilities but community facilities. The private provision of community facilities in Molonglo has not worked. I call on the government to look at what is happening there and build Molonglo better. I call on them to read the review that was commissioned, fix the problems of Molonglo and not inflict them on the other people of Murrumbidgee, the residents of Weston.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mental Health Amendment Bill 2020

Mr Rattenbury, by leave, presented the bill, its explanatory statement and a Human Rights Act compatibility statement.

Title read by Clerk.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong—Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety and Minister for Mental Health) (11.23): I move:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

I rise today to present the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2020. The Mental Health Act 2015 came into effect on 1 March 2016 and is the result of considerable stakeholder and public consultation. It seeks to promote a renewed, recovery-oriented approach to mental health service delivery. It brings the ACT's mental health legislation in line with human rights jurisprudence, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Human Rights Act.

The act gives people in the ACT living with a mental illness, as well as their carers and family members, greater opportunities to contribute to decisions about their treatment, care and support. The act also sets out the legal responsibilities of professionals, such as doctors, mental health workers, and ambulance and police officers, who engage with the act.

The act required two reviews, a review of section 85, the maximum period of further detention, and a review of the mental health orders provisions contained in the act. The first review concluded that the period of further voluntary detention was operating as intended. I tabled the report of this review in the Assembly on 30 July 2019. In addition, I tabled a review of the wider orders provisions on 13 February 2020. The report found that forensic mental health orders were not operating as

intended. At the time of the review, no forensic mental health orders had been made. Two orders have subsequently been made. The tabling of these two reports finalised my mandatory reporting responsibilities under the act.

During the consultation and review process, submissions were received on the general operation of the act. Through the review processes, several opportunities were identified for legislative amendments. The possible amendments range widely in scope and size, some being comparatively minor amendments, such as enabling a patient to consent to treatment after a contravention notice has been issued. Others require significant consultation, framing and consideration against the philosophical basis of the legislation, such as forensic mental health orders.

I determined that select amendments should be progressed at the earliest opportunity, while the remainder be considered in a second tranche of work. This decision considered the limited time available to progress amendments in the Ninth Assembly, the complexity of the potential amendments and the importance of engaging with consumers, carers, clinicians and the community in a sensitive and appropriate manner. As such, this bill does not conclude the process for amending the act. Further changes are likely to be proposed in a future legislation program, after detailed consultation and development of those proposed changes.

This bill seeks to enhance the rights of mental health consumers subject to the act, through the inclusion of additional safeguards to apprehension, and provides additional clarity about contravention orders. The bill also seeks to ensure the rights of affected persons by extending the affected persons register and providing a mechanism for the ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal, ACAT, to consider the views of the affected person and the Victims of Crimes Commissioner when orders are being contemplated. The bill also seeks to provide the Chief Psychiatrist with a power to issue guidelines that can provide greater detail on complex questions of operationalising the act.

These amendments support the object and principles contained in the act, particularly the rights of a person with a mental illness or disorder to determine their own recovery, as much as is possible, and access the best available treatment, care and support relating to their individual needs. The amendments reflect the ACT government's commitment to person-centred care and a safe, responsive and sustainable public health system. The amendments fall largely into five areas.

Firstly, section 77 of the act relates to contravention of a mental health order. The act is not currently explicit as to what happens in circumstances when a contravention notice is in force but the patient consents to treatment following the issuing of such a notice. The legislation specifies that, when a contravention notice requires a patient to undergo treatment, the patient must be taken to an approved mental health facility for the treatment to be provided.

The amendments to this section will provide clarity in these circumstances by providing the option for the clinician to provide the treatment in an alternative location such as a patient's home. The amendment will preserve the discretion for the clinician to determine what is the appropriate course of action, given the individual

circumstances of the case. This amendment promotes the objects and principles contained in the act by ensuring that a person has a right to consent to treatment and that consumers receive treatment in a way that is least restrictive or intrusive to them.

Under section 80 of the act, police officers or authorised ambulance paramedics may currently apprehend a person and take them to an approved mental health facility for assessment if the police or ambulance officer believes, on reasonable grounds, that the person has a mental disorder or mental illness and has attempted, or is likely to attempt, suicide or inflict serious harm on themselves or others. This section is a rare example of legislation that can lead a member of the community to be deprived of their liberty on mental health grounds. For this reason, it is essential that sufficient safeguards are in place to balance what can be competing priorities of safety and liberty.

Should someone be apprehended under section 80, whilst it may be a relatively short period of time, it still represents a deprivation of their liberty and this may have longstanding impacts for their personal matters. When someone agrees that they require immediate health care or assistance, they should not be penalised for their help-seeking behaviour, and a decision to apprehend on those grounds is likely to be disproportionate. The bill seeks to create an additional threshold: that a police officer or authorised paramedic must be satisfied, on reasonable grounds, that there is an immediate risk of harm, the person requires immediate examination and the person does not agree to be examined.

This amendment reflects the urgency of situations often faced by police officers and ambulance paramedics and makes clear that a decision to apprehend is made on reasonable grounds. There is no expectation that police or paramedics conduct any form of mental health assessment. The additional requirement of not agreeing to an examination prior to apprehension allows a person to consent to examination and to be transported voluntarily for this examination, without the requirement for apprehension. This supports the assumption of capacity and consent for persons with a mental disorder or mental illness.

The amendments to section 80 also include provision for a person subject to an apprehension order to seek review by ACAT. The commencement of amendments to section 80 will be delayed to allow sufficient time for ACT Policing and the ACT Ambulance Service to provide education and training to their officers regarding this change.

The purpose of the amendments regarding affected persons are twofold: firstly, the right for an affected person and the Victims of Crime Commissioner to provide their views to the ACAT when orders are being made, and, secondly, the rights of affected persons to the disclosure of information about a forensic patient. Currently, the eligibility to access these rights is dependent on a person being subject to a forensic mental health order.

The amended definition is intended to include all persons who arrive at ACAT through a criminal justice pathway, regardless of the type of order that is made under the act. This will allow affected persons to have access to the affected persons register

and the rights that flow from inclusion on the register. These rights are consistent with the rights of victims of crime in a criminal pathway. Amendments to the definition of forensic patient expand the affected persons scheme to ensure that an affected person's rights are not negatively impacted if the perpetrator of a crime follows a mental health pathway rather than a criminal justice pathway.

This bill also seeks to introduce a power for the Chief Psychiatrist to make guidelines on a broad range of matters under the act for which people are exercising a function. The power will enable the Chief Psychiatrist to be responsive to new and evolving issues in the mental health system and will ensure best practice and consistency across the mental health system when engaging the act.

The Chief Psychiatrist will be responsible for ensuring that the guidelines are consistent with the principles and objects of the act, as well as human rights. It is important to note that, when a proposed guideline would impact upon the operation of the police or ambulance service, the Chief Psychiatrist is obliged to consult with the relevant organisations.

The bill includes a new provision for the review of mental health orders, similar to section 271 of the Act when it was first enacted, within five years on enactment. The requirement for a further review of the orders provisions is appropriate, given the right to liberty and freedom of consent affected by the making of involuntary orders. The amendments also include a provision for the review of the new sections adopted by this bill to be undertaken within five years of commencement of the section, and a report of the review is required to be presented in the Legislative Assembly.

The bill is responsive to issues raised during the reviews of the act and the individual submissions received during consultation. The government has carefully considered these amendments and the human rights implications of the bill. This consideration is further detailed in the explanatory statement, as the Assembly would expect. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Debate (on motion by **Mrs Dunne**) adjourned to the next sitting.

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee Scrutiny report 47

MRS JONES (Murrumbidgee) (11.34): I present the following report:

Justice and Community Safety—Standing Committee (Legislative Scrutiny Role)—Scrutiny Report 47, dated 28 July 2020, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I seek leave to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

MRS JONES: Scrutiny report No 47 contains the committee's comments on 76 pieces of subordinate legislation and comments on fees instruments. The report

was circulated to members when the Assembly was not sitting. I commend the report to the Assembly.

Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee Report 11

MS CODY (Murrumbidgee) (11.35): I present the following report:

Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee—Report 11—*Report on Child and Youth Protection Services (Part 2)*, dated July 2020, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

MS CODY: I move:

That the report be noted.

I am pleased to speak to the Standing Committee on Health, Ageing and Community Services report on the committee's inquiry into child and youth protection services, part 2. The ACT Legislative Assembly asked the Standing Committee on Health, Ageing and Community Services to inquire into the ability to share information in the care and protection system, in accordance with the Children and Young People Act 2008, with a view to providing the maximum transparency and accountability so as to maintain community confidence in the ACT's care and protection.

If the committee was to scale back this inquiry to first principles, it would be about trust. Trust in the ACT care and protection system has been in decline for many years, despite numerous reviews and inquiries into various aspects of the system, stretching back over a decade or more. Trust in the system by the people whom the system seeks to serve and the community of which the system is a part, continues to remain at low levels. Trust is essential for any kind of relationship and gives legitimacy to decision-making and the actions that follow.

Trust is built, maintained or eroded in the array of interactions an individual has with representatives of a system or service and/or with the service or system itself. The integrity or quality of these interactions is premised on some form of information sharing. The effectiveness of information sharing in each of these interactions, coupled with appropriate accountability for these exchanges, can build, maintain or erode trust. Trust in a system and/or service has benefits for those who work within the system to provide services, the recipients of services provided by the system and the community of which the system is a part.

The committee acknowledges the efforts, to date, by the government, in conjunction with other stakeholders, to bring about change to the ACT care and protection system—a system in need of change. Notwithstanding these efforts, evidence to the inquiry made it clear that more needs to be done but also that any improvements need to be underpinned by legislative change. The committee received submissions to its inquiry from key stakeholder groups, including individuals, advocacy and support

groups, professional associations, academics, policy and research institutes, and government and civic-based stakeholders.

As part of its considerations, the committee scheduled a series of briefings to hear from subject-matter experts who provided background information on aspects of the inquiry coverage. The committee also heard from witnesses through public hearings in January and February 2020. Evidence to the inquiry emphasised a risk-averse approach to the sharing of information and urged that this be reframed to one of a risk-management approach. Contributors noted that decision-making in care and protection matters was a difficult mandate, and complex, and that at times there were legitimate reasons for not sharing information. However, the default prohibition on the sharing of sensitive information, and the lack of appeal and review rights, established a culture of information-sharing that was counterproductive to transparent and accountable decision-making.

Ultimately, such a culture is not in the best interests of a child or young person—the people whom the system seeks to serve. The committee recognises that decision-making under the Children and Young People Act 2008 affects the rights of individuals in profound and life-changing ways. It is imperative that people using the care and protection system “feel that there is justice, not just there somewhere but there as a first step”. Those words were from Mr Chris Donoghue of the ACT Law Society, in evidence provided to the committee.

In seeking to respond to the many issues raised in evidence to this inquiry, the committee has been forward looking in setting out its views and recommendations, using an overarching ethos that a care and protection system and its services should, at all times, be needs led, not service led. In doing so, the committee has sought to install an unlocked front door to the ACT care and protection system that can be opened to access the information needed by the clients of care and protection services and the stakeholders working in and across the care and protection continuum to assist these clients.

The committee has also endeavoured to establish an equitable power balance between the care and protection system and those highly vulnerable individuals who are caught up in the system that is supposed to be acting in their best interests. Accordingly, in the report the committee has set out its consideration of the many issues raised in evidence covering its inquiry terms of reference across the following parameters. The first is the overarching ethos of the Children and Young People Act 2008. The ethos of the act sets the tone or culture for the sharing of information in the care and protection system. The second is the legislative framework for care and protection services in the ACT. The legislative framework operationalises the culture for the sharing of information in the forward provisions relating to information sharing and the scope of decision making under the CYP Act.

The third is practice matters. Practice is the expression of the culture and values of information-sharing and decision-making in action. The committee accepts that questions about, and decision-making surrounding, the care and protection of children and young people in the Canberra community are often controversial, complex and require a balancing of rights. In that context, those working in the care and protection

space work in a challenging, tough and complex environment. Equally important is that keeping children and young people safe in their families and communities is not just the responsibility of child and protection services; it is a whole-of-community responsibility.

The committee wishes to thank all of those who have contributed to its inquiry by making submissions and/or appearing before it to give evidence. The committee also particularly thanks the statutory organisations, peak bodies, advocacy and support groups, professional associations and other community sector organisations that participated in this inquiry. Many of these groups also contributed to the ACT government review of child protection decisions in the ACT. The committee acknowledges that these groups have all been strong advocates in child protection over many years and genuinely thanks them all for sharing their wisdom, expertise and experience with this inquiry. The wide-ranging experience of these organisations and their commitment to serving children, parents and families was reflected both in the breadth and in the quality of their contributions.

The committee also acknowledges and thanks all individuals who made written submissions. The committee recognises that many participants to its inquiry shared deeply personal experiences and that contemplating and preparing their submissions would not have been easy. The committee sincerely thanks all inquiry participants for taking the time and personal energy to contribute to an inquiry of this nature. The committee is grateful that it was able to draw on a broad range of wisdom, expertise and experience in its deliberations.

In its report, the committee has based many of its recommendations on suggestions by inquiry participants. The committee has made 44 recommendations in relation to this inquiry into the ability to share information in the care and protection system in accordance with the Children and Young People Act. I will not take the time now to talk about any of the recommendations. I am sure my fellow committee members will do that for me.

As chair, I would like to thank my fellow committee members, Mrs Vicki Dunne and Ms Caroline Le Couteur, for their time, their contributions and the collaborative way the committee has worked through some wide-ranging and very challenging issues. Through these collaborative efforts, we have been able to deliver a unanimous report. I commend the report to the Assembly, and I wait to hear the comments of my committee colleagues. Thank you.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (11.45): I will begin where my colleague, the chair of the committee, Ms Cody, left off, by paying tribute to the members of the committee who worked so collaboratively together, Ms Cody and Ms Le Couteur; to our outstanding secretary, Dr Andréa Cullen; and to the people who presented to this committee on some taxing, troubling but ultimately very important issues.

I think, in the context of some of the discussion that we have had already today, it is worth highlighting some of the contemporary issues that we have dealt with and it is worth highlighting that, for instance, the ACT performs very poorly in care and protection when it comes to Indigenous people. There are 91.9 Aboriginal or Torres

Strait Islander children on a care and protection order for every 1,000 children in the ACT, which compares to a national average of just 66. I think that close to 50 per cent above the national average is a searing indictment of our performance, in a First World capital of a First World nation, in how we treat Indigenous people. I think that it is important, especially on a day when we have made such a symbolic gesture towards our Indigenous fellows, that we should also resolve that this disparity in relation to care and protection for our Indigenous children. It needs to be addressed as a matter of priority.

One of the take-out messages in the report—and I am glad that Ms Cody touched on this in her comments—is actually something that was reflected in the maternity services inquiry. We need to have—and the term was used—a needs-led care and protection system, not a service-led care and protection system. The care and protection system is not there for the people who provide the care and protection system; the care and protection system is there for the children and young people, their parents and families and the wider community, to ensure that children are safe.

One of the messages that we heard through this inquiry—and I think it is worth noting that getting this inquiry up in the first place was, from my experience, like extracting teeth; there was backwards and forwards, and backwards and forwards, and the government was very reluctant to have this inquiry—

Ms Stephen-Smith: Not for part 2; that is not true.

MRS DUNNE: The minister will have her opportunity to speak and respond to this, but at the moment I am putting forward the perspective of the opposition. Mrs Kikkert and I worked very hard to have a whole suite of inquiries included. There are two inquiries, of which this is part 2. The whole process of getting this inquiry up was like extracting teeth and the backwards and forwards and the reluctance of the government in particular and to some extent the crossbench, who eventually came around to having an inquiry into this space, was quite marked. I am glad that it has been overcome.

The committee has, by way of context, produced an interim report on part 1 of the inquiry, which relates to an individual case. Yes, it is unusual for a committee like this to inquire into an individual case, and we recognise that. We were also looking not to cast blame in relation to the individual case but to look at the systemic issues that arose.

One of the systemic issues which arose, and which is at the heart of this inquiry, which is about information sharing in the care and protection service, is the power imbalance in the care and protection service and how disempowered families are in relation to what appears to be a behemoth of an organisation that is opaque to them. Every witness that we heard from gave testimony of the extent to which the care and protection service in the ACT is opaque and that when there is opacity there is no assurance of a proper practice and that there is no assurance of, as Ms Cody and the committee have spoken about, there being trust in the system.

I will speak briefly about a number of issues. One of the things that I find utterly disheartening about the care and protection system is the myriad of inquiries that we have had into the care and protection system. We have had Vardon 1.0 and Vardon 2.0. There were a range of other inquiries, the most recent of which, before this committee inquiry, was the Glanfield inquiry, which came down with a report in April 2016 that is essentially about domestic and family violence and the interaction with the care and protection system. The Glanfield inquiry made a myriad of recommendations in relation to the care and protection system and principally made recommendations in relation to access to information and access to internal review in the care and protection system.

It is extraordinarily disappointing for this committee to see that it took this government three years after the tabling of the Glanfield inquiry report to get around to looking at implementing some of those recommendations and another year to report on some of those recommendations. In fact, not all those recommendations have been implemented and many, many contributors to this inquiry have spoken adversely about what I would call an unconscionable delay in implementing the recommendations of the Glanfield inquiry.

This is why, at recommendation 37, the committee specifically and explicitly calls for the minister, before the end of this term of the Legislative Assembly, to account for progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the Glanfield inquiry, including a summary of action to date, either completed or in progress, and the proposed action, including a timetable, for the implementation of things which have not been actioned. I think that this is most important.

This committee of inquiry makes 44 recommendations in relation to care and protection. At least 16 of them relate to specific advice in relation to specific amendments to the Children and Young People Act. They cross a myriad of areas. They cover things like internal review, external review and external merits review.

The most important one from my point of view, and the one where the committee decided that it should make this recommendation in this report—even though it had made it in its interim report on part 1—because we think it is probably the most important thing that we could do to create transparency in the care and protection act, is recommendation 7, which would explore codifying the Children and Young People Act so that all children have a legal entitlement to family group conferencing before child and youth protection services can intervene and before a matter is referred to the ACT Childrens Court in care and protection matters.

There is very strong support for this in the community, there is a very strong restorative community in the ACT who are passionately advocating for this and there is very strong evidence from many places in the world that this is a mechanism that works in favour of maintaining transparency, openness and the sharing of information. The processes also ensure that, as much as possible, we can keep children in their families, nurture them in their families, and not have them on the spiral of disadvantage of putting children in the care and protection system.

We have had some pilots of family group conferencing in the ACT, and those involved in it in the ACT have demonstrated just how fruitful it can be. I am very proud that my colleagues Mrs Kikkert and Mr Coe have also just recently made statements about their intent in the Tenth Assembly to ensure that family group conferencing becomes a legal entitlement for all children and their families in the ACT.

There is much in this report. Ms Cody has given a very eloquent outline of what is there. But I think one of the other things which is important and which occupies my mind and, I suspect, Ms Le Couteur's mind to some extent, is that we are fast approaching the end of the Ninth Assembly and it will not be possible, within the timetable of the government, to even respond to this inquiry before the last sitting day of the Assembly. So we have, as a committee, definitely made the point that we believe that this is unfinished business and this unfinished business must be taken up by the next Assembly.

We have taken a slightly unusual approach at pages 103 and 104, in what we have styled an epilogue, which is to pass the baton to the next Assembly to ensure that the important work that was done in this inquiry and the inquiry into part 1, which is not quite concluded, is picked up and carried on by whoever is the minister for children and young people. There is a specific recommendation in relation to that, which is recommendation 44, which I think has an important place because it does not just say "pick it up in the next Assembly"; it also creates a mechanism whereby this can be picked up.

The minister for children and young people has the capacity, under part 2.2 of the Children and Young People Act to constitute a children and youth services council for any purpose, for a brief period. I think that an appropriately constituted children and youth services council would be an outstanding mechanism for ensuring that the important work that this committee has done with the community is concluded in the Tenth Assembly.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (11.59): I want very much to echo my fellow committee members in thanking the contributors. I also thank my fellow committee members, Ms Cody and Mrs Dunne, and our brilliant committee secretary, Dr Andréa Cullen.

I was very conscious during this inquiry that I and my fellow committee members, all of whom are mothers, were not very likely to become involved in the CYP system. We are white and we are well off. The CYP system would just assume that we are capable parents and that any issues we may have with our children would be solvable. The idea of removal would not be on the agenda. This point was explicitly commented on in the discussion of the removal of newborn babies from their mothers. Karen Toohey, the Discrimination, Health Services, Disability and Community Services Commissioner, said:

The first experience that that parent has is of child protection coming to talk to them, and that whole initial bonding period has actually been completely

overshadowed by the experience, for some reason, of suddenly being on the CYPS radar and being summoned to a meeting to discuss their parenting skills when, in fact, what they have done is spent the previous months putting in place all the supports and services that they need to ensure that that child is well supported. It can be a ... disturbing and heartbreaking experience for people.

I would like to highlight the word “suddenly”. People, mothers, are losing babies in hospitals, it seems, for no apparent reason. Of course, it is not just newborns. Clearly, there are other examples of conscious and unconscious bias in the system about the capability of the family to look after children. This is one of the most important issues that needs to be resolved within the CYP system.

Throughout the inquiry, there were many references to the power imbalance between the government and children, parents and families. Possibly fortunately for committee members’ workload, the inquiry did not cover the whole question of how our CYP system works; it only covered information provision. Despite this very limited remit, the committee made 44 recommendations. As was the case with the other members, I will not discuss them all. The situation was so obviously unsatisfactory that we did make recommendations about non-information things, such as recommendation 3, which states:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government amend the Children and Young People Act 2008 to specify an express requirement for the court to be satisfied that all reasonable steps have been taken to provide the services necessary to support family unity prior to making an actual care and protection order ...

I must admit that I find it hard to understand why we even needed to make a recommendation like that. Why is CYPS support to families so limited? I guess it comes back to the point that I made before—that the CYP system in some cases does not see a family as being capable of looking after their child or children, and they do this without really looking into the family’s situation. For this reason, as Mrs Dunne highlighted, we made a recommendation to enshrine family group conferencing as an early component of the CYPS response. We also received this evidence from Dr Helen Watchirs, the ACT Human Rights Commissioner:

As a human rights jurisdiction, the starting point should be, naturally, the Human Rights Act. However, the underlying legislative framework, the Children and Young People Act 2008, falls well short of compatibility with the Human Rights Act by lacking safeguards.

We also heard about other inquiries in this area that have not, as yet, led to improvement. In particular, as Mrs Dunne also mentioned, submitters noted the recommendations of the Glanfield report which still need to be acted upon.

Looking at the part of the terms of reference relating to information sharing, it is abundantly clear that the system does not work. The committee found consensus among submitters about the need to improve transparency and accountability in the child protection system. The lack of both personal and systemic information, combined with the inherent power imbalance in the system, creates a situation where

many families cannot advocate for themselves; thus it leads to poor outcomes for the children and young people who are meant to be helped, and often very poor outcomes for their families as well.

Clearly, CYP system decisions are very difficult and complex, and the information that guides them is deeply personal. Of course, there are often very real reasons for not sharing information. However, it appears that the act has been constructed with a default prohibition on the sharing of sensitive information. If we add to this the lack of appeal and review of decisions, it creates an environment which does not support transparent and accountable decision-making.

This lack of transparency, plus the massive power imbalance, leads to a lack of trust in the CYPS system, and in the government as a whole, by the people affected by it. Particularly in situations such as the one we looked at in part 1 of our inquiry, where the state has taken a child away, it is vital that families and young people know why it happened and that they can trust that it really is in the best interests of the child. They need to be able to trust that the decisions are just. Trust requires information and transparency that should lead to accountability to the young person and their family in how they are being treated. Mr Chris Donohue, the President of the ACT Law Society, said:

We ... request for the Assembly to make laws that give the person, the carer, some degree of confidence and feeling that there is justice in the rule of law. You can have a law, and we all comply with the rule of law, but if there is no justice in it you cannot feel comfortable with the rule of law. It is most important that people who are using this system feel that there is justice—not just there somewhere but there as a first step.

The committee made numerous recommendations about specific information-related improvements that are needed, starting with recommendation 9, which states:

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government amend the Children and Young People Act 2008 to allow the sharing of sensitive information that would be in the best interests of the child or young person—from a child concern report, a care and protection report, a pre-natal report, provided interstate care and protection information, a contravention report or family group conference information—where respective notifiers consent to the information being shared.

The committee made more recommendations covering requirements that there should be times when information is provided to young people's parents or lawyers, guidelines about information provision and a specific right to review a decision to refuse information. I admit to being surprised that these recommendations were even needed, because I thought that information was available to those who needed it. However, as we heard from numerous witnesses, including Ms Claudia Maclean, the principal solicitor of the Women's Legal Centre:

Many women come to our service distressed and confused. They do not know the care and protection system and they are unable to get information from care and protection to clarify the situation.

In 2019 the Freedom of Information Act was changed to reduce access to personal information held under the CYP Act. At the time, I was briefed that this was merely tidying things up and that there were adequate pathways in the CYP Act. After being part of this inquiry, I regret my vote and support recommendation 14 of the committee, which states:

The Committee recommends that until such time as improvements for individuals to access information about themselves relating to matters under the Children and Young People Act 2008 ... are available under the CYP Act, the ACT Government should restore the pathway for access under section 17 of the Freedom of Information Act 2016.

I do, of course, acknowledge that decisions about the care and protection of children and young people in the Canberra community are often controversial and complex, and almost always will require a balancing of rights. Of course, keeping our children and young people safe is not just the responsibility of the government and child protection services. It is, rightly, the responsibility of the whole community.

I also acknowledge the important role that CYP staff and the ACT government play in keeping our children safe. I am sure that most interactions work out for the best in the long run. Assembly committees, of course, only hear about problems. I want to thank CYP staff and the rest of the community who, every day, help the kids of Canberra.

I reiterate the thanks of all committee members to those who have contributed to the inquiry. I agree with Mrs Dunne that we hope, and in fact have recommended, that the next Assembly and minister will put these recommendations into practice.

MS STEPHEN-SMITH (Kurrajong—Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Children, Youth and Families and Minister for Health) (12.09): I take the opportunity to speak briefly on this, not having formally seen the report or anything like that but hearing what people have to say around the recommendations. I make it clear that the government supported and welcomed part 2 of this inquiry, I had some significant concerns in relation to part 1 of this inquiry when it was established. I still have reservations about the appropriateness of a Legislative Assembly committee inquiring into an individual child protection matter, but that is as it is.

I advise the Assembly, and particularly the members of the committee, that the response to the interim report for part 1 is almost finalised, Unfortunately, it was not available for tabling today, but I intend to table it out of session as soon as possible. While Mrs Dunne is right that it is very unlikely that the government will be able to formally respond to the report on part 2 of the inquiry, I assure her and other members of the Assembly that, if I am in a position to do so, I will take the recommendations of this committee and this inquiry very seriously.

I recognise that Ms Cody, Ms Le Couteur and Mrs Dunne have worked really hard, with some very difficult material, in this inquiry. When it was established we recognised that there is work to do, and there is an opportunity to look again at the Children and Young People Act 2008. Elements of that act are out of date and there

are issues in relation to the sharing of information which we would like to address. I am sure the hard work that the committee have done and the recommendations they have made will inform that work. That is already underway, and if I have the opportunity to be back here in the next parliament I will certainly be pushing to take that forward.

I absolutely acknowledge many of the issues Ms Cody, Ms Le Couteur and Mrs Dunne have raised in relation to trust and the power imbalance in the child and youth protection system. To some extent, these matters are inherent in the system. We know that even the best and most restorative child protection systems in the world face challenges, but we also have acknowledged consistently that we have room to improve.

I want to acknowledge Ms Cody's comments about the fact that keeping children and young people safe in our community is a whole-of-community responsibility. Often there is commentary about child and youth protection services, but they are at the end of what should be a continuum of support for children and families. That is why we are putting a lot more effort into early support and keeping children safe in their families.

On that note, I want to acknowledge our hardworking child and youth protection services, our community partners and our policy people across the Community Services Directorate. I acknowledge some of the change we have seen in the child protection system over the last five years. Since the A step up for our kids strategy in 2015, significant changes have been made that would not necessarily be reflected in the examination of the individual case in part 1, given the timing of that, but that has led to improvements in outcomes.

There has been a significant investment in early intervention and prevention programs, including Uniting. The vast majority of families involved with the Uniting preservation and prevention service have seen children staying at home safe with their families or being restored to their families. A result of these changes and investments has been a significant reduction in the number of children and young people entering care over the past two years. That is despite an ongoing and very significant number of child concern reports being received. They have significantly increased since 2016 and remained high. The total number of children and young people in care decreased from a peak of 829 in 2017-18 and stabilised at around 810 since the end of 2018-19.

This is a very significant change in the stabilisation of the number of young people in care and goes against the national trend. It is important to recognise the work that our child and youth protection services and our community partners are doing to keep children and young people safe with their families. Sometimes you hear the contributions and think nothing is happening in this space, and that is simply not true.

It is also simply not true in relation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and families. I am the first person to say that the level of over-representation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children in our child protection system is unacceptable, and that is why we established the Aboriginal-led Our Booris, Our Way review and have been responding to the interim recommendations made throughout

that review. That is the first review of its kind to be absolutely and wholly led by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. I commend the members of the steering committee and the team that supported them in the directorate.

In the first half of this financial year Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children represented 11 per cent of those entering care. That is still a massive over-representation but compares with 13 per cent in the period in 2018-19, 35 per cent in the same period in 2017-18 and 32 per cent in 2016-17. In terms of numbers, we are talking about six Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people entering care in the first half of 2019-20 and seven in 2018-19 compared to 29 and 35 in the two previous equivalent years.

We are seeing change in the system. Is it enough? No, it is not. That is why we are continuing to invest in programs like family group conferencing and functional family therapy for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families. I welcomed the Liberals' announcement the other day and the government is open to expanding access to family group conferencing. I note, however, that it is simply not possible in some cases, where a child is at immediate risk, to offer family group conferencing prior to taking emergency action or going to court.

The other investment I want to acknowledge and touch on briefly in relation to A step up for our kids—people have spoken about advocacy and people having a voice—is the establishment of the Birth Family Advocacy Service, which has since been expanded. I commend Red Cross for the incredible job they do in supporting birth families in the system. That is now an incredibly important part of our system.

We have also established a duty lawyer at the Childrens Court, recognising that when emergency action is taken and matters go to court quickly there is an opportunity for people to be represented. The CREATE Foundation provides systemic advocacy for young people in the system and Carers ACT provide advocacy for carers in a system.

A lot of the messages that have come through this inquiry and its report have been heard, are being heard and are being acted on. As to the very specific recommendations in relation to changes to the Children and Young People Act and how we can continue to improve, continue our path of building a more restorative and more therapeutic child and youth protection system, I absolutely welcome both the evidence the committee heard and its thorough work in examining that evidence and making recommendations. Again, I give my commitment that, if I am in a position to do so, I will certainly respond to those recommendations in the next term of government.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Sitting suspended from 12.18 to 2.00 pm.

Ministerial arrangements

MR BARR: The Deputy Chief Minister and Attorney-General are absent from the Assembly today. I will take questions in their portfolios.

Questions without notice**Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate—staffing**

MR COE: My question is to the Chief Minister. I refer to news reports in the *Australian* newspaper today that Marcus Ganley, the former chief of staff to Senator Penny Wong, who left her office following sexual harassment claims, has been appointed to a senior role in the Chief Minister's directorate. Can the Chief Minister confirm that Mr Ganley is now employed in the directorate?

MR BARR: I will seek some advice from the head of the public service on that matter.

MR COE: Will the Chief Minister please advise if he or any minister, or anyone in his office or another minister's office, assisted Mr Ganley to gain this role?

MR BARR: I know I certainly did not, but I will seek advice in relation to the appointment, which I would presume would be in accordance with public sector management merit principles.

MISS C BURCH: Chief Minister, how is it that so many former Labor staffers end up in senior positions in the ACT government?

MR BARR: I do not believe that that is the case. Over the 30 years of self-government, there have been former staffers of all political parties who have served in roles in the ACT public service—

Mr Hanson: Brendan Smyth.

MR BARR: You raised it, Mr Hanson. There is Bill Stefaniak—

Opposition members interjecting—

MADAM SPEAKER: Members!

MR BARR: I am sure that Miss Burch is not suggesting that anyone who works for a member of parliament should be disqualified from achieving employment in a public sector role ever again in their life.

Planning—Coombs peninsula

MS LE COUTEUR: My question is to the Minister for Planning and Land Management and relates to the Coombs peninsula. Minister, on 27 November last year the Assembly passed a motion that called upon the ACT government to remove the Coombs peninsula from the land release program, protect it from multi-unit development and rezone it for environmental and recreational purposes by 30 June

2020. Minister, have you implemented this motion?

MR GENTLEMAN: Madam Speaker, I refer Ms Le Couteur to the correspondence I sent to you regarding this resolution and the copy that I sent to her office. I will table that correspondence:

Coombs Peninsula—Resolution of the Assembly of 27 November 2019—Copy of letter to the Speaker from the Minister for Planning and Land Management and Minister for the Environment and Heritage, dated 22 July 2020.

MS LE COUTEUR: I do not really have a supplementary. I will re-ask the original question. Minister, how have you implemented this and why have you not rezoned the peninsula?

MR GENTLEMAN: I missed the second part of the question.

MS LE COUTEUR: It was the same as the first. Why did you not rezone the peninsula, as requested in the Assembly motion, or at least explain it to the Assembly? What have you done to implement the will of the Assembly?

MR GENTLEMAN: Madam Speaker, the correspondence to you and the copy to Ms Le Couteur's office goes into detail about the actions that we have taken and not taken.

MRS JONES: Minister, will works begin on transforming the peninsula into suburbia at all before this year's election?

MR GENTLEMAN: No. It was not even indicated on the original IRP, many years ago.

ACT Health—child sex offences

MRS DUNNE: My question is to the Minister for Health and relates to what she knew about a convicted paedophile working in ACT Health. Minister, in this place on 2 July you noted that the Health Directorate first became aware of a senior health official being before the courts on child sex offences on 14 May, despite the matter of Mr Burch being first named in the public court lists as early as the beginning of April. You said Mr Burch breached the ACT public sector employment enterprise agreement. Minister, why did it take so long for the ACT government to establish that one of its most senior officials was appearing before the courts on child sex offences when it was on the public record?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: I thank Mrs Dunne for the question. I refer her to previous answers that I have given in this place. For the information of the Assembly, I again offered Mrs Dunne a private briefing on this matter earlier this week. That is the third time I have offered her a briefing. I am going to take this question on notice. I am going to take all questions in relation to this matter on notice, other than if there is one particular question that I am going to be able to answer. Out of respect for an individual with whom I have been in correspondence—and I recognise that what occurred in this chamber a week ago caused some distress to that

individual—because I have committed to getting back to them with detail and I am not going to speak more publicly about this until I have had the opportunity to review some draft correspondence to them and to respond to them comprehensively and formally, rather than taking questions in this place, I will take the question on notice.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, was Mr Burch provided with any termination payments and, if so, how much taxpayers' money was provided?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: I will take the question on notice.

MR COE: Minister, did Mr Burch's bail conditions prohibit him from participating in social media activity and, if so, was he in breach of those conditions when, while still working for ACT Health, he continued to participate in a work-based WhatsApp group which included the sharing of photographs of children?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: I will answer this question. To the best of my knowledge, that was one of his bail conditions and I understand that the matter is under investigation.

ACT Health—child sex offences

MS LEE: My question is to the Attorney-General and, in his absence, the Chief Minister. It relates to the decision in the matter of Bradley John Burch. Chief Minister, there has recently been a strengthening of sentencing at a commonwealth level to ensure that child sex offenders spend time behind bars. To what extent was your government involved in discussions about changes to commonwealth law on child sex offences and does the sentencing in this case, where a self-confessed child sex offender spent not a single day behind bars, reflect the intent of those discussions and the changes to the commonwealth law?

MR BARR: I will take the first part of the question on notice. I need to get some advice from the attorney in relation to conversations I was not privy to. What I can advise Ms Lee is that Mr Burch was sentenced in the ACT Supreme Court but his convictions were for commonwealth criminal offences and he was prosecuted by the commonwealth DPP.

MS LEE: Chief Minister, is the attorney, or are you, aware that Mr Burch's intensive correction order has seen him released to live in Fyshwick in a brothel? Does this meet the government's expectations of how these orders should work?

MR BARR: I will take that question on notice and seek advice on the matter.

MRS DUNNE: Is the government satisfied that a convicted child sex offender not only should not have spent a single day behind bars but is literally serving out his sentence whilst living in a brothel?

MR BARR: The question is asking me to comment on a judicial decision. I will not be doing that. I will take the question on notice.

ACT Corrective Services—intensive correction orders

MR MILLIGAN: My question is to the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health. In the last fortnight, intensive correction orders have been used to allow a convicted child sex offender and a repeat offender convicted of drug trafficking not to spend a day behind bars. Can the minister advise whether these decisions are in line with the government's intended operation of intensive correction orders?

MR RATTENBURY: It is the government's responsibility to provide a range of sentencing options. As members will know, these offences do have the potential for time to be served behind bars. It is then a matter for the judiciary to weigh up the circumstances and make a penalty as they see fit in the circumstances. That is the role of the judiciary. Certainly, from a government point of view, the full range of penalties are available to be served, depending on how the judiciary directs.

MR MILLIGAN: Has the government raised the use of these intensive correction orders with the Director of Public Prosecutions in encouraging an appeal?

MR RATTENBURY: The Director of Public Prosecutions sits within the portfolio of the Attorney-General. I am afraid that I do not have any information to answer Mr Milligan's question.

MRS JONES: Minister, does the government have any concerns about any signal that these sentences may send to other potential perpetrators?

MR RATTENBURY: As I said in answer to the first question, the government provides a full range of penalties through the legislative and policy mechanisms. It is then a matter for the courts to determine the penalty that they see fit, in the circumstances of the case and in light of the evidence presented. I am sure that different members of the community would have different views on the appropriateness of the sentence handed down by the court.

Access Canberra—data security

MS LAWDER: My question is to the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services and, in his absence, the Chief Minister. You would be aware that drivers licence renewal notices that have included drivers licence numbers in the subject line have been sent to ACT residents via email. Chief Minister, given that two Auditor-General's reports this year alone have criticised the ACT government's cybersecurity practices, why does your government continue to include in an automated email personal information that could be misused?

MR BARR: Situations like this are of course regrettable, and I will take some advice from the area concerned in relation to this matter to ensure that it does not happen in the future.

MS LAWDER: Chief Minister, what actions has your government taken to ensure the data security of Canberra residents?

MR BARR: Numerous actions. I do not think it would be possible to list them all right now, but I will happily take the question on notice and provide the information to Ms Lawder.

MR WALL: What protocols or safeguards are in place to avoid people's personal information from being sent over the internet unprotected?

MR BARR: I do not have the technical information in front of me, which I presume is what Mr Wall is looking for. I will take that on notice.

Trade unions—CFMMEU fines

MR WALL: My question is to the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety. Minister, in a Federal Court judgement handed down on Tuesday, the ACT branch of the CFMMEU and its officials were fined close to \$160,000 for unlawfully picketing outside an ACT construction site. Two of the offenders were labelled by the court as acting "as if they were above the law" by a Federal Court judge. These offenders are currently serving roles on at least two government advisory councils, specifically the ACT Work Safety Council and the Secure Local Jobs Code Advisory Council. When will you or the Chief Minister be terminating their appointments to these government boards?

MS ORR: I thank Mr Wall for his question. I will take the question on notice for the substance and seek some advice as to any implications it may have for the appointments. I would note, however, that all appointments go through a rigorous process in being made and that all people appointed to these positions have passed a number of criteria and shown their merit in being selected.

MR WALL: Minister, how can you justify allowing these individuals, who wilfully break federal laws, to serve on government advisory bodies?

MS ORR: I find Mr Wall's question a bit difficult in the sense that it is quite inflammatory and unreasonable, putting judgement on someone for the work that they do and have been found capable of doing. I will leave it there.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, why do you insist on running a protection racket for recidivist offenders described by the Federal Court as acting as if they were above the law?

MS ORR: I am not running a protection racket.

Children and young people—parental contact

MRS KIKKERT: My question is to the Minister for Children, Youth and Families. On 29 May I emailed you, minister, about a mother who also emailed you at your personal and public inbox. She has been denied seeing her daughter after months and months. Still no action from you, and both mother and daughter have been pleading for contact. On 9 July I emailed you again and I wrote:

Minister may I remind you. You are robbing from this girl ... How? By robbing time away from her to see her mother. The judge saw that they should see each other. But the government have taken their pride and have not looked at the best interest of the child.

Now the government has blocked the mother from emailing them. She cannot contact them for updates to see her daughter. Minister, why is your government blocking a mother from seeing her daughter and, as a result, stopping the daughter from seeing her mother when she has said that she wants to?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: Obviously I am not going to comment on the details of an individual child and youth protection matter, but I can inform the Assembly that there are a number of errors of fact in Mrs Kikkert's assertion.

MRS KIKKERT: No error. Ask the mum. Minister, why is the government going against a court order where a judge approved that a reunion be made between the mother and the daughter?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: My understanding is that the Community Services Directorate is acting in accordance with the court order.

Mrs Kikkert: Rubbish.

MADAM SPEAKER: Mrs Kikkert, please.

MS LAWDER: Minister, will you and your directorate reach out to the mother today to organise for the right of both mother and daughter to see each other?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: Again, I am not going to comment on the details of an individual matter.

Public land—bike tracks

MR PARTON: My question is to the Minister for Planning and Land Management. Minister, I refer to the story in the RiotACT yesterday about the local kids who have made a bike track in Duffy Street, Ainslie, during the COVID-19 pandemic as a form of local recreation and fun. Minister, what advice have you received from your directorate about the plans to knock down the mounds and the track that these local kids have put a considerable amount of time and effort into constructing?

MADAM SPEAKER: Mr Steel.

MR STEEL: I will take the question on behalf of the government, as the responsible minister for public unleased land and the PUL Act in the ACT. The ACT government recognises that a number of pump tracks have been built by local children, possibly because the rain has softened up the earth and enabled these mounds to be built creatively, and no doubt with a lot of innovation. We certainly recognise that more children are out there riding in our community, and that is fantastic to see.

However, there is a well-developed framework for managing the use of public unleased land. Often that has been in conjunction with the government. We have built the pump track near Gundaroo Drive, in collaboration with the community, and now one in Farrer as well. We are looking into this particular matter, bringing in an expert to review the safety of these tracks and also to make sure that they are not damaging any trees in the vicinity. We will take a balanced approach to this matter. At this stage, no further work will be undertaken to remove these pump tracks.

MR PARTON: Minister, can you confirm if any complaints have been received regarding this issue or if the demolishing is occurring due to bureaucratic risk assessment?

MR STEEL: Certainly a number of people have been in touch with me, with members of the Assembly and with the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate in relation to this matter. That has resulted in us further reviewing these particular developments on public unleased land.

MISS C BURCH: Minister, what other community bike tracks such as this one built by children in the Canberra community does your government plan on demolishing?

MR STEEL: We do not plan on demolishing any.

Building—COVID-safe construction sites

MISS C BURCH: My question is to the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety. Minister, it has been brought to my attention that there are inconsistent hygiene and COVID-safe practices being adopted on various construction sites in the ACT. Another concern is that a significant number of construction workers continue to travel to the ACT during the week from known COVID hotspots in western Sydney. Has this been brought to your attention by the newly appointed workplace safety commissioner?

MS ORR: I thank Miss Burch for her question. As we know, the government takes worker safety very seriously, as well as community safety, during the time of COVID. I will seek more recent advice from the commissioner for work health and safety, noting that I do get a regular update. These specific issues have not been raised with me to date but, as I said, I will seek a more recent update. If Miss Burch has any particular instances that she is concerned about, she is also welcome to contact my office and let us know so that we can investigate.

MISS C BURCH: Minister, what action are you taking to ensure that a consistent approach is being adopted across the construction industry, in line with what is expected in other industries?

MS ORR: There are a range of measures that have been put in place, not only by our office of work health and safety but also Safe Work Australia, to provide consistent guidance across all of Australia, in line with the health recommendations that have been put forward. All this information is available to businesses, to construction

companies and to many other fields as well. We will continue to work with all the organisations within Canberra to make sure that workers are safe within their workplace.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, are you satisfied that construction employers and employees have an understanding of their obligations under the Work Health and Safety Act to maintain a COVID-safe workplace and are you satisfied that this is being done?

MS ORR: I am satisfied that everyone is doing everything they can in what is a very rapidly moving and fast developing situation. We will continue to work with all businesses across Canberra to adapt to and implement measures as required.

Hospitals—waiting times

MR HANSON: My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, I refer to an analysis performed by former Chief Minister Jon Stanhope and Dr Khalid Ahmed that was published on the University of Canberra policy space website. This analysis found that, for orthopaedic surgery, the median wait time in the ACT was 55 per cent longer than the average in peer hospitals across Australia. In relation to gynaecological surgery, the ACT's performance was much worse than its peer group of public hospitals. Minister, why is the median wait time for orthopaedic surgery in the ACT 55 per cent longer than in peer hospitals across Australia?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: I thank Mr Hanson for his rather predictable question. Of course, comparisons between jurisdictions on wait times vary between different craft groups all over the place. The ACT performs significantly better than other jurisdictions in cardiothoracic surgery. We perform better than most other jurisdictions in vascular surgery and neurosurgery, and indeed in urological. Mr Stanhope can cherry-pick the AIHW data any way that he likes, but I have been surprised that he—

Mr Hanson: A point of order on relevance. My question was about orthopaedic surgery, not any other form of surgery. Could the minister explain why we are suffering from median wait times that are 55 per cent longer for orthopaedic surgery, not for all other forms of surgery?

MADAM SPEAKER: You interjected after about 40 seconds. The minister, I think, is getting to the point. She is being relevant to the question on the data and median wait times.

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: I will take the question on notice in relation to the particular detail about why orthopaedic surgery is one of the ones where the ACT jurisdiction is not performing as well as in others. Of course, there are a range of areas where the ACT jurisdiction is performing better than other jurisdictions. Again, I was surprised that Mr Stanhope chose elective surgery, because when we look at the overall performance in relation to the time period that he chose, with respect to the average change in elective surgery from 2014-15 to 2018-19, there is a significantly higher number of admissions in the ACT than the national average. Growth in elective surgery has been absolutely significant and a vast improvement on 2009-10.

MR HANSON: Minister, why is the performance of gynaecological surgery much worse than in peer hospitals?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: Again, I will take the detail of the question on notice and come back to Mr Hanson in relation to gynaecological surgery in particular. What I would say, in terms of the ACT's overall performance in elective surgery, is that we have seen a significant improvement in the number of elective surgeries that have been performed in the ACT over the last 10 years. As members would be aware, we were on track this year to perform a record 14,250 elective surgeries, before the COVID-19 pandemic, and last year we performed more than 14,000 elective surgeries, which compares with 9,830 in 2009-10. We saw significant improvements in "seen on time" in 2018-19 compared to 2009-10 for category 1 and particularly for category 2. Seventy-one per cent of category 2 were seen on time in 2018-19, compared to 44 per cent in 2009-10. So I would argue that Mr Stanhope's argument does not stack up in relation to elective surgery.

MRS DUNNE: Minister, to what extent are the poor and disadvantaged of Canberra, who are on waiting lists for extensive periods of time, the price that we have to pay for Labor's mismanagement of the health system?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: I think I have just outlined that Labor has not been mismanaging the health system.

Health—elective surgery

MRS JONES: My question is to the Minister for Health. Recently you announced a \$30 million injection into the health system, in part around \$20 million to catch up on the 2,200 or so planned elective surgeries that were suspended because of the COVID-19 health emergency. Was the appropriation which had been allocated to fund the planned surgeries rolled over to 2020-21? If not, what has happened to it?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: As I would expect members opposite would know, the budget process involves allocating new funding for 2020-21. We have seen significant activity in the health system in 2019-20—

Mrs Dunne: A point of order, Madam Speaker. The question that Mrs Jones asked was not about the 2020-21 budget but about whether the appropriation made in 2019-20 was rolled over.

MADAM SPEAKER: As I understand it was also about where is the appropriation sitting.

Mrs Dunne: If not, where is it?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not believe that was case, but I will take the question on notice.

MRS JONES: Minister, is the \$30 million you talked about new money to be appropriated in the 2020-21 budget?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MRS DUNNE: Can you assure the Assembly that when you announced a \$30 million initiative none of the money for that \$30 million initiative was rolled over from the 2019-20 appropriation?

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: I will take the detail of the question on notice, but what I can assure the Assembly is that it is \$30 million allocated to elective surgery, outpatient appointments and other procedures that was not previously allocated for this financial year. So \$20 million of that, as Mrs Jones identified, will deliver an additional 2,000 elective surgeries compared what would have previously been the case in 2020-21.

Government—community support

MS CHEYNE: My question is to the Minister for Community Services and Facilities. Minister, how is the ACT government ensuring that Canberrans in need are able to access food and other essential items?

MS ORR: I thank Ms Cheyne for the question. In March this year I announced the \$1.5 million food relief package, which is part of the overall \$9 million community support package delivered by the ACT government. The Canberra Relief Network was established to ensure that Canberrans in need can still access essential goods and items during the COVID-19 pandemic. The Canberra Relief Network is a group of almost 20 emergency food relief and community service organisations in Canberra working together to ensure that all Canberrans have access to food and other essential items.

As of Friday last week, the Canberra Relief Network had recorded more than 5,800 calls from Canberrans in need, as well as broader community interest to support the initiative. Since commencing the delivery of food hampers on 1 April 2020, almost 6,000 standard food hampers have been delivered. In addition, more than 100 gluten-free hampers and more than 1,000 hygiene hampers have been delivered, supporting over 200 local women with sanitary items and more than 200 local families with baby items such as nappies and baby wipes.

Aside from providing necessary food items to Canberrans in need, the Canberra Relief Network is founded on the principle of supporting our local organisations that served the Canberra community long before the breakout of COVID-19. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have worked alongside the Canberra Relief Network, including the amazing volunteers. The COVID-19 pandemic has again demonstrated the caring nature of Canberrans. Their enduring commitment to provide much-needed support and services to Canberrans who are experiencing increased pressures during this time of uncertainty is deeply appreciated.

MS CHEYNE: Minister, what are the eligibility requirements for Canberrans to access the Canberra Relief Network services?

MS ORR: I thank Ms Cheyne for the supplementary. I know that Canberrans are strong and resilient, but I also know that it can be difficult to reach out for help at times. People who have never relied on support services have suddenly found themselves in a position of need.

Anyone currently experiencing pressures as a result of the current pandemic should not hesitate to utilise these services. This government is determined to make sure that no Canberran is left behind during the crisis and throughout recovery. We are all in this together. The eligibility to utilise these services is extended to any Canberran in need, including the elderly, people living with disability, people with health conditions who may be continuing to self-isolate, and workers whose income has been reduced due to their inability to work. Any member of the community who requires this service can register through the website at canberrarelief.com.au or by calling 1800 431 133 between 9.30 am and 2.30 pm Monday to Friday.

MR PETTERSSON: Minister, can you expand on the ways that the ACT government is building resilience and preparedness for our community now and into the future?

MS ORR: I thank Mr Pettersson for the question. The ACT government has invested heavily to support the economy, health and wellbeing of Canberrans. This support will continue through our recovery, bringing together economic and social support with a wellbeing and resilience-building focus for all Canberrans.

The \$9 million community support package has been rolled out across the community, supporting the sector to respond to increases in demand, as well as to those most in need directly. As part of the community support package, the ACT government is supporting community sector service providers through grants rounds which deliver on a range of outcomes, increasing wellbeing, enhancing adaptability and building resilience.

More than \$1 million has been provided to community organisations to develop and deliver services to the broader community and to support social connection and resilience, as well as providing fast and flexible funding to support organisations to adapt and adopt innovative and essential business model changes in response to COVID-19. Successful applicants include Lifeline Canberra for their COVID-19 response digital platform, the Canberra PCYC for their resilience-building program, and Yeddung Mura Aboriginal Corporation to assist them with virtual visits and upgraded IT.

Through the delivery of the Canberra Relief Network, these vital community grants programs and our overall community recovery plan, this government is ensuring that every Canberran receives the support they need, as well as building resilience and preparedness for our community now and into the future.

Mr Barr: I ask that all further questions be placed on the notice paper.

Supplementary answers to questions on notice

ACT Health—child sex offences

Health—elective surgery

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: In response to an earlier question from Ms Lee, I think I indicated that a matter was under investigation. I should have said that the matter had been referred to ACT Policing. I am not in a position to comment on whether or not they are currently investigating.

In relation to the question on the budget allocation of \$30 million for elective surgery, I can assure the Assembly that this is indeed new funding for the 2020-21 financial year and I have been advised, of course, that we continue to spend last year's funding on our doctors, nurses and allied health professionals. We did not stand our workforce down as a result of COVID-19. Indeed, when some surgery was suspended, those workforces instead were training to intubate and treat COVID-19 patients, should that be required. Essentially, you cannot stop paying a permanent workforce and transfer money to a different year. That is not really how it works. I just wanted to get some advice because there had been a number of \$30 million flying around in my head.

Leave of absence

Motion (by **Mr Gentleman**) agreed to:

That leave of absence be granted to Minister Berry and Minister Ramsay for today due to personal illness.

Papers

Mr Gentleman presented the following papers:

ACT Carers Strategy 2018-2028—Progress report 2020, dated July 2020, together with a statement.

ACT Volunteering Statement—Action Plan 2018-2021—2020 Annual Update.

COVID-19 Emergency Response Act, pursuant to subsection 3(3)—COVID-19 Measures—Report No 3—Reporting period 1-30 June 2020, dated July 2020.

Financial Management Act—Supply Instrument and Authorisation of Payments—Explanatory Notes—2020-2021, dated 30 June 2020, made pursuant to sections 7 and 37.

Mutual Recognition Act (Cth)—Mutual Recognition (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Notice 2020 (No 1)—Notifiable Instrument NI2020-463, dated 27 July 2020.

Planning and Development Act, pursuant to subsection 242(2)—Statement of leases granted for the period 1 April to 30 June 2020, dated July 2020.

Special Gazette No S4, Wednesday 29 July 2020, incorporating:

Mutual Recognition (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Notice 2020 (No 1)—Notifiable Instrument NI2020-463, dated 27 July 2020

Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Endorsement 2020 (No 1)—Notifiable Instrument NI2020-464, dated 27 July 2020.

Status of the public health emergency due to COVID-19—Chief Health Officer Report—24 July 2020, dated 30 July 2020.

Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition Act, pursuant to section 7—Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (WA Container Deposit Scheme) Endorsement 2020 (No 1)—Notifiable Instrument NI2020-464, dated 27 July 2020.

Subordinate legislation (including explanatory statements unless otherwise stated)

Legislation Act, pursuant to section 64—

Juries Act—Juries (Payment) Determination 2020—Disallowable Instrument DI2020 209 (LR, 6 July 2020).

Planning and Development Act—Planning and Development Amendment Regulation 2020 (No 1), including a regulatory impact statement—Subordinate Law SL2020-28 (LR, 16 July 2020).

Rates Act and Taxation Administration Act—Taxation Administration (Amounts Payable—Rates) Determination 2020 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2020 210 (LR, 3 July 2020).

Road Transport (General) Act—

Road Transport (General) Driver Licence and Related Fees Determination 2020 (No 2)—Disallowable Instrument DI2020-214 (LR, 10 July 2020).

Road Transport (General) Fees for Publications Determination 2020 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2020-211 (LR, 10 July 2020).

Road Transport (General) Numberplate Fees Determination 2020 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2020-213 (LR, 10 July 2020).

Road Transport (General) Refund and Dishonoured Payments Fees Determination 2020 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2020-212 (LR, 10 July 2020).

Road Transport (General) Vehicle Registration and Related Fees Determination 2020 (No 1)—Disallowable Instrument DI2020-215 (LR, 10 July 2020).

Industrial relations—long service leave

MS CODY (Murrumbidgee) (2.36): I move:

That this Assembly:

(1) notes:

- (a) that, since the implementation of the Long Service Leave (Portable Schemes) Act 2009, some workers' long service leave entitlements have been protected;
- (b) workers in some transient workforces are protected when staying in the industry but moving between employers; and

- (c) the intention of the Long Service Leave (Portable Schemes) Act 2009 is to ensure workers not in the public sector will be able to have their long service leave transferred from one employer to another;
- (2) further notes:
 - (a) the ACT Government has included industries, such as building and construction, contract cleaning, community sector and security, in the Portable Long Service Leave Scheme;
 - (b) there are other trades, such as hairdressing, where workers change employers without changing industries; and
 - (c) hairdressers and employees of other sectors who have a high churn of employers but stay within their relevant industry; and
- (3) calls on the Government to:
 - (a) work with Hair Stylists Australia, the ACT hairdressing industry, employers, employees, employee bodies and registered training organisations to determine how to include hairdressing in the Long Service Leave (Portable Schemes) Act 2009; and
 - (b) investigate extending the Long Service Leave (Portable Schemes) Act 2009 to other non-public sector industries.

Many years ago, a very brave Labor member of this place had a vision that all non-public sector employees would have portability of their long service leave entitlements. That member was former Speaker and member for Ginninderra, Mr Wayne Berry. Since his brave vision, we now have the Long Service Leave (Portable Schemes) Act 2009, which has brought together four industries where we know employee churn is high. Today, I call on Minister Orr to look at how we can include hairdressers and other non-public sector employees in this scheme.

As I often say in this place, I am a hairdresser. I have also owned a hairdressing salon. I know what it is like to be on both ends of the employment relationship. I also know a large number of hairdressers—both employees and employers—and, as with industries such as community services, hairdressing has a high percentage of women who work in it.

We know women's work is traditionally lower paid, less secure and more temporary. The project to fix that has been running for decades—decades too long. We already know that most women take a break in their career due to caring responsibilities, whether that be after having a baby or to care for loved ones. So it is not reasonable that they are also disadvantaged when it comes to access to leave entitlements, particularly long service leave entitlements.

As we are all painfully aware, the COVID-19 pandemic has caused stress for many people; but it has been really tough on those in insecure work. We also need to acknowledge that hairdressers are predominantly women and that women have been particularly hard hit by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Providing opportunities for support workers in high-churn industries to access their leave entitlements seems like a pretty reasonable thing to do—to me, it does.

When I was an employee, I was really lucky. I did not move around too much. I found great bosses who respected me and paid me what I thought I was worth; but I never worked in a salon long enough to gain long service leave entitlements. I worked in the one salon for my whole apprenticeship, which is usually about four years. I then worked in a couple of smaller salons until I found a salon that was great for me. I stayed there until the birth of my second child and I then opened my own salon. Really, I had very few bosses, and I stayed for long periods with them, but I still did not get long service leave entitlements.

As with industries such as construction and building, hairdressers move between employers but not always out of the industry. Some hairdressers move around a bit, whether that be from having to get away from bad bosses or whether they want to grow their abilities and work with new people. That does not mean that they should not be entitled to access long service leave. These are real-world issues experienced by real-world people.

Imagine a hairdresser by the name of Boris. Boris left school and started hairdressing when he was 17. Boris is full of life and thrives on learning. Boris, like me, did his apprenticeship in one salon for the whole four years. Many do not make it the whole time. Let us say that Boris was lucky enough to find a good boss and it all worked out perfectly. From there, Boris went to work in a salon which had a bit more flair and gave him the ability to do more fashion hairdressing. If you want a mix of colourful dreadlocks and braids with a side cut, Boris is your man.

Boris's boss at his second salon decided to sell up and, unfortunately, his new employer and Boris did not see eye to eye. Boris found a new job. He even got a promotion. He became the manager at the new salon. Boris reckons that it is pretty grouse there and he has now been hairdressing for a total of 12 years. He has met the love of his life and wants to travel and get married overseas. He loves his job. This was also all before COVID times.

We are imagining this scenario: even as a brilliant hairdresser and a manager, he is not really paid very well. As an apprentice, junior hairdresser and even as a manager, he is struggling to put savings together. If Boris was able to have his long service leave entitlements transported, he would have plenty of leave available to him and enough money to pay for the trip. I am sure that some people would say that Boris is being greedy with his request that he get the same rights to long service leave as other people get. I reckon that Boris has waited long enough.

Long service leave should not be limited to people in industries with more ongoing employment practices. Hence, I am really happy to include other industries in my motion. It is important that we look at all the industries that are non-public sector industries. Things like childcare workers, beauty therapists, mechanics—they are just a few of the industries that could also benefit from being included in the long service leave portability scheme.

As a very colourful former member of this place once said:

It is our vision that ultimately everybody who is not employed in the public sector will be able to have their long service leave transferred from one industry to another. The challenge for us into the future is going to be having a scheme where a person can be, for example, a shop assistant during the day and a cleaner at night. If that particular individual works for 10 years or so continuously, they are entitled to long service leave from both sectors. At the moment, we do not have one single mechanism to allow them to achieve that. That is our aim and that is where we are headed.

That former member for Brindabella, Mr Hargreaves, was very passionate about seeing the beginnings of a scheme which would cover many industries.

Whilst the particular industry today I am pushing for is hairdressing, I believe that everyone should get long service leave, because the people of the Australian Capital Territory should be the best paid and have the best entitlements and the most workplace rights of anyone in the world.

I was lucky enough in the lunch break to spend some time with a couple of hairdressers, and they were so excited to have the opportunity to speak to me and to Minister Orr about how hard it has been for them to not have these entitlements, to not be able to access something that a lot of public sector workers take for granted. We have it in the construction industry, we have it in the security industry, we have it in the contract cleaning industry. We should be looking at other industries that also deserve these entitlements.

MR WALL (Brindabella) (2.46): I rise to speak to Ms Cody's motion, which she has brought here today. My thoughts on the long service leave scheme and how it has operated are well known, and my view on Ms Cody's pitch today will not surprise anyone in this place. When it was first brought to the ACT Assembly, the idea of the portable long service leave scheme was fundamentally flawed. As the security industry, the cleaning industry and the community sector joined the construction industry in the scheme, we have not seen any real consideration of the effects on the industries or their employees and employers.

As usual, ideas such as these are not put before industry first, because, in all probability, those opposite have an idea of what the response will be. Little consultation occurs unless, of course, it is with the union movement. Like many decisions made by the Labor-Greens government, these have been made without any consideration of the impacts they will have on employers, with no measure of the cost implications and with no idea of the impact they could have on the ability of a business to employ a person.

Even before the pandemic hit and began impacting our economic stability, the Labor government took a sledgehammer to vocational education, training and apprenticeships at the beginning of this year. Courses and course funding were slashed in January to the point of triggering what many described as a pending skills shortage in some industries. I find it extremely disappointing but not surprising that this government would choose to pursue or even suggest placing further imposts and barriers in the way of creating and retaining jobs in our community, particularly at this time.

Hairdressing is a tough and competitive industry, with high overheads often experienced by businesses, and very slim margins. Now is utterly the worst possible time to be adding additional costs and barriers to the employment of Canberrans. Calls for an increase in employment costs will make existing margins—if there are any—slimmer, and for some it will be the difference between staying in business and not. It will be the difference between operating in the ACT or having to look for some respite elsewhere—over the border—from the high costs of operating in the ACT. It will be the difference between putting that extra employee on or having to let an employee go.

I have spoken to many in the industry about this, in particular an industry representative who has done many years as a hairdresser—as an employee and, for many years, as an operator of a number of hairdressing salons. She tells me that any move to introduce the portable long service leave scheme to the hairdressing and beauty industry would add another layer of compliance for small businesses, which already do not have the time or resources to manage the requirements they have to meet. Further, she reiterates the potential of having a situation where an additional, say, two per cent impost on top of their payroll would make the decision to employ more staff difficult. Again, in the current economic circumstances this seems to be naively short sighted. This purports to be a move to support the worker, but it fails to acknowledge the potential risk to the worker's job.

Another huge concern I have with Ms Cody's motion is this government's long and chequered history of mismanagement and maladministration of the scheme, and its inability to interpret the legislation. We need only look at the recent debacle and the subsequent legal stoush around the eligibility and/or requirement of a peak body in the community services sector to contribute to the scheme, and the scheme's reluctance to repay a substantial overpayment once the courts ruled, following a substantial legal battle, the funds that had been contributed to the long service leave fund. We also only need to look at the private aged-care providers in this town, who are struggling in a government-regulated market to meet the costs of doing business when competing with not-for-profits paying significantly lower taxes and no payroll tax.

The opposition does not support Ms Cody's motion today, and I strongly oppose any further action on the matter. I reiterate my concerns that the extension of eligibility of the scheme will make it harder for employers to provide jobs and will add to the financial burden already present for business owners, who are doing everything that they can to keep their staff employed at this time. Whilst we are in the depths of a battle against a once-in-a-lifetime pandemic and a national economic crisis, I will go so far as to say that this is one of the most ill thought out and ill-considered motions that Ms Cody has brought to this place. It is about time that she ventured outside her union bubble and realised that thousands of businesses across the ACT are currently on life support, and that without those businesses there will be no jobs.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (2.51): The Greens are pleased to see a continued commitment to long service leave for ACT employees and to have an opportunity to discuss that here in the Assembly today. Ms Cody's motion calls on the ACT

government to look into how to further extend portable long service leave benefits to another dynamic employment sector in the ACT—hairdressing.

Portable long service leave is an excellent scheme. We are proud of the work that has been done in the Assembly, over a number of terms now, to provide long service leave benefits to an increasing number of employees, including commitments by my colleagues Amanda Bresnan and Meredith Hunter in the Seventh Assembly. The scheme seems to be working well for the industries already covered, so we believe that it makes sense to consider extending it to other sectors.

Portable long service leave is intended to protect the entitlements of workers who work in industries that are characterised by higher levels of mobility and brief employment. We take on Ms Cody's comments that employees working in hairdressing may often move between salons and employers but remain in the same sector for their entire careers. They, like the employees already covered by the scheme, deserve access to paid leave and entitlements.

The view held by some that long service leave is painful to industry and a burden on employment is antiquated and fails to recognise that workers need rest and balance in their lives. Long service leave helps provide that. It contributes to worker health and safety and it helps build a better and fairer society. The evidence is also clear that treating workers well, and giving them proper breaks and leave, improves productivity. As I have raised before in this place, there is a question about whether it is time for Australia's long service leave provisions to go through a more fundamental, modernising transformation. All long service leave could, in fact, be portable, recognising that, in the modern age, people change employers and industries fairly frequently. Today's working environment is just not the same as in the days when someone might be a company employee for life.

The Australian Senate, through the inquiry into the feasibility of, and options for, creating a national long service standard, and the portability of long service and other entitlements—and that is quite a title for a committee inquiry!—has looked into the issue. The report highlighted the value of states, territories and the commonwealth reviewing the long service leave systems in Australia and considering the development of a nationally consistent scheme.

In recognition of the ongoing changes to the ACT workforce across sectors, I welcome that Ms Cody's motion looks into how we could broaden this scheme even further in the ACT. I recognise that extending this outside of select industries would require significant work and consultation. The approach that has been taken so far to pick certain industries and add them individually makes sense from a practical perspective; however, given the long success of the scheme in the ACT, the time has come to broaden it to other sectors.

All our workforces are becoming more fluid and flexible, and this is an opportunity to share the benefits of long service leave to all employees in the ACT, not just those in individually championed industries. I recognise that an extension of this scope will take time and so it is appropriate to ask the government to investigate the options for

expansion. We certainly look forward to the results and, all else being equal, to continuing that discussion in the next term of the Assembly.

To conclude, I reiterate my thanks to Ms Cody for recognising hairdressing employees and for giving us the opportunity to discuss long service leave again in the Assembly. The scheme is consistent with our values that recognise and respect the needs and rights of ACT workers and value the opportunity for people to have time out through the course of a long working life. We are pleased to support the motion today.

MS ORR (Yerrabi—Minister for Community Services and Facilities, Minister for Disability, Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety and Minister for Government Services and Procurement) (2.55): I thank Ms Cody for moving this important motion today, drawing the Assembly's attention to the ACT's portable long service leave scheme. The ACT government is proud to have introduced portable long service leave for Canberra workers. It is another example of how, under this government, the ACT leads the nation on strong workplace relations reforms.

Australia ranks highly against most of the wellbeing measures described in the OECD's better life index. Out of 40 participating countries, Australia has the highest civic engagement and is above average in areas such as income and wealth, housing, jobs and earnings, education and skills, subjective wellbeing, and security. Disappointingly, there is one measure against which Australia performs very poorly. It ranks 31st out of 40 participating countries in the area of work-life balance. This is primarily because 13 per cent of employed Australians work 50 or more hours per week, compared to the OECD average of 11 per cent.

Australians are working longer hours than ever before. Excessive work hours are not conducive to good physical or mental health. Overwork puts pressure on families, social interactions and rest. Australians' working lives are also getting longer. Growing numbers of workers are remaining in the workforce at older ages. Commonwealth policy has supported and, in fact, encouraged this trend through superannuation, tax and age pension eligibility policies.

This trend of spending more time at work means that it is more important than ever before for employees to have a sustained period of recovery and renewal from work during their working life. Long service leave is one mechanism that facilitates this. However, this trend is on a collision course with another major trend in the labour force—mobility. The Australian Bureau of Statistics reports high levels of workforce mobility, with almost one in five workers employed by their current employer for less than one year. This has led to a lower prevalence of long-term employment relationships, with around three in four workers staying with their employer for less than 10 years.

Long service leave forms part of the national employment standards. As of January 2010, the standards have applied to all employees covered by the national workplace relations system, regardless of the industrial instrument or contract of employment. However, even with these positive acknowledgements of the importance of long service leave, one historic relic has largely remained—the concept of tying eligibility to service with just one employer.

The structural trend away from long-term employment is limiting access to long service leave for a large portion of the workforce. This is a limitation that is particularly pronounced for women, who are much more likely to take a break from the workforce, and therefore lose the right to long service leave.

Portable long service leave was introduced to mitigate these inequalities by allowing workers to move between employers in a specific industry without losing credit for the time worked in that industry. The industries selected for portable schemes are characterised by short-term employment, contract work, high mobility, and part-time and casual employment. Several of the industries covered by portable long service leave in the ACT also have a relatively low average salary.

By recognising and encouraging loyalty within these industries, portable long service leave schemes benefit workers by facilitating sustainable career paths while providing a variety of work opportunities. The schemes benefit the consumers of industry services by encouraging the attraction and retention of skilled workers within the industry.

To achieve these benefits, the schemes may disadvantage employers by reducing worker loyalty to individual employers. They also require employers to pay projected entitlements up front into a public fund. However, one of the benefits of this is that it allows employees to leave situations where they are mistreated or treated unfairly at work without the fear of losing their long service leave entitlements.

Portable long service leave in the territory is governed by the Long Service Leave (Portable Schemes) Act 2009. The act established portable long service leave schemes for the building and construction industries, contract cleaning, community sector and security industries.

The building and construction industry scheme came into effect in 1981, and an equivalent scheme exists in most states and territories. The contract cleaning scheme came into effect in 2000, the community sector scheme in 2010 and the security scheme in 2013. In 2016 access to portable long service leave was extended to additional classes of workers. The coverage of the cleaning and the community sector schemes was expanded to include waste disposal and aged-care workers, respectively.

The portable long service leave schemes are administered by the Long Service Leave Authority. Employers for each covered industry must pay a quarterly levy into a fund managed by the authority, from which workers are paid when they access long service leave. Currently, levies are 1.0 per cent of wages for the security industry, 1.2 per cent for the contract cleaning and the community sector industries, and 2.1 per cent for the building and construction industry.

The authority maintains separate funds for each scheme, and separate registers for employers and workers. These costs are partially offset because employers are not required to make a provision for long service leave under the Long Service Leave Act 1976 for workers that are covered by a portable long service leave scheme.

The motion that is before us proposes that a portable long service leave scheme be established for ACT hairdressers. Workers compensation data indicates that there are around 250 employers operating hairdressing and beauty services in the ACT, employing more than 1,300 people. Of the 250 registered employers, around half are small businesses, employing fewer than three people on average. Another 30 are slightly larger, employing around six people on average. The industry is characterised by a high degree of worker mobility within the sector, most employees are female, and wages are below average, at around \$35,000 per person.

Sectors that are currently covered by portable long service leave were selected, in part, based on the degree of short-term employment, contract work, high mobility, and part-time and casual employment. Hairdressing shares many of these characteristics. In view of this, and in response to Ms Cody's motion, I intend to request that directorate officials begin a process of consultation with the authority, employers, workers and their representatives on the question of whether and how to establish portable long service leave for hairdressers in the ACT. This consultation will allow the government to test the views of the workers and employers who would be most affected and who have the most to gain from accessing portable long service leave. It will also explore the most effective and efficient method of extending cover.

Significantly, the most recent extension of portable long service leave to waste disposal and aged-care workers was achieved by expanding existing schemes which had characteristics in common with those occupations. None of the existing schemes have this level of compatibility with hairdressing. A number of ACT hairdressing employers are microbusinesses which, due to their size and relatively tight profit margins, have limited capacity to manage cash flow demands or new administrative obligations. Consultation should have a particular focus on considering how to best limit any adverse impact on small business costs.

Portable long service leave schemes respond to the fluidity of the modern-day Australian workforce. They recognise that workers very often do not stay in the same job for their whole working life; nonetheless, they remain committed to their professions, their careers and their industry. Portable long service leave supports workers who are willing to commit to the same industry. This can have a beneficial productivity impact for industry, which is better able to retain skilled workers.

The ACT government is committed to making use of all legislative, policy and procedural tools at its disposal to improve workplace ethical and labour standards. This includes strategies to reduce both the incidence of insecure work and the adverse impact of insecure work on the community. Portable long service leave is one of the mechanisms implemented by this government to reduce inequality levels between workers in secure and insecure work. More than half of ACT private sector workers currently have access.

I take the opportunity to share a quote from two workers who are covered under the scheme. Christine is a cleaner, and told me:

We fought for so long to get what others take for granted. It is good to know that in a time when the world has gone mad, our long service leave is safe.

Nazish, who is an early childhood educator, told me:

For educators, long service leave provides sufficient time to relax, recharge and return to the industry. By boosting morale and increasing productivity of employees, long service leave helps in attraction and retention of educators in the early childhood sector to achieve the best learning outcomes for our children.

It is timely to consider whether the coverage of the scheme should be extended, particularly as we are seeing the impacts of COVID-19 on working people. Christine and other working Canberrans can trust that this government will always stand up for them, and ensure that our workplace relations system provides the best outcomes for them and their families. I thank Ms Cody for her strong advocacy on behalf of hairdressers and working people in the ACT, and I commend the motion to the Assembly.

MS CODY (Murrumbidgee) (3.05), in reply: I would like to thank my colleagues Minister Orr and Minister Rattenbury for their kind words today and their support for this motion. It is 100 per cent about working people in Canberra. Mr Wall was correct; his speech did not surprise me one little bit, but there might be some things that surprise Mr Wall. I, too, spoke to many business owners; but do not take my word for it. I will quote a business owner that was interviewed by the *Canberra Times*, not even by me. In this morning's *Canberra Times* article, we heard from a boss that owns a salon in Woden—a great barbershop, actually. He is a really good hairdresser. I might have to go and see him myself; I need a bit of a trim. He was very supportive of this motion. He spoke to me not so long ago about the fact that hairdressers need something like the construction industry has for portable long service leave.

The portable long service leave scheme is something that has stood the test of time. It has been very well received. It has looked after workers here in the ACT. It has looked after workers in some industries. It is time now, particularly during this tragic pandemic, for us to look at workers in other industries that need the protection of the portable long service leave scheme.

I am advocating today on behalf of hairdressers, because that is an industry I know, and know very well. I can tell you all of the ins and outs, as both a worker and a boss, of the hairdressing industry. I know what it is like to pay your bills, to treat your staff well and to make sure that they are looked after every day, so that they, too, can buy their groceries. It is also very important to ensure that they get all of their leave entitlements—not just the good pay but the leave entitlements.

Again, I thank my colleagues on this side of the chamber for their input to today's debate. I commend my motion to the Assembly, and thank all of the hairdressers that have come forward since I announced that I was doing this and thanked me for my advocacy for them.

Question put:

That the motion be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 12

Noes 9

Mr Barr	Ms Orr	Miss C Burch	Mr Parton
Ms J Burch	Mr Pettersson	Mr Coe	Mr Wall
Ms Cheyne	Mr Rattenbury	Mrs Dunne	
Ms Cody	Mr Steel	Mr Hanson	
Mr Gentleman	Ms Stephen-Smith	Mrs Kikkert	
Mr Gupta		Ms Lawder	
Ms Le Couteur		Mr Milligan	

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Housing—affordability

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (3.13): I move:

That this Assembly:

(1) notes that:

- (a) after years of ACT Labor, thousands of Canberrans are still priced out of the housing market;
- (b) there has been no progress regarding housing or rental affordability;
- (c) according to Domain's June 2020 *State of the Market* report, the median rent in Canberra was \$575 and the median house price was \$819,000;
- (d) annual rent of \$30,000 is out of reach for many of Canberra's "working poor"; and
- (e) the Government's land supply, planning system and tax regime has stifled the supply of new houses for rent; and

(2) calls on the Government to bring down the cost of renting in Canberra by:

- (a) stopping the unfair increases to rates and taxes;
- (b) bringing clarity and confidence to the planning system;
- (c) delivering certainty to the land supply; and
- (d) ensuring that the rate of construction of townhouses and free standing homes keeps pace with demand.

Unfortunately, the housing situation in the territory is not getting better. In fact, it is getting worse very, very quickly. So many Canberrans are priced out of the housing market in the ACT. After 19 years of Labor 35,000 Canberrans are living in poverty, including 8,000 kids. We have a housing market that now has a median rent of \$575 per week—\$1,150 a fortnight after tax. That is a huge amount of money in anyone's language. We also now have a median house price of \$819,000.

When you have annual rents of \$30,000, it is no wonder that so many Canberra families are doing it tough. It is no wonder that we have an increasing problem in the ACT regarding the working poor. It is no wonder that we have an increasing

homelessness problem and that we have so many people that are doing it tough. It is no wonder that we have overcrowded apartments and houses with people trying to split the rent.

The government's land supply, planning system and tax regime has stifled the supply of new homes in the territory to a point where if it was not for the Queanbeyan council and the products being delivered over the border, there would be almost nothing available in our region that could be regarded as affordable.

Anglicare recently put out their rental affordability snapshot. On the weekend of 21 March the snapshot showed 1,201 private rentals were advertised in the ACT and Queanbeyan region. Only 78 of those 1,200 properties were affordable, and of those none were affordable for a couple with two children, a single person with a couple of kids or a single person with either a young child or an older child. If you are single, aged over 21 and on the disability support pension, there are no options regarded as being affordable in the territory.

This is Labor's legacy. This is what you get after 19 years of Labor—the most disadvantaged in our community, those who struggle the most, are worse off now than ever before. It has never been worse than what it is right now for people looking for houses. The sum of \$575 a week for an average home is an extraordinary amount of money.

We hear of all sorts of issues with the planning system. Nobody knows where they stand. The lack of certainty, the lack of confidence, the special deals, the sweetheart deals done by this government have all led to the exacerbation of this situation. We also know that rates and land taxes are bringing in a huge amount of money and that is coming from Canberra households.

The average rates bill with levies was \$1,300. Now, after the tax reform, it is almost \$3,000 and increasing rapidly. Tenants ultimately pay the rates increases. They also pay for the delays in the planning system and the lack of dwellings, and all these things drive up the cost of rent in the territory.

Land tax on residential properties in 2011-12 was \$63 million. In 2021-22 it will be up to \$164 million. Land tax per rental residence will be more than \$3,000, on average. This is what you get after 19 years of Labor.

This tax regime that is meant to be simpler and fairer is driving up the cost of living right across the territory. Stamp duty that was abolished in 2011-12, when it brought in \$239 million, is estimated to bring in \$283 million in 2021-22, according to the Treasurer's update.

One of the key problems in the territory is the profiteering this government has done with regard to land in the territory. The government's abuse of its land release monopoly underpins the government's gross profit margins on suburban residential land development, a gross profit margin of 78.7 per cent. I have chatted with some private land developers and they reckon 15 to 20 per cent means that they are doing pretty well and that that is pretty profitable. Meanwhile, the ACT government is bringing 78.7 per cent. It was 44 per cent in 2012 and it has gone up and up since.

We are calling on the government to bring down the cost of renting in Canberra. We want to stop the unfair increases to rates and taxes, fees and charges. We want to bring clarity and confidence to the planning system. We want to deliver certainty to the land supply so that there is not as much speculation in the market. We want to ensure that the rate of construction and freestanding homes keeps pace with demand.

It is a shame that we have to ask these things. It is a shame that we have to beg in the chamber for these most simple requests. Either the government is incapable of doing them or they do not want to and it is deliberate. One way or another, it is Canberra families that are doing it tough, it is Canberra families that are paying the price.

The Canberra Liberals will continue to do all that we can to draw attention to this issue. We will continue to do all that we can from the opposition, but rest assured that from October we finally will stop the unfair increases to rates and taxes. We will bring clarity and confidence to the planning system. There will be certainty regarding land supply. We will make sure land is released so that we can keep pace with the demand of our city. We owe it to all of Canberra's families. We owe it to everybody doing it tough to make sure we have affordable housing in the territory.

MR BARR (Kurrajong—Chief Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality, Minister for Tourism and Special Events and Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment) (3.22): I move the amendment circulated in my name:

Omit all text after “That this Assembly”, substitute:

“(1) notes that:

- (a) over this term of the Assembly, the ACT Government has implemented a range of measures to support and protect people renting in the ACT, including:
 - (i) protecting renters from excessive rent increases; and
 - (ii) making it easier for renters to end leases without incurring punitive costs;
- (b) during the Covid-19 pandemic and associated global economic crisis, the Government has implemented a range of further urgent measures to protect residential tenants, including:
 - (i) commencing a moratorium on evictions for non-payment of rent, and rent increases, for Covid-19 affected tenants and occupants;
 - (ii) funding a mediation service and increasing legal assistance funding for tenants; and
 - (iii) establishing a process to negotiate rent reductions and providing landlords access to a land tax credit and rates rebate scheme for reductions in rent of at least 25 percent; and
- (c) the Real Estate Institute Housing Affordability Index for the 2020 March quarter, released in June 2020, showed the proportion of income in the ACT required to meet the median rent was 19 percent, the second-lowest in the country;

(2) further notes that:

- (a) residential dwelling construction in the ACT is performing strongly, as reflected in the Commonwealth Bank's July 2020 State of the States report, which showed the ACT currently leads the nation for dwelling construction starts, with starts in the ACT 21.7 percent above the decade-average in trend terms;
- (b) on 4 June, the ACT Government announced a range of measures to support people to purchase their own home, as well as stimulate the residential construction sector by reducing stamp duty on new land single residential blocks to zero; off-the-plan apartment and townhouse purchases up to \$500 000, to zero; and off-the-plan apartment and townhouse purchases between \$500 000 and \$750 000, by \$11 400, available until July 2021; and
- (c) on 17 June, the Government announced average rates increases for residential land would be set at 0 percent for the 2020-21 financial year, which combined with the one-off \$150 Covid-19 economic survival package rates rebate, means that over 100 000 residences in the ACT will see an actual reduction in their rates bill this financial year;

(3) also notes that:

- (a) each year, the ACT Government releases an Indicative Land Release Program to provide certainty to builders, developers, investors and residential owner-occupiers;
- (b) there are currently 346 single residential blocks available over the counter through the Suburban Land Agency and the Ginninderry development, as at 20 July 2020, starting at \$197 000; and
- (c) there are currently 188 blocks available through the Suburban Land Agency and from the Ginninderry development, as at 20 July 2020, which are priced below \$420 000;

(4) calls on the ACT Government to:

- (a) continue its policy of a compact and sustainable city, with a land supply program that provides a range of accommodation types to cater for individuals, couples, groups and families of all shapes and sizes as the city grows;
- (b) continue to help more people transition to home ownership through stamp duty cuts;
- (c) commit to regular review and improvements to the planning system;
- (d) continue to implement its affordable housing agenda and work towards further diversifying housing choice consistent with the ACT Housing Strategy; and

(5) calls on the Legislative Assembly to commit to protect Tuggeranong natural grasslands west of the Murrumbidgee from urban housing development.”.

The amendment I move notes that over the terms of the Assembly the government has implemented a range of measures to support and protect people renting in the ACT, including and protecting renters from excessive rent increases and making it easier for renters to end leases without incurring punitive costs.

One notes that during the COVID-19 pandemic and the associate global economic crisis, the government has implemented a range of further measures to protect residential tenants, including commencing a moratorium on evictions for the non-payment of rent and on rent increases for COVID-19 affected tenants and occupants. The government has funded a mediation service and increased legal assistance funding for tenants, and established a process to negotiate rent reductions and provide landlords with access to our land tax credit and rates rebate scheme for reductions in rent of at least 25 per cent.

The amendment also notes that the Real Estate Institute's Australia's housing affordability index for the March 2020 quarter, which was released last month, showed that the proportion of income in the ACT required to meet the territory's median rent was the second lowest in the country, at 19 per cent. The amendment further notes, perhaps in contrast to the situation that the Leader of the Opposition outlined in his brief address, that residential dwelling construction in the ACT is performing strongly. This was reported only this week, in fact, in the Commonwealth Bank's *State of the States* report, which showed that the ACT leads the nation for dwelling construction starts. The starts in the ACT now are a full 21.7 per cent above the decade average, in trend terms.

I note that some of the recent activity—activity in the last seven weeks or so—has been spurred on by the ACT government's announcement of a range of measures to support people to purchase their own homes and, of course, stimulate the residential construction sector. We have done so by reducing stamp duty on new land—single residential blocks—to zero, and stamp duty on off-the-plan apartment and townhouse purchases valued up to \$500,000 also to zero. For those who wish to purchase an off-the-plan apartment or townhouse with a value between 500,000 and \$750,000, there is an \$11,400 stamp duty reduction available.

On 17 June, building on an announcement that I made in March, the government announced that the average rates increase for residential land would be set at zero per cent for the 2020-21 fiscal year, which, combined with the one-off \$150 COVID-19 rates rebate, means that over 100,000 residences in the ACT will see a reduction in their rates bill in this financial year. This is, of course, timed as an economic stimulus measure, as we are now officially, according to the Australian government, in a depression. The Australian government is forecasting two years of negative economic growth. That is a depression. A recession is two quarters of negative economic growth. A depression is two years of that, and that is what the commonwealth has forecast.

My amendment also notes that each year the ACT government releases an indicative land release program. This indicative land release program provides information to builders, to potential homeowners and to investors, about the forward land release program. I can advise the Assembly that at 20 July there were 346 single residential blocks available over the counter through the Suburban Land Agency and through the Ginninderry joint venture development. Those blocks start in price at \$197,000. As at 20 July 2020, there are 188 blocks available through the Suburban Land Agency and from the Ginninderry development which are priced below \$420,000. That is a threshold that would clearly enable those who are building a house—a reasonably

large house at \$330,000 worth of housing construction—to fit in under the commonwealth’s HomeBuilder program, which has a nationwide threshold of \$750,000. I note that New South Wales is having extraordinary difficulty providing land at a price that will enable people in that state—particularly those seeking land anywhere near Sydney—to be able to access that scheme. So a hot tip might be that the federal government might need to adjust that nationwide threshold.

My amendment calls on the government to continue its policy of issuing a compact and sustainable city with a land supply program that provides a range of accommodation types to cater for individuals, couples, groups and families of all shapes and sizes as Canberra grows; to continue to help more people transition to home ownership through a continued focus on stamp duty cuts; to commit to regular review and improvements to the planning system, which Minister Gentleman has underway; and to continue to implement its affordable housing agenda and work towards further diversifying housing choice, consistent with the ACT housing strategy that the Deputy Chief Minister has been leading.

Importantly, today is an opportunity for the Legislative Assembly to commit to protecting Tuggeranong’s natural grasslands west of the Murrumbidgee from urban housing development. So the pledge that I can give today is that a Labor government will not allow environmentally sensitive and community-use land—particularly the native grasslands in Tuggeranong west of the Murrumbidgee, but also the Kowen Forest—to be bulldozed for urban development. So the challenge for the Leader of the Opposition is to match this commitment.

As our city grows, more living options will become available for residents, from single detached residences in new suburbs to townhouses and apartments in town centres. Canberrans deserve to have confidence in where new housing will be built, confidence that sensitive environmental areas will not be bulldozed for housing, and confidence in the quality of the residences that they purchase. That is why we have announced that we will be creating a developer licencing scheme and establishing an expert certifier team within the public service to break the sometimes too cosy connection between developers and certifiers, which can lead to significant and distressing rectification costs for owners.

These are important commitments that the government has made. I note that, at least on some of them, there is a degree of bipartisan or even tripartisan support, but today is an opportunity for the opposition to be very clear about which land, including environmentally sensitive land, it proposes to bulldoze for housing developments under the proposals that the Leader of the Opposition continues to float. He says that there is an abundance of land but does not identify which land should be protected and which land should be developed. The government has been very clear in this regard, in terms of the forward land release program and the areas for residential development. We have been equally clear about the areas that we will not pursue for urban development. That is an important statement of principle, and I know that it is something that many Canberrans want to know before they vote in October.

In conclusion, the opposition leader in his remarks might be stating that the election is a foregone conclusion. From the statements that he made at the conclusion of his

remarks, it is obvious that he believes that he has already won the election, but this contest remains alive. It is close—ACT elections always are—but what I am saying today, and the clear commitment that I am giving through the amendment that I have moved, is that the government will continue to pursue its planning reforms, its building quality reforms, the affordable housing strategy, and that we will rule out development which involves bulldozing a sensitive environmental urban plan for high environmental value land west of the Murrumbidgee River in Tuggeranong. I commend my amendment to the Assembly.

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (3.32): Mr Coe's motion is very similar to the one he moved last year, and it has the same fundamental problems as that one. The Greens will not be supporting Mr Coe's motion but, instead, we will support Mr Barr's amendment. There are lots of useful facts in Mr Barr's amendment but the thing that I found particularly interesting and positive was that last call, No 5, to protect Tuggeranong natural grasslands west of the Murrumbidgee from urban housing development. Those of us who were campaigning south of the lake in 2016, as Mr Parton was, will probably remember that, in relation to this development, there was a very live issue at the time and it was not at all clear what the government's views were for most of that period. I am very pleased that it has been ruled out.

I am afraid that Mr Coe's motion is wrong about the majority of the causes of housing affordability and, therefore, he is not actually correct in his solutions. I have to agree that housing is unaffordable for many people, particularly those who are renting, and I wish that this had improved since the motion in September last year. I cannot dispute with Mr Coe that it has not improved.

The most recent Anglicare rental affordability snapshot found, in March this year, zero market rental properties in Canberra and Queanbeyan that were affordable for people living on JobSeeker payments without placing them in housing stress. Only eight were affordable for housing four people with two parents both earning the minimum wage. The Anglicare report shows that this is not just an ACT problem, it is a national problem. It is not unique to the ACT; and that is the problem with this motion. It incorrectly draws a straight causal relationship between housing and affordability in the ACT and the ACT government's tax planning and land supply policies.

As I said when this issue was raised last year, if this is the ACT government's fault, then why is the situation like this in Sydney, Melbourne and Hobart? How do you explain this? It is not just in the ACT. Across Australia hundreds of thousands of people are priced out of appropriate housing. The housing affordability crisis is a textbook example of market failure, made worse by over two decades of federal government policy.

Australia has had chronic house price inflation since 1999. That year, the Howard federal government introduced the 50 per cent capital gains tax discount, which, coupled with negative gearing, turned housing into a speculative investment rather than a necessity of life. The sad and frustrating thing is that in 1999 groups like the Australian Council of Social Service and the Greens said that the result of the capital gains tax discount would be rapid house price inflation which priced out lower income

people, and that is exactly what has happened. Twenty-one years afterwards we can see it; and we have been able to see it for a few years before today, obviously.

Federal governments over the last three decades have also let down Australians on funding for social housing. A proportion of Australians have never been able to afford decent housing in the private market. To address this, from the end of World War II state and territory housing commissions around the country built large volumes of public housing, primarily funded by the federal government. This funding built housing for those most in need, housing for working families and infrastructure for housing development.

Sadly, federal funding is now much less generous. The slashing started with the Howard government in 1996 and has not been restored by either the Liberal or the ALP federal governments since then. The current federal Liberal government is no better. Just last week we debated the federal government's HomeBuilder recovery package. As I said then, it will waste \$680 million. It includes the outrageous McMansion expansion grants which will pay wealthy people \$25,000 to put towards a renovation and/or house extension costing up to \$750,000. That funding should have gone straight to community and social housing providers to provide affordable rental homes for people who need it. Putting \$680 million into affordable housing would make a huge difference.

I urge the Liberal Party to talk to their federal colleagues about the incredibly poor targeting of their HomeBuilder program. I note in particular Ms Lawder's speech last week about HomeBuilder, and I really felt, at the end of that, that her analysis of the problem was not entirely correct and what she had not realised was that HomeBuilder was going to do nothing to solve it. Anyway, enough of that!

Income support and rent assistance have also been whittled away by federal governments year after year. The indexation of most benefits, including Newstart, which is now JobSeeker, youth allowance and rent assistance have been well below the cost increases which are actually faced by low income people. This means that recipients of these benefits are unable to meet the basic costs of living, such as housing, food and transport.

The federal government did one very good thing at the beginning of this crisis. It doubled the rate of the JobSeeker allowance, but the boost is only temporary. From October it is being wound back. The *Canberra Times* headline says it all: "Welfare cuts to plunge 1,000 Canberra children back into poverty".

Of course, while it is difficult for the ACT government to respond to a housing affordability crisis which is primarily caused by the federal government, the ACT government does need to act where it can. This is why the ACT Greens' first announcement for this election was a \$450 million housing package. Our commitment includes a \$200 million investment into new social housing stock over a four-year period and this would deliver a total increase of 400 social housing dwellings over the term. It also includes a \$200 million investment in new community affordable rental housing.

The community housing sector needs to be able to grow at the same rate, or preferably faster than, as the overall housing market. To allow that to happen the sector needs an injection of equity and a business model that allows growth over time. That is why the commitment includes a land supply pipeline of low-cost development land sold at book value and the provision of community housing stock. Given Mr Coe's comments about the ACT government's profit margin with the land it sells, I am really hopeful that the Liberal Party may take this one up as an election initiative, which we offer to you.

Opposition members interjecting—

MS LE COUTEUR: I am glad to hear the positive responses to my right.

There should also be planning initiatives to encourage the development of affordable rental housing, stock transfers of properties currently managed by community housing providers on behalf of the ACT government and debt forgiveness by the ACT government to the community housing providers. The Greens estimate that this will deliver over 600 new affordable rentals for people in housing need.

The commitment also includes action on making rough sleeping history, starting with an immediate 20 per cent funding boost to all existing specialist homelessness services. Common Ground in Gungahlin would also be expanded, which would provide another 20 apartments for people who have experienced chronic homelessness.

In conclusion, the Greens, I am afraid, cannot support Mr Coe's motion unamended because it wrongly blames the ACT government for the housing affordability crisis, which unfortunately is a national crisis. If Mr Coe wants to resolve this problem, he needs to address the real issues and he needs, as I said, to have a conversation with his federal colleagues. Mr Coe needs to do that first off. The federal Liberal government could get the problem fixed with taxation changes like winding back the capital gains tax discount, permanent social security benefit increases and proper funding for social and community rental housing. As well as this, he could release a well-thought through housing affordability commitment for the ACT election that is similar to the one that the ACT Greens have released. If it just looks at land release and planning rules, it will be close to useless. If it focuses on increasing the supply of public and community affordable rental housing, then it will be a step in the right direction.

MR PARTON (Brindabella) (3.42): I shake my head in wonder every time Labor and the Greens members, including the Chief Minister and Ms Le Couteur, come into this place and stand here with a straight face supporting their record on housing affordability and rental affordability. If you think that you have done a good job in this space, you are in the wrong job, seriously. How could anyone possibly believe that the current state of play is acceptable? Ms Le Couteur says that it is a national problem. We could ask Mrs Smith, who was featured in an ABC TV report recently, who found that it was a national problem until you crossed the border into Googong; then it was not. There are some national problems, but they have been greatly exacerbated by long-term policies implemented by this government.

It is no wonder that former Chief Minister Jon Stanhope is so persistent in calling out this government for their complete failure in this space. Madam Assistant Speaker, I think that it is almost criminal when you consider how many people are being forced out of this city, when you consider how many people are being forced into the most extreme rental stress and how many people have been forced into homelessness. When you consider all of those things, it is almost criminal that Labor and the Greens continually try to create a diversion by pretending that they care about renters in other peripheral ways. “We care about you renters, but the rents are going to continue going through the roof.”

Let us get to basic realities. When there is strong demand for housing, particularly detached dwellings, and you do not release enough land for those dwellings, when you do not even provide enough residential land of any kind to match population growth, and the land that you do release to the market is highly priced—too highly priced—you force people from the market. You take hope from, and smash the aspirations of, Canberra families.

We have all seen what happens; we have all seen the consequences of this. Demand for rental properties increases; this increased demand flows through to increased rents, which prices more people out of the rental market.

I note that in Mr Barr’s amendment he says that the Real Estate Institute housing affordability index for the 2020 March quarter, released in June, showed that the proportion of income in the ACT required to meet the median rent was 19 per cent, the second lowest in the country. ACT Labor, as per the words of Jon Stanhope, do not really care about that bottom 20 per cent. It is all well and good here if you are earning a good quid, but for the people that Labor used to look after, they say, “We don’t really care about you.” Not everyone lives in the latte land of Braddon, in trendy one-bedders. The consequences of a land release policy devoid of any semblance of empathy for Canberra families is very real.

What about the dad who I spoke to recently who is ashamed that the only rental he can get for his wife and three kids is a two-bedroom apartment? They are trying to make it work, but he was embarrassed to talk to me about it. What about the single mum with two kids, who is working two jobs to save up a bond, only to show up to a rent inspection for a three-bedroom house to find 30 other parties there? This is absolutely crushing people, and it is crushing people that used to fly the Labor flag.

The Labor-Greens government has abandoned the working families of Canberra, forgotten their working-class roots, focused on virtue signalling and could not really care less about outcomes. The land release policies under this Labor-Greens government will be a case study in masters public policy programs for generations to come. I am completely serious about this. They will roll this out as a case study of what not to do.

Also included in the amendment from Mr Barr is the continuation of the policy of a compact and sustainable city, which I think is working for people in COVID times. I note the comments from a senior health official in Victoria, I think only yesterday,

who said, in response to a journalist's question, that people who have no garden have a right to exercise, and who said that the Victorian charter of human rights is clear that if you are not giving people an option to exercise, then you are effectively putting them in prison. I understand that we are living in extraordinary times, but I am not sure that heaps of people are thinking "compact" at this stage of the game.

The land release policies under this Labor-Greens government are a policy failure on the grandest scale. Of course, I could not help mentioning Mr Stanhope again. The way I think of it, Madam Assistant Speaker, is that he is trying to be the conscience of the Labor Party. He is trying, but they are not listening.

How bizarre is it when his comments and his common sense are much more in alignment with the policies and principles of the Canberra Liberals than of ACT Labor? It just shows how much Labor has simply become a Greens-like party and has lost touch with everyday Canberrans. There is a better way. We will not be supporting Mr Barr's amendment.

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Manager of Government Business, Minister for Advanced Technology and Space Industries, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management, Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister for Urban Renewal) (3.49): I welcome the opportunity to talk about the government's land release program and how this assists in having a sustainable city.

Since the release of the ACT planning strategy in 2018, the government has consistently signalled its commitment to plan the city to balance a growing population and a high quality of living, while protecting the landscape setting, and creating accessible and friendly spaces that connect people and promote healthy communities. Better managing and restricting the outward spread of our urban footprint limits the impact on the environment and better connects people to their jobs and to each other.

The ACT government is responding to population growth by supporting growth and development in and around key centres and along major transport routes, such as along the light rail corridor between the Gungahlin town centre and the city centre. This allows our suburbs to keep their low-rise character and prevents urban sprawl.

We are continually thinking of ways that we can improve the planning system. Right now there is a major review of our entire planning system underway, with a view to key areas for reform. It is holistic and integrated, rather than tinkering with elements in a piecemeal fashion that progressively erodes the integrity of the system. The review and reform project aims to deliver a planning system that is clear, easy to use, and that facilitates the realisation of long-term aspirations for the growth and development of Canberra while maintaining its valued character.

The indicative land release program is a vital tool in implementing the desired growth and settlement patterns of our city by establishing a program of land supply and release. The ACT government is always working on a forward program of land release to make sure that the program responds to circumstances forecast for the next few years.

Each year the ACT government prepares and publishes a four-year indicative land release program. This plan is an important link in how the ACT government delivers on the strategic directions in the ACT planning strategy and the housing strategy and is a key driver for the ACT infrastructure plan.

The work in getting land ready to release is complex, requiring rigorous analysis which takes many years to complete. It can take up to 10 years to undertake a range of planning, environment, infrastructure and due diligence investigations to satisfy the many legislative requirements. Of course, we engage the Canberra community and listen to what Canberrans have to say about how our city should grow and change, as we did in preparing the planning strategy.

The government's approach to land release aims to deliver affordable housing, choice and diversity, stimulate urban renewal where it is planned and appropriate, and support a competitive land development and construction industry to create and maintain jobs for Canberrans. As the Chief Minister outlined, there is ample supply of land in the pipeline to be sold in a range of ways to prospective buyers, both private developers and government.

There has been much commentary about the price of land. It is simplistic to say that the price of land in Canberra is only about how we do our land release. I think we can agree that releasing an appropriate supply of land is only one part of the solution to affordability. There have to be other policy levers and actions that work together to achieve this.

The government has continued to prioritise residential property support measures to improve housing affordability, the availability of affordable renting dwellings and to help more people move from tenancy to home ownership. The ACT housing strategy, which was launched in October 2018, sets the strategic vision for housing in the ACT for the next decade to guide policy, planning and the delivery of appropriate housing for every ACT household at all income levels.

One of the aims of the housing strategy is the delivery of affordable rental housing. Another goal of the housing strategy focuses on increasing affordable home ownership. Under this goal, the ACT government has dedicated 15 per cent of all new residential land released to public, community and affordable housing.

In 2019-20 a total of 628 dwellings were allocated under this target in the ILRP, consisting of 488 affordable dwellings, 80 community housing dwellings and 60 public housing dwellings. As you can see, Madam Assistant Speaker, our planning, land release and housing policies are highly integrated and work together to achieve a compact city that provides a range of accommodation choices as our population grows.

Finally, I would like to comment on the request that we do not bulldoze Kowen Forest and the Tuggeranong natural grasslands west of the Murrumbidgee for suburban development. We know how much Canberrans value our surrounding landscape. We hear those opposite talk about protecting green space, yet every time they talk about land release, they talk about building on our sensitive landscapes.

I would like to echo the Chief Minister's comments about his government's commitment to protecting Kowen and the area of Tuggeranong west of the Murrumbidgee. The government is committed to reducing urban sprawl and protecting our surrounding landscape from development. Our planning policies and strategies are achieving that fine balance between accommodating the projected growth of our city and protecting those elements and characteristics that Canberra residents value so highly.

MR COE (Yerrabi—Leader of the Opposition) (3.54): In closing, what we have heard from the government today is that, in actual fact, everything that has happened in the ACT has been by design—that the prices that have been set, the shortage of supply, the profits that have been raked in and the hardship that has been caused is all by design; that this is the culmination of 19 years of strategy, and they are standing by it.

As Mr Parton said, how is it that they can look at themselves and say that they are happy with this situation? What we have heard today from the Labor Party and the Greens is that they are very satisfied with the housing situation in the ACT. They are very satisfied with median rents of \$575. They are very satisfied with median house prices of \$819,000. They are very satisfied with the mix of houses, townhouses and units.

We on this side are not satisfied, and we will keep doing everything that we can to stick up for the Canberra families that are doing it tough because of Labor's policy. Labor's policy is about gouging Canberrans. It is about having LDA or SLA profit margins at 78 per cent. It is about squeezing Canberra families as much as possible—in fact, so much that they are forced to go over the border. This government is happy. It is happy to lose those people over the border. It is happy to lose aspirational families over the border. It is happy to drive them out of this jurisdiction.

What this Labor-Greens government have created, what they have created by design, is absolutely wrong. We know that the ACT government's own survey by Winton housing demonstrated that 84 per cent of people expressed a preference to live in a stand-alone dwelling. Fourteen per cent wanted a medium density alternative—townhouses, dual occupancy or a small unit block. Only two per cent of people wanted a unit in a block higher than two storeys.

We want to have genuine choice in the ACT. There is a role for apartments, but there is also a very strong and growing role for townhouses and stand-alone houses. We will keep sticking up for the people that are doing it tough. We will keep sticking up for the family that is crammed into a two-bedroom apartment in Tuggeranong. We will keep sticking up for the single mum who is trying to find an affordable townhouse but cannot because every time she turns up to an open home there are three dozen other people desperately trying to get that same property.

This is the Canberra that they have created. This is the Canberra that they are responsible for, and this is what we will change.

Question put:

That the amendment be agreed to.

The Assembly voted—

Ayes 12

Noes 9

Mr Barr	Ms Orr	Miss C Burch	Mr Parton
Ms J Burch	Mr Pettersson	Mr Coe	Mr Wall
Ms Cheyne	Mr Rattenbury	Mrs Dunne	
Ms Cody	Mr Steel	Mr Hanson	
Mr Gentleman	Ms Stephen-Smith	Mrs Kikkert	
Mr Gupta		Ms Lawder	
Ms Le Couteur		Mr Milligan	

Amendment agreed to.

Original question, as amended, resolved in the affirmative.

Planning and Urban Renewal—Standing Committee Report 13

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (4.03): I present the following report:

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee—Report 13—*Draft Variation No 363—Curtin group centre and adjacent residential areas: zone changes and amendments to the Curtin precinct map and code*, dated 29 July 2020, together with a copy of the extracts of the relevant minutes of proceedings.

I move:

That the report be noted.

Today the planning and urban renewal committee is tabling its 13th report for the Ninth Assembly. For those keen observers of planning committee reports, I anticipate that we have one more to go, on SPIRE. On 5 March 2020, pursuant to section 73 of the Planning and Development Act 2007, Minister Gentleman referred draft variation No 363, Curtin group centre and adjacent residential areas, zone changes and amendments to the Curtin precinct map, to the standing committee for consideration and report back to the Assembly. The Assembly, in our wisdom, decided that we would conduct an inquiry into the draft Territory Plan variation.

The committee received three submissions which brought a wide range of issues to the committee's attention. The committee extends its thanks to all those people who provided information. Some of the submissions were not individual submissions. I also thank directorate officials and members of the community for their involvement. I personally thank my fellow committee members and the committee secretary, Annemieke Jongsma, who has been assisted, for this report, by Danton Leary.

The report contains seven recommendations, and my comments now reflect my views. If you want the consensus view of the committee, you should read the report. I will give the edited highlights.

Recommendation 2 is that the directorate needs a more fulsome desired character statement for the Curtin precinct codes to include human scale, sunlight to the central courtyard and the provision of attractive and busy public spaces more generally. Talking about sunlight, recommendation 5 is that when the Territory Plan review is done it should include options to protect sunlight during the day in the public spaces that the community values. The committee has dealt with this issue in Mawson and Woden in this term of the Assembly.

We also talked a bit about trees, and recommendation 7, believe it or not, was in fact suggested by a development consulting firm. This will not make an awful lot of sense to people who do not know Curtin, but as we have three members from Murrumbidgee here I will speak to them particularly. The precinct code had suggested that on Strangways Street, where there will a ground floor commercial development, there would be not enough space for full-size street trees. We think it is possible, with a bit of a stagger forward and backwards, to have space for street trees and commercial development. This would be a much more attractive space for the commercial customers, the residents and the wildlife around. I commend the report to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Economic Development and Tourism—Standing Committee

Statement by chair

MR HANSON (Murrumbidgee) (4.08): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Economic Development and Tourism relating to statutory appointments in accordance with continuing resolution 5A. I inform the Assembly that, during the period 1 January to 30 June 2020, the standing committee considered six statutory appointments to the Cultural Facilities Corporation Board. I now table a schedule of the statutory appointments considered by the committee during this period:

Economic Development and Tourism—Standing Committee—Schedule of
Statutory Appointments—9th Assembly—Period 1 January to 30 June 2020.

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee

Statement by chair

MS CHEYNE (Ginninderra) (4.09): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services for the Ninth Assembly relating to statutory appointments in accordance with continuing resolution 5A. I wish to inform the Assembly that during the applicable reporting period, 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2020, the committee

considered a total of 13 appointments and reappointments to the following bodies: the ACT Heritage Council, the Commissioner for Sustainability and the Environment and the Cemeteries and Crematoria Authority Governing Board. I now table a schedule of the statutory appointments considered by the committee during this period:

Environment and Transport and City Services—Standing Committee—Schedule of Statutory Appointments—9th Assembly—Period 1 January to 30 June 2020.

Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee

Statement by chair

MS CODY (Murrumbidgee) (4.10): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Health, Ageing and Community Services relating to statutory appointments in accordance with continuing resolution 5A. Continuing resolution 5A was agreed by the Legislative Assembly on 23 August 2012. The schedule is required to include the statutory appointments considered and, for each appointment, the date the request from the responsible minister for consultation was received and the date the committee's feedback was provided. For the reporting period 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2020, the committee considered zero statutory appointments. I now table the schedule of the statutory appointments considered by the committee during this period:

Health, Ageing and Community Services—Standing Committee—Schedule of Statutory Appointments—9th Assembly—Period 1 January to 30 June 2020.

Planning and Urban Renewal—Standing Committee

Statement by chair

MS LE COUTEUR (Murrumbidgee) (4.10): Pursuant to standing order 246A, I wish to make a statement on behalf of the Standing Committee on Planning and Urban Renewal relating to statutory appointments in accordance with continuing resolution 5A. I wish to inform the Assembly that, during the period 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2020, the standing committee considered 10 statutory appointments. In accordance with continuing resolution 5A, I table a schedule of statutory appointments considered during this reporting period:

Planning and Urban Renewal—Standing Committee—Schedule of Statutory Appointments—9th Assembly—Period 1 January to 30 June 2020.

Executive business—precedence

Ordered that executive business be called on.

Public Health Amendment Bill 2020 (No 2)

Debate resumed from 23 July 2020, on motion by **Ms Stephen-Smith**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MRS DUNNE (Ginninderra) (4.12): I note that the cheat sheet that I get all the time, which I actually read this time, says, “Mrs Dunne will resume the debate and the time limit is 20 minutes.” Here I go! The opposition will support the Public Health Amendment Bill 2020 (No 2). I am sure the minister did not speak for 20 minutes on the way in. I thank the Minister for Health for giving me a heads-up on the bill before it was introduced last week. This bill simply establishes that the ACT government can charge a fee to returning travellers having to undergo mandatory quarantining in a place other than their own home during the COVID-19 health emergency.

I think we are far enough down the track of this pandemic for some travellers to know what will be expected of them when they return home, hopefully, and we are far enough along the track for returning travellers no longer to expect the government to foot the bill for their quarantine. They have had plenty of opportunity until now.

The minister assures us that the bill is consistent with national policy agreed by national cabinet, as well as legislation introduced in other jurisdictions, and I have evidence that that is the case. It would establish that the minister has the power to set quarantine fees by disallowable instrument. Importantly, this bill also requires the minister to consider the financial situation of anyone under mandatory quarantine who asks for a payment plan or a deferral or a waiver of fees.

In considering this bill I asked my office to seek clarification on the quantum of fees being proposed, because the explanatory statement talks about the fees being based on a cost-recovery strategy, and I thank the minister’s chief of staff for providing that clarification. If this were literally the case, the cost would vary from person to person and this would create an administrative nightmare which would necessitate the issuing of a disallowable instrument for each case. Where we ended up is that we will have a set fee, the same for everyone, established by a disallowable instrument. I am advised that this fee is consistent with the other jurisdictions, particularly New South Wales, and is informed by the ACT’s experience so far. I note that the notifiable invoices have a substantial bill for us already racked up for quarantining in the ACT.

I understand that it does not necessarily recover all the costs incurred by the ACT government. It will recover much of the cost of accommodation and food but not necessarily other costs, such as transport and security. I have asked the minister to clarify some of this detail in her closing statement. Having said that, the essence of the bill makes sense. It makes it clear for everyone that the taxpayer should no longer be footing the bill for all the costs of mandatory quarantining arrangement. It makes it clear that returning travellers must take financial responsibility for at least some of those costs but it also builds in some flexibility for those returning travellers who may face financial hardship as a result of being quarantined somewhere other than in their own home.

This bill reinforces the dictum that we are all in this together. It reinforces the notion that if we work together we can beat this pandemic.

In closing, I take the opportunity, once again, to thank the minister for the regular briefings I have been receiving, and the opposition has been receiving, throughout the

COVID-19 crisis. I have been kept well informed of developments. It becomes easier to deal with the problem and contribute to the solution if you have information on your side. It shows that when the chips are down and when the government is truly open and transparent all angles of the political spectrum can work together towards a shared outcome. In that spirit of cooperation, the opposition is pleased to support the bill—with 16 minutes to spare.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (4.16): The ACT Greens will be supporting the bill before us today. In short, the Public Health Amendment Bill 2020 (No 2) establishes a power for the minister to determine a quarantine fee for overseas travellers who arrive in the ACT and face a requirement to undertake mandatory quarantine which has been in place since 19 March 2020 under the Public Health (Returned Travellers) Emergency Direction 2020 and subsequent extensions.

These, of course, are very unusual times. We live in a time where state borders are, for Australia, more than just a milestone for car trips and perhaps marking a place to stop for a coffee. Certainly not in my lifetime have we seen such scrutiny and restrictions placed on either our domestic or, for that matter, international travel.

As the Minister for Justice, I have recently held conversations with the ACT Human Rights Commission on matters of racism and discrimination. I remind our community to remember that viruses do not discriminate but people do. This is a truly global pandemic and we have a long way to go before we can find a new equilibrium that will support the free and unencumbered international travel that has helped shape our multicultural and diverse city. Until that time, there is a need to reduce the likelihood of new outbreaks of COVID-19.

As the bill sets out, and as we all know from watching the reporting, many cases of COVID-19 in Australia were acquired from overseas travel. Certainly, until the outbreak in Victoria that was the case. Mandated quarantine is therefore a reasonable and proportionate measure to maintain public health not only within the ACT but also throughout Australia.

The quarantine fee determination will be limited to recovery of costs incurred by the territory for the quarantine of individuals. Implementing a quarantine fee scheme gives effect to national cabinet's decision that states and territories are to be responsible for introducing their own charging or recovery schemes for costs associated with the mandatory quarantine.

I note and appreciate that the new section 137(1B) requires the minister to take into account the individual's personal circumstances, including financial hardship, when deciding whether to waive, defer or decide on an instalment plan. It is essential that people with a genuine need to travel to Australia—Australians and those with dual nationalities—are able to return home during these challenging times. Not everyone will have the means to be able to meet these payments, which is why the financial hardship provisions are an important safety net in this bill.

In closing, I reiterate that Canberra is a welcoming place and I encourage us all to remember the incredible benefits, both social and economic, that international travel

and immigration have brought us. We must implement these measures to keep us all safe, but I look forward to the day when, hopefully in the not too distant future, we can relax conditions such as these and once again have open borders, welcoming borders, and see a range of people able to come to Canberra in a free and easy manner. In the meantime, we are supporting the bill today.

MS STEPHEN-SMITH (Kurrajong—Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Children, Youth and Families and Minister for Health) (4.19), in reply: I thank Mrs Dunne and Mr Rattenbury for their support. As we all know, anyone arriving in Australia from overseas is required to undertake mandatory quarantine for a period of 14 days in a hotel or other government-authorised premises. In the ACT this has been enforced under the Public Health (Returned Travellers) Emergency Direction and, as people have noted and I noted in my speech introducing the bill, the bill before the Assembly is consistent with the national approach.

To date, as others have recognised, the government has taken responsibility for the costs associated with mandatory quarantine, irrespective of the state or territory of residence of returning travellers. As I stated last week however, unfortunately, and as Mr Rattenbury has touched on, the pandemic is far from being over and the ongoing national and worldwide impacts of COVID-19 will likely see the ACT government asked to host further overseas flight arrivals in coming months.

The bill allows for the recovery of costs associated with hotel quarantine, and the proposed cost-recovery approach is consistent with the actions of a number of other jurisdictions. As Mrs Dunne has noted, the individual costs associated with individual people's quarantine will vary, in the same way that other costs associated with services provided by government vary from person to person, and fees tend to be set at a particular cost recovery at the broad level rather than at the individual level, recognising those different individual circumstances.

As I said in introducing the bill to the Assembly, and Mrs Dunne has touched on as well, the fee structure will be established by disallowable instrument. The fee schedule will be \$3,000 for the first returning adult, \$1,000 for any additional adults within the same family and \$500 for any child over three years of age. Those fees have been informed by the recent costs associated with the two returning flights already managed by the ACT government and the current interjurisdictional charging arrangements. I think Mrs Dunne also indicated, and I certainly did in my speech introducing the bill, that this would align with the New South Wales government's charging arrangements. This is important to ensure that travellers do not have an incentive to choose one destination over another.

Mrs Dunne and her office have asked that I outline in my closing remarks what those fees will cover. I can advise the Assembly that the fees will cover accommodation costs, food and other personal costs, with government continuing to cover the cost of transport, health-related costs and security services.

As I previously outlined, and as Mr Rattenbury has also touched on, the bill warrants that the minister consider any request from a person to pay the fee in instalments or to have it deferred or waived, taking into account the person's circumstances, including

considering those who may be suffering financial hardship. We consider that this is a necessary adjustment to support the recovery of costs by government during these challenging times. I thank the other parties for their support and commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Amendment Bill 2020

Debate resumed from 20 February 2020, on motion by **Ms Stephen-Smith**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MR MILLIGAN (Yerrabi) (4.23): I am pleased to say that the Canberra Liberals will be supporting the bill today. The amendments that are being put forward will strengthen the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body and help to increase community participation and transparency of government processes.

These amendments elevate the status of the elected body at the national level, with now a formal role and position to advocate at a national level. This includes being able to participate in and advise national bodies—bodies such as the Coalition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peak Organisations, as part of the commonwealth government's closing the gap and other activities. This status also extends to giving advice and working with non-government organisations. The ability to provide advice as a voice for the local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community has also been amended to include advice to ministers and the ACT government on behalf of the community.

The amendments also stipulate that there will be clear time frames for reporting and response processes. This applies to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body produced reports, and there will be a six-month time frame for the minister to respond to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body reports. Similarly, with all consultation reports there is a requirement to provide these reports to the minister, including online. The minister then has two months to respond.

One amendment which I am very pleased to support reflects more accurately how people work and interact with government these days. We will now see broadcasting services being available for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body public hearings. This is extremely positive for community members who cannot attend hearings or those who wish to watch proceedings, rather than read transcripts.

Finally, there are some technical amendments to the way the electoral roll is managed under the Electoral Act 1992, as it relates to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body election process. I hope that when the next Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body election takes place we see a seamless process from an administrative point of view. Perhaps we will also see increased participation and voting from the community.

In reviewing this legislation it was great that the office of Minister Stephen-Smith and the team at the Community Services Directorate were very open to providing briefs and answering questions. I was also pleased that the current Chair of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body, Ms Katrina Fanning, was able to discuss these changes and confirm the elected body's position, as well as the views of the local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

It is always nice to see legislation and process here at the Assembly flow in such a manner. If other areas of Indigenous affairs policies could have the same approach, I am sure we would see much better outcomes for our local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the federal coalition government and Minister Ken Wyatt in particular for his efforts in progressing a new national agreement on closing the gap. This work has been incredibly important, and it has been done, as it should be, in partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. I look forward to reviewing this agreement in more detail. Having worked closely with Minister Wyatt in developing the Canberra Liberals' own Indigenous affairs policies, I feel confident that our own initiatives will align well with achieving the new national targets and getting the best possible outcomes for the local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong) (4.28): I rise today to speak in support of the amendments outlined in this bill. The ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body is unique in this country. It gives a democratically elected voice to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community members that ensures that there is direct communication to government on their behalf. Importantly, this voice is informed by and for first nations people with firsthand experience of the impacts of colonisation and the impacts of racism. The benefits of their lived experience cannot be underestimated, for it is through these experiences and through listening to others in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community that the most informed advice can be developed and given to government.

Members of the elected body are respected in their community and, more importantly, they are trusted to listen to and represent the issues and concerns brought forward. The provision of this advice is something that the ACT government truly values. These amendments further strengthen the formal role that the elected body provides.

The added provision for the elected body to participate at a national level as a member of the Coalition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peak Organisations ensures that first nations voices from a local level are heard in national discourse and debate.

The participation of the chair on the Joint Council on Closing the Gap also ensures that advice is well informed and that the unique aspects of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders living in the ACT are formally represented.

I am particularly pleased to see the amendment that allows for the functions of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body to include the ability to provide advice to any minister about the views of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community in the ACT. As the current minister for justice and corrections, there is no doubt that a specific focus on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander issues is needed when considering their disproportionate over-representation in the criminal justice system. Direct advice from the elected body will definitely assist me in progressing the agenda of justice reinvestment and building communities, not prisons.

That is not to say, of course, that I have not already been informed by them or by their annual report on the outcomes of the elected body hearings, which I refer to and from which I have drawn guidance in the past. Their recommendations in regard to progressing the ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander agreement 2019-28 ensure that we remain on track and focused, and they are certainly very quick to let us know if we are not. I think that is very important.

In fact, the elected body have already played a significant role in the development of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander agreement 2019-28. It is my understanding that they, not government, determined the core and significant areas of focus. Their ability to provide clear guidance on expectations and mechanisms for reporting and holding government to account is highly valued and is a demonstration of Aboriginal-led engagement with government processes.

The agreement represents a long-term commitment to self-determination for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, ensuring that systems and processes of government better meet the needs of that community and that tangible economic and social impacts are delivered. That is our shared goal, and I am pleased to see that the elected body's ability to provide advice to government at all levels has been strengthened. It demonstrates our commitment to walking the talk and doing it together.

I am also pleased that the amendments will allow for the public hearings of the elected body to be broadcast, as it simply makes them more accessible. I understand that the broadcasting, while not specifically required, if desired will need to be undertaken by an entity other than the Office of the Legislative Assembly and that whoever provides the broadcast will be immune from prosecution in the same way that the Assembly broadcasts have that protection. My only area of concern is, of course, ensuring that sufficient resourcing and relevant expertise are allocated for that purpose, should it be required.

I note the government amendments that have been put forward this week. I also indicate now that I support them, rather than speaking again later. I do not believe they are controversial in and of themselves. They simply make it clear that nominees for positions on the elected body do not need to disclose any political party affiliations and that the commencement date of this legislation will be the day after notification.

As outlined in the bill, new time lines for the presentation of and responses to reports by and to the elected body are included. This will ensure that reports do not languish unattended or unconsidered for extended periods of time and provides some assurance that issues will be addressed in a timely manner.

It is my hope that the strengthening of the role of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body will engender greater trust from both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community members and government ministers and officials in the elected body's ability to provide frank and fearless advice.

Certainly, as a former Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs here in the ACT, I have been pleased to see the evolution of the elected body. At the time I became the minister, the body was still relatively new. Over time I believe it has really grown in stature, as successive members have worked incredibly hard to build its reputation, to advocate for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the ACT and to contribute to and influence government policy and resource allocation. I hope that that trend continues because their role has the potential to make a significant difference in the ACT. I think they have done that already, and there is room for that to continue to grow.

As the elected body state themselves, "Nothing about us without us." This legislation ensures that the perspectives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders inform the way that services and programs are developed and delivered, and that is as it should be. The Greens are pleased to support this bill.

MS STEPHEN-SMITH (Kurrajong—Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Children, Youth and Families and Minister for Health) (4.34), in reply: Thanks to Mr Milligan and Mr Rattenbury for their contributions to the debate and their support for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Amendment Bill 2020. From the commencement of the original elected body act Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in the ACT have had the right to a democratically elected voice to the Legislative Assembly and ACT government. The ACT government fundamentally believes in the importance of the elected body as a voice and is committed to strengthening it, in line with the views and expectations of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community.

As we have discussed, this bill will: strengthen the ability of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body to advocate for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in the ACT, including on a national level and with non-government organisations; enable and protect a broadcasting service in relation to elected body public hearings; impose reporting time frames to enable more timely reporting and response processes; and clarify the application of the Electoral Act 1992 to elected body election processes.

I am particularly pleased that the bill makes amendments to acknowledge the new advocacy role of the elected body at the national level, as the ACT representative and member of the coalition of peak Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisations and its involvement with the joint council on closing the gap to progress the work on developing and implementing the national partnership agreement on closing the gap.

Katrina Fanning, as chair of the elected body, has done an absolutely outstanding job in representing the elected body and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community of the ACT through the development of the new national partnership agreement on closing the gap, which was announced jointly today by the Prime Minister and the indomitable Pat Turner, as chair of the Coalition of Peaks.

I particularly want to congratulate the coalition of peak Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organisations on delivering this. The priority reforms under closing the gap commit governments to new partnerships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and organisations, focusing on addressing structural racism in our systems, sharing information and data but particularly on strengthening community-controlled organisations to deliver services. We know that when services are in Aboriginal hands and are Aboriginal led the outcomes are so much improved.

I want to quote from Katrina Fanning's media release that she put out today on behalf of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body. It emphasises the driving role of the Coalition of Peaks in getting to where we have got to on the national agreement on closing the gap. Katrina says:

The national agreement does not include everything that the coalition of peaks wanted nor everything that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have said is needed to improve their lives. But governments have been pushed in their commitments to our people on closing the gap because the coalition of peaks has been at the negotiating table. There is a big difference from what governments alone were prepared to commit to in December 2018 and where we are now. That change has come about because of the work of the Coalition of Peaks and the support of our communities and organisations.

I could not agree more. The ACT government has strongly supported and advocated for the positions being proposed by the Coalition of Peaks throughout this process and has absolutely welcomed their role sitting alongside ministers from commonwealth, states and territories, as well as the local government association, in driving the national partnership agreement on closing the gap. We absolutely welcome that they will be there at the table for the next 10 years, holding us to account.

The changes made by the this bill will formalise the elected body's role in the ongoing work under the national partnership agreement and strengthen its capacity to work and advocate on a national level. The bill will also establish the ability to enter into agreements for the purpose of broadcasting elected body annual hearings. The elected body has told us that hearings, while very important to members of the community, can be hard to attend or access. The broadcasted hearings will allow people to follow the questioning from the members on issues that are important to them. It also has the potential to provide an accessible archive of hearings similar to the Assembly on Demand service.

Enabling community members to follow the hearings process in a way that is convenient to them while also providing a new platform to hold their own elected body members accountable is significant. I believe it will foster a stronger hearings process that will be more relevant to more members of the community. As

Mr Milligan said, we really hope that that increases engagement with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body. The more people who engage with the elected body and the more people who vote, the stronger it will be and the more robust a voice it will be for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

The bill also shortens the time frame for relevant ministers to respond to consultation reports. Due to COVID-19 the fifth election of the elected body has been postponed by 12 months to NAIDOC week 2021. I thank the community for its understanding with this necessary change.

Part 3 of the bill covers the consequential amendments related to the Electoral Legislation Amendment Act 2020. The passing of the act earlier this month made several amendments that affect the ATSIEB Act.

Subject to leave of the Assembly, I will move government amendments in the detail stage, following advice from the Parliamentary Counsel's Office. These will make several technical changes to the bill, including changing the commencement date. When it passed the Assembly recently, the Electoral Legislation Amendment Bill included two additional amendments that have implications for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body elections requiring additional consequential amendments. These are a new section 110A, candidate information to be published, and changes to section 292, which relates to the dissemination of unauthorised electoral material.

I thank the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body for their ongoing work on behalf of Canberra's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community. The elected body is driving real, lasting change and the amendments debated today will only strengthen the elected body's role and purpose in Canberra and nationally. I also thank the officials who have worked on this bill and the scrutiny committee for its consideration of the bill. I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Detail stage

Bill, by leave, taken as a whole.

MS STEPHEN-SMITH (Kurrajong—Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, Minister for Children, Youth and Families and Minister for Health) (4.42): Pursuant to standing order 182A(b), I seek leave to move amendments to this bill that are minor and technical in nature together.

Leave granted.

MS STEPHEN-SMITH: I move amendments Nos 1 to 3 circulated in my name together and table a supplementary explanatory statement to the government amendments [*see schedule 1 at page 1789*].

Amendments agreed to.

Bill, as a whole, as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, agreed to.

Electricity Feed-in (Renewable Energy Premium) Amendment Bill 2020

Debate resumed from 4 June 2020, on motion by **Mr Rattenbury**:

That this bill be agreed to in principle.

MS LEE (Kurrajong) (4.43): The ACT Legislative Assembly has a consistent record of tripartisan agreement on the issue of renewable energy, and has done so for some years, despite the best efforts of some of those opposite, who have tried to spruik misleading assertions to the contrary. The ACT is in a unique and privileged position to be able to deliver 100 per cent renewable electricity and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and the Canberra Liberals, over the course of this Assembly, have continuously shown their support for that commitment.

The Electricity Feed-in (Renewable Energy Premium) Amendment Bill 2020 is the result of the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability's audit of Evoenergy's reporting of data on the territory's feed-in tariff scheme, which he called for in February last year. Concerns about the accuracy and reliability of the data had been an ongoing issue for some time, and we on this side of the chamber had also raised our concerns. The scheme, which closed to new participants in 2011, pays home owners for the electricity they feed into the network from their rooftop solar panels, with different rates per kilowatt hour for small, medium and large-scale generation. However, it appears that some solar systems had been recorded in the wrong size categories.

Larger systems attract a bigger tariff under the scheme, so if larger customers were put into a smaller category they were being paid at a lesser rate, while the reverse could be true for small systems put in a larger category. In briefings, we were advised by officials that the financial impost was estimated to be in the vicinity of two to three cents per bill per affected customer. This bill sets out to implement some of the recommendations of the 2019 audit and the 2018 review of the original act.

The bill seeks to ensure that sufficient data is supplied to government by Evoenergy for annual reporting purposes and to allow distributors to pass on reasonable costs of administering the scheme. We have been advised that ensuring that correct data is supplied will address the estimated 110 to 120 of 10,500 customers who may have been incorrectly charged or paid. The bill also allows electricity distributors to pass on to eligible entities the administration costs incurred in meeting their obligations under the act, with the maximum amount to be determined by the minister.

The bill introduces a new requirement for reporting entities to give the minister any other information reasonably required to ensure the accuracy of information provided for annual reporting purposes. It also makes clear that it is an offence if a reporting entity is required to give the minister information and either fails to do so or provides information that is false or misleading and the reporting entity knows it or is reckless about it. The bill also broadens the ability of the minister to request a reporting entity to undertake an audit for annual reporting purposes if the minister believes the collected data information is false, misleading or incomplete, and failure to undertake the audit is also an offence.

Scrutiny report 44 had some remarks to make on the legislation, suggesting the bill may limit the right to a fair trial protected by section 21 of the Human Rights Act. It noted that in making any determination the minister must ensure that the electricity distributor, eligible entities and ACT electricity consumers are not unreasonably financially disadvantaged by the determination, and any determination is by way of a disallowable instrument. Whilst we are, and will always be, conscious of the rising costs of living for all Canberrans, the Canberra Liberals believe these amendments provide for increased transparency and accuracy in data collection, make the administration of the data more accurate, and provide more confidence to participants about exactly what they are paying and getting paid.

In the briefing, officials advised that, whilst the exact costs are yet to be determined, it will be lower than the cost under large generation, which currently adds approximately 30c to the annual bill per household affected. They estimate that any additional financial impost on households would ultimately be less than 30c per year. Officials also advised that they expect the total annual cost for Evoenergy to administer the scheme will be between \$100,000 and \$150,000 each year. The administration costs are separate from any other subsidy payments. In practice, these costs are already passed on to consumers as part of the normal operating costs of Evoenergy.

Under those understandings, the robust increase in transparency and accuracy of data, and following the recommendations of the audit and the strong assurances from officials on the minimum cost impost on households, the Canberra Liberals support this bill.

MR GENTLEMAN (Brindabella—Minister for Advanced Technology and Space Industries, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Minister for Planning and Land Management, Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister for Urban Renewal) (4.48): I rise with pleasure today to talk about the Electricity Feed-in (Renewable Energy Premium) Amendment Bill 2020. As a Labor member in this place, I am very proud of the steps that members of our movement have taken to protect the environment. Our party does not just talk about protecting the environment; we act. And we have shown that you can be sustainable and grow jobs.

It took a Labor government to create the first state park in Australia, now known as Kosciuszko National Park. It took a Labor government to protect the Franklin River by enacting the World Heritage Properties Conservation Act. It was a Labor Prime Minister who led world efforts to protect and preserve Antarctica as a natural reserve

dedicated to peace and science. And it was Labor that world heritage listed the wet tropics of Queensland and the Daintree, and created the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and the authority to manage it. It was a Labor government that signed and ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change—the UNFCCC—and another Labor government that ratified the Kyoto protocol in 2007.

This tradition of firsts in leadership is one that this Labor government follows proudly. As we grow our city and deliver more services, we are working to build a sustainable and low-carbon Canberra. It was under Labor that the territory began charting an ambitious and bold course towards a renewable energy future. While other subregional governments aim for 50 per cent and others talk about 70 per cent renewable electricity, we are already entirely powered by 100 per cent renewable electricity. Powering a city with 100 per cent renewable electricity is an initiative of ACT Labor. In fact, I ticked it off, and then it was followed by my predecessor as environment minister, Simon Corbell. The bill before us today forms part of this legacy as well.

Renewable energy is the future. It is a future that Canberrans—indeed, all Australians—are embracing. Just look at the uptake of rooftop solar on homes across the country. It is no small irony that the conservative federal Liberal government idols of those opposite—those who wish to take Australia back to the 1850s and a supposed coal utopia—have all their electricity sourced cleanly and sustainably when they sit in the federal parliament, because of the actions of this Labor government.

Like Mr Abbott and other conservatives, Mr Coe does not support renewable energy. He has parroted their deceptive lines about renewables increasing electricity prices. Knowing that our city is powered by 100 per cent renewable electricity, in February this year Mr Coe claimed energy prices were rising. In reality, our electricity prices are falling. The tactics adopted by Mr Coe are right out of Tony Abbott's playbook—a playbook about mistruths and laziness. Not content with copying the conservative Liberals on renewables, Mr Coe's latest stunt is to borrow from Tony Abbott's discredited direct action policy—a fig leaf promise on trees. This is the wafer-thin policy adopted by those who do not believe in tackling climate change, deploying renewable energy or helping the environment. The only detail they have provided about the policy is that they are expecting schoolkids and householders to do all the planting and maintenance. This is a glimpse into the lack of government services that a Canberra Liberals government would bring.

In announcing this policy Mr Coe committed to every Canberran being no more than 10 minutes from a green space. That does sound nice, but there is one big oversight. According to federal data, 98 per cent of Canberrans already live within walking distance, or about 400 metres, of a green space, with the highest levels of green space per person. It seems that what Mr Coe is promising is a reduction in green space across the city. Not only is he content to remove our precious grasslands and woodlands from the urban fringe; he is now looking to bulldoze the network of native reserves within the city.

So there is a clear choice for Canberrans. On this side, ACT Labor has a proud tradition of supporting renewable energy. We do not just talk about the environment;

we get on with protecting it and making it better. We have done that while growing our city, making it a vibrant and inclusive place to live. We have done it while delivering and growing more jobs for our city as well.

MR RATTENBURY (Kurrajong—Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety and Minister for Mental Health) (4.53), in reply: On 4 June this year I presented the Electricity Feed-in (Renewable Energy Premium) Amendment Bill 2020 to the Assembly. This bill makes amendments to the Electricity Feed-In (Renewable Energy Premium) Act 2008, which established the ACT's small and medium-scale feed-in tariff scheme.

This scheme encouraged the uptake of renewable energy generators such as rooftop solar photovoltaic systems and was open for applications between March 2009 and July 2011. The increased uptake helped drive solar PV prices down and make renewable generation accessible to more households and businesses across the ACT. For the 2018 financial year there were 10,170 generators supported by the scheme which collectively generated 46,550 megawatt hours of clean electricity for the ACT.

Evoenergy, as the ACT electricity distributor, is required under the act to provide data to the ACT government for the purposes of an annual report on the scheme. Evoenergy also uses this data to calculate the amount that is passed through to ACT electricity consumers. In 2018-19 the average weekly cost to a representative ACT household was 85c. In 2019 the ACT government sought an audit of Evoenergy's data to ensure the ongoing efficiency of reporting and that the data being provided to the government is accurate, reliable and timely.

The amendment bill I presented for debate today has been prepared, following the outcomes of the audit, in order to strengthen the legislative requirements for scheme data collection and record keeping. This is intended to support improvement in Evoenergy's data collection and record-keeping systems and improvement in the information provided to the ACT government. This bill has been prepared to enable the scheme to retain the long-term confidence of ACT energy consumers.

I will briefly outline the amendments that relate to accuracy of scheme data. These comprise the majority of the bill and provide the ACT government with an ability to take stronger action, if required, to ensure the reliability of the information being reported.

The first key amendment is that the minister will be able to request additional information from reporting entities where this is reasonably required to ensure the accuracy of the information they have reported. This could include information about how the entity records data or information about internal systems that it has in place to ensure data accuracy. The intent of these amendments is to enable the ACT government to ensure that reporting entities have robust processes in place to manage scheme data.

The amendments create an offence provision, should the reporting entity fail to provide the requested information. This conveys the seriousness of an entity not

meeting their obligations in relation to the scheme. Importantly, it will also be an offence for a reporting entity to provide information that is false or misleading where the entity knows or is reckless about it being false or misleading. The maximum penalty for each of these offences is 30 penalty units.

Another key amendment is that the minister will be able to require a reporting entity to undertake an audit of the information it has provided to the ACT government. This will be available in circumstances where the minister reasonably believes information provided is false, misleading or incomplete or that there is a risk the information is false, misleading or incomplete. There will also be an offence provision for the reporting entity if it should fail to undertake the requested audit. The maximum penalty for this offence is 400 penalty units.

In addition to the amendments that support data accuracy, the bill also allows Evoenergy to pass on its reasonable costs in administering the scheme. This will allow Evoenergy to dedicate resources to the scheme and is consistent with the approach taken for the ACT's large-scale feed-in tariff scheme. These amendments require the minister to approve a reasonable amount that may be passed through to ensure that the costs are fair. This determination will be a disallowable instrument and subject to scrutiny by the Legislative Assembly. The costs will then be passed through to ACT electricity consumers by their retailer.

Administration of the large-scale feed-in tariff scheme has cost consumers no more than 30 per cent per household per year and I expect that the cost for administration of the small and medium-scale scheme will be similar to this at the most. The ACT small and medium-scale feed-in tariff scheme has helped drive the uptake of renewable electricity generation for the ACT community over the past decade, enabling more consumers to access technology that empowers them to produce their own clean electricity.

The amendments presented in the bill will ensure that this scheme continues to provide value to the ACT community in years to come, that the minister and the directorate are able to maintain a good level of scrutiny and therefore, by default, that the Assembly is also able to maintain that level of scrutiny where it seeks to do so. I commend the bill to the Assembly today.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill agreed to in principle.

Leave granted to dispense with the detail stage.

Bill agreed to.

Adjournment

Motion (by **Mr Gentleman**) proposed:

That the Assembly do now adjourn.

Mr John van Waterschoot—tribute

MS CHEYNE (Ginninderra) (4.59): I rise this evening to pay tribute to John van Waterschoot, an active Rotarian, former scout leader, motivational speaker, adventurer, IT guru and Belconnen resident. John died on 29 June this year, aged 60 years. Before I go on, I want to record my sincere thanks to Mr Leo Farrelly for his significant contribution and insight into John's life in crafting this speech.

What made John's life remarkable is what he achieved. As a child John's enrolment in the local public school was denied on account of him having cerebral palsy. So the nuns at the local convent school accepted him, and he was an A-grade student from the start. At eight years of age John started at St Laurence's College in South Brisbane and again was an A-grade student right through to matriculation. John could not play regular sport so he took up chess, became school champion five years in a row and was the Queensland under 16 state champion in 1975.

John came to Canberra in the early 1980s, and he worked in the computer systems area of the Department of Defence. He was a scout leader with the 13th Canberra Scout Group in O'Connor, where he developed his interest in trekking, which in later years saw him climb Mount Kilimanjaro in Tanzania and to Everest Base Camp in Nepal.

In addition to scouting, John joined the Canberra Ginninderra Rotaract Club and he attended Rotary's youth leadership awards seminar at Greenhills in 1982. The motto of RYLA, as it is known, is assist youth to lead by bringing out the best in candidates to provide them with the leadership skills for their working life, and John found his niche as a team leader and motivational speaker at subsequent RYLA seminars over the next 20 years.

He would have spoken to approximately 1,000 young, professional business and trades people over those years. He developed his talks around the topic of, "What if I couldn't," broadly based on being an achiever in spite of his disability and inspiring others to recognise their abilities. John inspired many RYLarians to become leaders in the local and wider communities.

John was a member of a six-week Rotary vocational exchange or group study exchange, a team which went to the United States in 1991. Returning from his exchange having reached the maximum age of 30 for Rotaract membership, John joined the Rotary Club of Belconnen in 1992 to continue his community service through RYLA where he became a mentor at seminars and managed the administration of those seminars for 20 years. Additionally, John provided leadership guidance to Rotary's younger cohort, the Rotary youth program of enrichment, or RYPEN, aimed at developing communications and social skills and giving confidence and self-esteem to teenagers between 15 and 17 years over a full weekend seminar.

John became president of the Rotary Club in 1999. He served in many club roles over the next 20 years, especially in helping others through his considerable IT skills. He also served at the regional level as the coordinator for RYLA and RYPEN to ensure the continued success of those youth programs.

John's service to his club was much appreciated by all members and friends of the Belconnen Rotary Club, including his management of the website, the club's database and its weekly newsletter. He was well known for his attention to the minutest detail in anything he took on. Remarkably, John has left his entire estate to his college to provide ongoing schooling opportunities for special needs students.

John was not concerned at failing. His personal credo was, "But what if I hadn't tried?" Because of this, the way John lived his life became a gift to others. Rest in peace, John.

Roads—traffic calming

MRS KIKKERT (Ginninderra) (5.04): Three years ago, I wrote to the then Minister for Transport and City Services to share concerns that had been raised with me by residents who live in and near Hawker's Delamere and Walhallow streets. One of their main concerns was repeated occurrences of dangerous driving in the two streets. I informed the minister that reckless hooning had been occurring in the area for years and pointed out that these residents had repeatedly asked for traffic calming measures to be installed in order to help address the problem.

The next time I wrote to the minister about these streets I had spoken with residents who told me that they had personally witnessed drag racing taking place in front of their houses, with cars lining up three abreast to race each other—a very dangerous situation. Around this same time, a car that had been travelling well over the speed limit had swerved off the street and smashed into a resident's fence, leaving skid marks in the driveway and pieces of its headlights embedded in the fence. I included with this letter photographs of the crash site and others showing an abundance of tyre marks in both Walhallow and Delamere streets, many of them showing clear evidence of intentionally erratic skidding. Still no action was taken by this government.

My next step was to write to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. I shared with him everything mentioned above and asked what he could do to help make these streets safe for residents and other users. In response, the minister stated that law enforcement is the single most significant method of controlling the types of antisocial behaviour that I had reported to him. He then promised that police would conduct patrols in the area, as operational priorities allowed. Again, nothing changed and these problems have been allowed to continue until now.

Two weeks ago I wrote to the current Minister for City Services to again raise the issue of dangerous driving on behalf of residents living in and near Delamere and Walhallow streets. I let him know that I had received numerous reports since 2017 of speeding, hooning, burnouts and drag racing and the many attempts since then to obtain assistance on behalf of these worried residents.

I attached to this letter an image of the change room facility located near the intersection of these two streets. I was told the side of the structure facing the street has been completely smashed as a consequence of still more reckless driving. Residents rightly fear that at some point the property damage caused by drivers using their streets as recreational speedways may turn into serious personal injury.

I rise today to call upon the current ACT government to finally respond appropriately to the concerns raised by these Hawker residents. They do not feel safe in their streets, but they should and it is not fair that they do not. Through me, they have asked for traffic calming measures and increased police patrols. To date they have seen no evidence that this government cares for them at all, and I ask for that to change.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.08 pm until Thursday, 13 August 2020, at 10 am.

Schedule of amendments

Schedule 1

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body Amendment Bill 2020

Amendments moved by the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs

1

Clause 2

Page 2, line 5—

omit clause 2, substitute

2 Commencement

This Act commences on the day after its notification day.

Note The naming and commencement provisions automatically commence on the notification day (see Legislation Act, s 75 (1)).

2

Proposed new clauses 13A and 13B

Page 9, line 6—

insert

13A Schedule 1, modification 1.20, section 110A heading

substitute

110AA Retention of nomination papers

13B Schedule 1, new modification 1.20A

insert

[1.20A] Candidate information to be published Section 110A (8)

omit

3

Proposed new clause 17A

Page 11, line 21—

insert

17A Schedule 1, modification 1.84

substitute

[1.84] Dissemination of unauthorised electoral matter Section 292 (1) (b) (iii)

substitute

- (iii) if the matter is disseminated for a candidate for election or a person who has publicly indicated that the person intends to be a candidate for election—a statement to the effect that the matter is disseminated for the candidate or person; and

Answers to questions

Municipal services—tree management (Question No 2075—revised response)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 30 November 2018:

- (1) Given that on page 45 of the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate Annual Report it says that the Minister has over 768 000 trees to manage, but only planted 1 450 replacement street trees, is the tree stock in existing suburbs declining; if so, by how many a year.
- (2) Did Mr Alegria, on 15 November 2018, tell the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services that “We have spaces available to fill for planting, no doubt” (Transcript, p 138); if so, (a) does the Government have an estimate of how many spaces are available and (b) what is that estimate.
- (3) Did Minister Steel, on 15 November 2018, tell the Standing Committee on Environment and Transport and City Services that “We are currently sitting at around 20 percent canopy across the city, and the better suburbs statement recommended that we should move to 30 percent” (Transcript, p 139); if so, what is the “percent canopy” figure a percentage of, for example, Government-owned urban land.
- (4) By what method is the “percent canopy” figure measured, for example, use of light detection and ranging.
- (5) How frequently is the “percent canopy” figure measured, for example, one-off basis, annually etc.
- (6) Is the “percent canopy” data available geographically, for example, in a geographic information system, or only as an overall estimate for the whole city.
- (7) What is the exact figure for the whole urban area for the latest data available.
- (8) If the data is easily available, can the Minister also provide a breakdown by suburb and district.
- (9) Is the “percent canopy” figure believed to be in decline, stable or growing.
- (10) Does the Government have access to data which is or could be used to measure the canopy cover on privately-owned urban land in the ACT; if so, (a) what is that data and (b) does the Government have an estimate of how many additional trees would be required to achieve a 30% target; if so, what is that estimate.

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

- (1) No. In 2017-18, 1,117 established trees in existing suburbs were removed due to end of life decline or death of the tree and 1,450 new trees were planted. This will provide a net increase in tree canopy once the replacement trees reach maturity, helping to address the urban heat island effect identified in the 2017 CSIRO report “Mapping surface urban heat in Canberra”.

- (2) No current estimates are available. The most recent audit in 2010-2012 identified approximately 22,000 vacant street tree sites to be prioritised for planting and 17,300 dead trees in streets and parks that required removal and replacement.
- (3) Yes. The 'around 20%' figure is taken from the LiDAR data that indicates that tree canopy covers 19.18% of all developed land (residential, commercial, urban open space, road reserves).
- (4) The "percent canopy" figure was measured using LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) remote sensing methods.
- (5) The LiDAR was captured as a one-off.
- (6) Tree canopy cover data is available for most but not all of the ACT's urban area (the 2015 Lidar coverage did not include all of Canberra).
- (7) Based on the limited extent of LiDAR data (limited to most but not all of the ACT's urban area), the average canopy cover percentage across all divisions is 19.18% (land use includes residential, commercial, urban open space and road reserves).
- (8) Yes. Please see below table extracted from *ACT's Urban Forest Strategic Guide for the Urban Tree Planting Program June 2016* (Fig.8 Pg. 30).
- (9) Data on changes in canopy cover require future data acquisition and analysis via further LiDAR capture.
- (10) Yes. (a) The LiDAR data could be used for this purpose. (b) No. The necessary analysis has not been undertaken.

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

Justice—COVID-19 (Question No 3002)

Mrs Jones asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 8 May 2020 (*redirected to the Attorney-General*):

- (1) In relation to Federal funding for justice sector preparedness in the ACT, given the Prime Minister announced the provision of an additional \$63.3 million for the legal assistance sector on 5 May 2020 to support Australians during COVID-19; \$49.8 million for additional frontline legal services and \$13.5 million for IT costs to support transition to virtual and online delivery, how much of this funding will the ACT receive.
- (2) Can the ACT Government advise how Federal assistance for justice sector preparedness will be used specifically in the ACT by providing a breakdown of the received funding.

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

- (1) Under the Project Agreement, the ACT will receive:

- a. \$944,287 across 2019-20 and 2020-21 to support increased frontline service delivery by Legal Aid Commissions, Community Legal Centres, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services; and
- b. \$447,238 in 2019-20 to support Legal Aid ACT (\$270,439) and the community legal centres (\$176,799) to ensure they have the ICT capacity to support virtual service delivery.

(2)

Frontline service delivery funding (\$944,287):

It is intended that the Commonwealth frontline funding will be used to deliver the following:

- 1 x family law lawyer to support women experiencing domestic and family violence (*Women's Legal Centre*);
- 1 x employment and discrimination lawyer to support women who have been impacted by the economic impacts of COVID-19 (*Women's Legal Centre*);
- 1 x lawyer to increase the capacity of the Family Violence Unit at Legal Aid ACT
- 1 x housing lawyer to support Canberrans experiencing housing vulnerabilities as a result of the economic impacts of COVID-19 (*Canberra Community Law*)
- 1 x lawyer to increase the capacity of the Older Persons ACT Legal Service, which plays a critical role in the ACT's response to elder abuse (*Legal Aid ACT*);
- 12 months extension of the Reach Out Program which combines legal assistance services and financial counselling to support Canberrans impacted by economic abuse (*CARE Inc.*); and
- 1 x trial lawyer to support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients to access the justice system in a culturally supported way (*Aboriginal Legal Service*).

Collectively, these roles will assist the ACT's legal assistance sector to respond to:

- family law matters, including child contact and parenting arrangement issues during COVID-19 (CLCs);
- family violence matters, including family law, elder abuse and economic abuse, as well as housing vulnerabilities caused by family violence;
- employment law issues; and
- criminal justice issues affecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the ACT.

ICT Funding (\$447,238)

It is intended that the Commonwealth ICT funding will be used to deliver the following

- providing infrastructure (e.g. computers/telephones) to enable remote working;
- commencing the set-up of a document management system to support a CLC practicing in family law
- the costs of software to support virtual board meetings; and
- providing the ICT infrastructure to support online delivery of community legal education.

A breakdown of the funding allocation for ICT and Frontline Service Delivery is in the below:

ORGANISATION	ICT FUNDING	FRONTLINE SERVICE DELIVERY FUNDING
Women's Legal Centre	\$60,315	\$224,200
<i>ICT Infrastructure</i>	\$25,662	
<i>Action Step Set Up Costs</i>	\$33,960	
<i>Online Board Platform</i>	\$693	
<i>Family Lawyer</i>		\$117,021
<i>Employment and Discrimination Lawyer</i>		\$107,112
<i>Administration</i>		\$67
Canberra Community Law	\$75,575	\$114,000
<i>Initial set-up of new phone lines</i>	\$15,000	
<i>ICT Infrastructure</i>	\$60,575	
<i>Housing Lawyer</i>		\$114,000
Environmental Defenders Office	\$10,000	0
<i>ICT Infrastructure</i>	\$10,000	
Aboriginal Legal Service	0	\$142,000
<i>Administration</i>		\$79
<i>Senior Trial Advocate</i>		\$141,921
Legal Aid ACT	\$270,439	\$314,087
<i>Lawyer - Family Violence Unit</i>		\$138,881
<i>Lawyer – Older Persons ACT Legal Service</i>		\$138,881
<i>Legal Aid ICT</i>	\$270,439	
<i>Additional capacity subject to further negotiations</i>		\$36,325
CARE	\$30,909	\$150,000
<i>ICT Equipment</i>	\$10,909	
<i>ICT for Community Legal Education</i>	\$20,000	
<i>Reach Out Program</i>		\$150,000

¹ Action Step is a document management system which automates workflow processes to reduce administration in the Centre to allow lawyers more time to help clients and run cases.

Roads—projects (Question No 3010)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Roads and Active Travel, upon notice, on 22 May 2020:

- (1) In relation to the response to question on notice No 2975 on funding for roads and parking infrastructure, what works/studies are being delivered for each of the projects listed in the response as (a) Feasibility studies – duplication of Tharwa Drive and extension of Nudurr Drive, (b) Planning better roads for our growing city, (c) Making our roads safer while keeping Canberra moving, (d) Better connecting Belconnen and Gungahlin, (e) Delivering safer intersections, (f) Supporting more Canberrans to Park and Ride and (g) Keeping our growing city moving – Safer intersections.

- (2) How much of the funding is uncommitted (eg not required to pay for an existing contract) for the projects listed in the response as (a) Feasibility studies - duplication of Tharwa Drive and extension of Nudurr Drive, (b) Planning better roads for our growing city, (c) Making our roads safer while keeping Canberra moving, (d) Better connecting Belconnen and Gungahlin, (e) Delivering safer intersections and (f) Keeping our growing city moving Safer intersections.

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

(1)

- a) Tharwa Drive - This project will investigate the possibility of duplicating the 1.6km section of Tharwa Drive between Woodcock Drive and Pockett Avenue in Banks including improved safety at its intersections and better active travel links via shared paths and on-road cycle lanes.

Nudurr Drive - This project will deliver traffic modelling to inform whether the extension of Nudurr Drive from Grampians Street to Gungahlin Drive is required.

- b) Athllon Drive Infrastructure Study and Duplication Concept Design - This project will produce an Infrastructure Study documenting the ultimate service and utility requirements of the Athllon Drive corridor adjacent to the proposed new development areas opposite Phillip, and a concept design of the duplication of the unduplicated sections of Athllon Drive. These being the duplication of Athllon Drive for the 2.4km section between Sulwood Drive and Drakeford Drive (the southern section) and a 0.6km section from Shea Street to Melrose Drive (the northern section). Particular attention is being given to providing safe and effective active travel infrastructure such as on-road cycling lanes and shared paths.

Morisset Road Extension - This project is the detail design and environmental and planning approvals for the upgrade and extension of Morisset Road and a retardation basin on Sullivan's Creek. The project also includes an investigation of Sandford Street from Flemington Road to Gungahlin Drive to facilitate a heavy vehicle freight route into Mitchell, then through to the Barton Highway, and onward to the Hume Highway.

William Hovell Drive duplication - This project is the detail design and environmental and planning approvals for the duplication of William Hovell Drive between John Gorton Drive and Drake Brockman Drive. The project will include the provision of on-road cycling lanes and a dedicated shared path for the 4.5km length. Attention is also being given to facilitating the Bicentennial National (equestrian) Trail and a dedicated access and parking for the heritage listed Old Weetangera Cemetery.

- c) HSVPP - Works involve the design and construction to upgrade multiple intersections within the Commercial Route Network.

Bridges Renewal - Works involve the design and construction of a 2-lane bridge and associated works to SM1600 design standards.

Northbourne Avenue Pavement Rehabilitation - Works involve the rehabilitation of the road pavement on various sections of Northbourne Avenue including the milling, replacement of deteriorated pavement subgrade and asphalt resurfacing and landscaping works.

d) William Slim Drive Duplication -

Works include:

- Approx. 3.2km of new carriageway;
- Approx. 6.4km of new on-road cycle lanes / hard shoulder;
- Reconfiguration of existing intersections, including:
 - Ginninderra Drive
 - Dumas Street
 - Baldwin Drive
 - Owen Dixon Drive; and
 - Chuculba Crescent.
- Signalisation of the Dumas Street intersection;
- Barrier replacements at bridges along the corridor;
- New bus bays and relocation of existing bus bays;
- Construction of linkages to existing community shared paths
- Street lighting;
- New and augmented stormwater systems, including levee bank at the existing underpass; and
- Landscaping.

e) Southern Cross Drive/Starke Street - Works involve the installation of new traffic signals which will provide controlled right turn and through movements at the intersection and associated road pavement widening;

Launceston Street/Irving Street - Works involve:

- the installation of new traffic signals at the intersection of Launceston/Irving providing a controlled pedestrian crossing across Launceston Street.
- Zebra crossing on the slip-lane from Irving Street to Launceston Street.
- Continuation of the existing median island closing the right turn into Furzer Street from Launceston Street, and the right turn out from Furzer Street to Launceston Street. This will convert Furzer Street into a left turn in and left turn out arrangement; and
- Creation of a formalised right turn queue lane for the right turn from Launceston Street into Bowes Street.

Belconnen Way/Springvale Drive - Works involve the conversion of the existing intersection arrangement into traffic signals and the potential realignment of slip-lane arrangements into and out of Springvale Drive to ensure safer operation with the new traffic signal arrangement.

Mt Taylor - Works involve the Feasibility Study for the upgrading of the Mt Taylor and Sulwood Drive Intersection including the developing of design options for the Mt Taylor Car Park extension and a new shared path along Sulwood Drive between Drakeford and Athllon Drive.

Hume Circle - Works involve the Feasibility Study for the upgrading of Hume Circle.

Kent/Novar Street intersection upgrades - This project involves the detailed design and construction of upgrades to three intersections on Kent Street/Novar Street.

The three intersections are:

- Dudley Street/Novar Street/Kent Street/Adelaide Avenue on-ramp;
- Kent Street/Adelaide Ave off-ramp; and
- Kent Street/Denison Street.

The project will signalise the three intersections and coordinate traffic signal phasing to achieve maximum traffic flow benefit during the AM and PM peaks to improve safety and ease congestion. The project will also rationalise active travel infrastructure so pedestrians and cyclists can move through the three intersections efficiently and safely.

- f) Supporting more Canberran's for Park and Ride - Works involve the construction of a Park and Ride facility at the south eastern corner of Well Station Drive and Flemington Road for the community to accommodate parking facilities for 150-200 vehicles and other associated works in support of Light Rail.
- g) Kuringa and Owen Dixon Drive Intersection - Works involve the signalisation of this intersection. This includes improved safety and crossing opportunities for pedestrian and cyclists, including a shared path connection to Barton Highway. The project will also accommodate the future duplication of Kuringa Drive and the modification of the intersection from uncontrolled to controlled should result in a reduction of accidents occurring.

Monaro Highway- The Monaro Highway Safety Improvements project will see the construction of an overtaking lane on the Monaro Highway between Old Cooma Road and Williamsdale Road and improvements at the Old Cooma Road and Williamsdale Road intersections.

Monaro Highway - The project involves upgrading the existing intersections at Monaro Highway / Lanyon Drive and Monaro Highway/ Isabella Drive to provide elevated 'grade separated' interchanges at both as well as intersection treatments (on the Monaro Highway) through Hume. The upgrades will improve safety and network efficiencies along the corridor.

2. All funds have been committed within the appropriations based up on estimates of the value of the associated works and management fees. At this point it would be inappropriate to discuss contracts that maybe in procurement, negotiation, or not yet complete. Upon the completion of projects, realised savings are identified, notified to treasury and returned as appropriate.

Children and young people—care and protection (Question No 3011)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 22 May 2020:

- (1) In relation to care and protection matters during the COVID pandemic, when will the Government be providing a response to the final report presented to the Minister by the Our Booris, Our Way Steering Committee in December 2019 and will it be made publicly available.

- (2) Does the Minister have a commitment to publish regular updates on progress against agreed recommendations; if so, how often.
- (3) Can the Minister provide a brief overview of progress on some of the key recommendations contained in the final report.
- (4) Has there been a significant increase in the number of notifications received by Child and Youth Protection Services during the COVID pandemic period, since March 2020 compared to the previous six months; if so, is the Minister able to provide a number or percentage of this increase and if not able to provide data for the pandemic period, can the Minister provide a number or percentage for the past six months.
- (5) Can the Minister provide the data referred to in part (4) broken into Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children; if so, what is that breakdown.
- (6) How many appraisals have been undertaken during the pandemic period for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and if not able to provide the data for the pandemic period, can the Minister provide the data for past six months.
- (7) How many appraisals have been undertaken during the pandemic period for non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and if not able to provide data for the pandemic period can the Minister provide the data for the past six months.
- (8) How were appraisals being undertaken during the period of strictest social distancing measures and how are they occurring now.
- (9) Have contact visits for children with their birth families been undertaken or maintained during COVID pandemic period; if so, how have they been managed.
- (10) What is the number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children taken into care during the past six months.
- (11) What is the number of non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children taken into care during the past six months.
- (12) Was extra monitoring put in place for children in the care and protection system, particularly while not visible during distance learning regimes; if so, how was that done.
- (13) Have the recommendations made by Our Booris, Our Way Steering Committee relating specifically to the contracted provider, ACT Together, been implemented.
- (14) Can the Minister provide an update on the implementation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle, including a time line for associated legislative reforms.
- (15) When will the Policy and Practice co-design forum be convened.
- (16) What progress has been made towards implementing an Aboriginal Child Care Association.

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

1. The Government's response to the *Our Booris, Our Way* Final Report will be tabled in the Legislative Assembly in July 2020 and subsequently published online.
2. In line with the recommendation from the *Our Booris, Our Way* Final Report, an interim Implementation Oversight Committee has been established. The Community Services Directorate will work with the Committee to decide on the format and frequency of reporting on progress. This will be made publicly available.
3. The ACT Government continues to make progress against the *Our Booris, Our Way* recommendations, as outlined in progress reports available at: <https://www.strongfamilies.act.gov.au/our-booris,-our-way>. The Government Response to be tabled in July 2020 will include an update on progress against the final recommendations included in the report.

Key recommendations progressed to date include:

- Engagement of a designated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Training and Workforce Development Officer to deliver the Cultural Development Program to Child and Youth Protection Services (CYPS) staff. (Recommendation 1)
- Engagement of the Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care (SNAICC) to undertake training for CYPS staff on the implementation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle. (Recommendation 2)
- Engagement of a designated Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Practice Leader within CYPS, who has a key role in embedding the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principles to ensure culturally responsive practice remains at the forefront of CYPS decision making. (Recommendation 3)
- Engagement of an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Senior Policy Officer, who is responsible for the delivery and implementation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle into CYPS policies and procedures. (Recommendation 3)
- The establishment of the Ngura Naraganbang (Safety in the Pouch Advisory Committee) to provide advice and feedback to CYPS in relation to policy and resource development to support practice when working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children, young people, their families and community. The Ngura Naraganbang (Safety in the Pouch Advisory Committee) membership includes diverse representatives from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community. (Recommendation 3)
- Continued funding for Family Group Conferencing to support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families to make decisions to keep their children safe, strong and connected to family and culture through the development of a family plan. (Recommendation 4)
- The development and delivery of several CYPS practice guides and procedures to guide CYPS staff when working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families. Some of these practice guides and procedures include:
 - Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Families; Providing Culturally Responsive Practice;
 - Engaging with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle;

- Placing a child in accordance with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle;
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Father Inclusive Practice; and
- Working with the CYPS Cultural Services Team.

4. A table outlining all Child Concern Reports received by CYPS by month for the past eight months is below and includes the COVID-19 pandemic period:

	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and Young People	Non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and Young People	All children and young people
Oct 2019	304	1257	1561
Nov 2019	304	1414	1718
Dec 2019	253	1246	1499
Jan 2020	193	871	1064
Feb 2020	241	1265	1506
Mar 2020	250	1356	1606
April 2020	209	978	1187
May 2020	208	1156	1364

5. Refer to item four above.

6. A table outlining all Appraisals completed by CYPS by month for the past eight months is below and includes the COVID-19 pandemic period:

	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and Young People	Non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and Young People	All children and young people
Oct 2019	24	84	108
Nov 2019	35	88	123
Dec 2019	43	139	182
Jan 2020	34	125	159
Feb 2020	30	101	131
Mar 2020	21	131	152
April 2020	43	169	212
May 2020	34	105	139

7. Refer to item six above.

8. Appraisals have been undertaken with face-to-face contact occurring where appropriate following an assessment process. CYPS staff complete a COVID-19 Offsite Visit Checklist prior to undertaking a home visit. CYPS staff are provided with hand sanitiser and gloves in all government vehicles when visiting homes, and social distancing measures consistent with the advice of the time is followed.

If face-to-face contact was not possible after conducting the assessment, video conferencing and phone calls have been utilised.

9. During the Public Health Emergency most contact visits transitioned to occur via telephone or video calls. Face-to-face contact between a child and their parent/s or kin

may have proceeded if it could be managed in a way that was consistent with the health advice and assurance of personal hygiene and physical distancing. Some of the factors that were considered were:

- a. when restoration is the child's Care Plan goal;
- b. when the child/ren is very young (under three years);
- c. if a person in the household has a serious health condition;
- d. significant bereavement (Sorry Business) or adverse event within the family network (noting restrictions on funerals);
- e. if the child is experiencing significant emotional or psychological impacts as a result of separation from their parent or usual carer; and
- f. following consultation with a maternity nurse, paediatrician or maternal and child health nurse, it is agreed maintaining breast feeding is necessary to keep baby well and this could be done safely in the context of COVID-19.

For children on long-term orders, face-to-face contact is being progressively reintroduced (from 9 June 2020). Face-to-face contact between a child and their parents or kin is being managed in a way that is consistent with the health advice on personal hygiene and physical distancing. All supervised contact will occur at the contact centre and the number of adults to attend will be limited in order to adhere to social distancing measures. Screening of symptoms and hygiene practices are in place.

10. For the period 30 November 2019 to 29 May 2020 (six months), 18 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people entered care, noting several children and young people may relate to one family.
11. For the period 30 November 2019 to 29 May 2020 (six months), 35 non-Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people entered care, noting several children and young people may relate to one family.
12. During the Public Health Emergency, essential services to support children and young people have continued to be delivered to meet their needs. This includes continued contact with relevant case managers, ongoing care team meetings and the continuation of services by specialist providers in person or via telephone or video link.

Case managers have contacted families and carers to discuss their individual circumstances and needs, and to talk about revised arrangements for transport, education and contact. These conversations are ongoing and are being reassessed based on the recent easing of restrictions.

As a community, we are concerned about there being increased risk for some children who may not be as visible in the community and whose families are under increased pressure as a result of the pandemic. CYPS commenced a client coordination meeting bringing together Education, Health, ACT Policing and critical community partners such as OneLink, DVCS, the Canberra Rape Crisis Centre and ACT Together, to ensure that by collectively working together, all supports are in place to keep our most vulnerable children and young people safe.

13. The ACT Government is in the process of finalising its response to the *Our Booris, Our Way* final report and recommendations. The Community Services Directorate remains committed to realising the intent of the review and implementation will be in partnership with ACT Together, particularly for the recommendations that refer to *A Step Up for Our Kids*.

14. Application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle is reflected in CYPS policy and requires that the first placement priority for all children who enter care is with 'kin'. In recognition of this priority CYPS has developed a Practice Guide titled: Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Families: Providing Culturally Responsive Practice.

This is supported by several policies and includes a procedure titled: Placing a child in accordance with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle that prioritises the placement of children in accordance with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle. Further information about embedding the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle is identified at item three above.

The Community Services Directorate has also engaged SNAICC to deliver training to CYPS staff on the implementation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle, and discussions are taking place for the delivery of this training for a further three years.

Changes already made to policy and practice have been recognised by SNAICC. SNAICC's latest review of ACT's compliance with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Placement Principle states that the ACT is engaging with all child protection decision making elements of the Principle.

On a national level, the ACT is co-leading (with Queensland) the national Priority One Working Group, focused on improving outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children. The Priority One Working Group sits under the Fourth Action Plan for the National Framework for Protecting Australia's Children 2009-2020. The workplan for the group includes actively implementing legislation, policy and/or practice to ensure compliance with the five elements of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle and developing a nationally consistent approach to measuring the application of the five elements. The workplan was agreed by all jurisdictions on 13 August 2019 and jurisdictions are completing project plans to deliver on this work.

In response to COVID-19, Children and Families Secretaries (CAFS) recently agreed to reprioritise national effort and resources to focus on the complex task of ensuring the safety and wellbeing of the children, families, carers, staff and stakeholders during this time. This includes immediate service delivery challenges and building capability for the recovery phase. This has meant that work on the National Framework for Protecting Australia's Children related working groups, including meetings has been paused.

All governments have undertaken to resume national child protection related work at the earliest possible time and continue working together for a coordinated approach to reducing child abuse and neglect in Australia.

15. Work is underway with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community to scope the format, model, and membership of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy and Practice Forum. This work will ensure that the model reflects the diverse experiences and expertise of members of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community, so that it enables community-led solutions to human service policy and practice issues.

A workshop on the non-adoption of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people in the care of the Director-General was held in October 2019. This workshop brought together members of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body, the United Ngunnawal Elders Council, staff from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Community Controlled Organisations, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community members with lived experience of the out of home care system, and staff from the Community Services Directorate. This workshop tested possible deliberative approaches, with learnings from the workshop informing the ongoing development of the Forum model.

Following this workshop, ongoing conversations with key stakeholders to support scoping of the model have taken place.

Establishment of the Forum is delayed as a result of COVID-19 and will resume when it is safe and appropriate to do so.

16. CSD is finalising a feasibility study and jurisdictional review into establishing Aboriginal Community Controlled Organisations in the ACT. This paper will form the basis of consultation and development with the community and *Our Booris Our Way* Oversight Committee to finalise and recommend a position to support implementation of this recommendation.

The Implementation Oversight Committee will be monitoring the implementation of all recommendations of the *Our Booris, Our Way* Final Report of which this is one.

Environment—Hall park upgrade project (Question No 3012)

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 22 May 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for City Services*):

- (1) In relation to the proposed Hall Park Upgrade Project, including the proposed bike track, what is the estimated cost of the Geotech fabric required to be laid under the trail as part of the approved Statement of Heritage Effect.
- (2) Who will be responsible for covering the additional cost due to the requirement of Geotech fabric.
- (3) What is the approximate date that the project will commence.
- (4) What is the estimated length of the project and has this been increased due to the requirement of Geotech fabric.

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

- (1) The Hall community was given an overall estimated cost of \$80-100,000 for the whole project, which includes approximately \$50,000 for the Geotech fabric.
- (2) Being a community funded project, the Hall community is responsible for covering all costs of the project including the Geotech fabric.

- (3) There is no commencement date yet. The project is currently on hold until the community can raise additional funds.
 - (4) The adventure trail and nature play space will likely take about 6-8 weeks for construction using the minimal disturbance method involving Geotech fabric. This is around double the time expected for a conventional approach.
-

**Ginninderry—vegetation
(Question No 3014)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 22 May 2020:

- (1) In relation to the 330kV transmission lines recently constructed east of Ginninderra Estate, Holt, given that plans call for the large steel towers erected directly behind residential properties to be screened by vegetation, who is responsible for the planting of this screening vegetation.
- (2) What species will the screening vegetation consist of, how many of each species will be used around each tower and what will be the placement.
- (3) Will hedges be considered as an alternative for residents.
- (4) Will residents whose environmental amenity has been degraded by the erection of these towers be consulted in any way regarding the selection of vegetation to be used in screening these towers; if so, how will this occur; if not, why not.
- (5) When will the planting of this screening vegetation be completed.
- (6) Who will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of this vegetation.
- (7) Given that before the decision was made to locate this 330kV transmission line on the west side of the easement directly behind new houses in Ginninderra Estate, other possible routes were considered, (a) how many other routes were considered and where was each located, (b) why weren't these other routes chosen, (c) how many of these routes would have resulted in large steel towers being erected directly behind people's homes, (d) which route was determined to be the cheapest and (e) what other factors contributed to the route west of Ginninderra Estate being selected.

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

- (1) The proponent, Transgrid, is responsible for the plantings between the new towers and Ginninderra Estate.
- (2) The approved landscape plan (Attachment A) states that the locations of trees and species will be agreed in consultation with the landowners and properties adjacent.
- (3) Planting locations and species are to be determined by agreement between Transgrid, the land custodians and property owners adjacent to the fence-line. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and development approval (DA201732500) required adequate screening to be provided with maximum heights for species growth to four metres.

- (4) See answer above.
- (5) The planting was required as part of the approval process and will need to be undertaken before the completion of the development.
- (6) Transgrid will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the planting. Condition D2 of the notice of decision for DA201732500 (Attachment B) requires an Operating Phase Environment and Sustainability Plan (OPESP) to be prepared by the proponent prior to operation. The OPESP must include adequate procedures to maintain/replace planting, intended for visual mitigation, through the life of the project.
- (7) Several options were considered with regard to 330kV supply into the new substation from the National Grid. The lowest impact option to the proposed residential developments and the environment was to utilise a portion of the existing Holt to Williamsdale 330kV transmission line. The Holt to Williamsdale 330kV line is being diverted through the new substation. The location of the substation also required options to be considered to configure the transmission lines to meet the Electricity Transmission Supply Code – July 2016. These requirements consisted of:
1. A new 330kV transmission line connecting the new substation to the existing Holt substation; and
 2. A new 132kV transmission line connecting the new substation to the existing Holt to Woden 132kV line.

Determining the transmission line routes from the new substation

It was considered logical to run the two new transmission lines from the new substation within a shared easement. The existing Holt to Woden 132kV line (owned and operated by Evoenergy) was already within a 92m easement through the Belconnen golf course. The Holt to Woden 132kV line was commissioned in 1967 and the 92m easement was in place in 1972 (See footnote 1).

The closest route to connect a new 132kV transmission line from the new substation to the existing 132kV transmission line was on the southern side of and along Stockdill drive. This route also did not impact any proposed development. Given that the new 132kV transmission line route was both logical and relatively low impact, the decision to route the new 330kV transmission within a new shared easement with the new 132kV transmission line was considered the best option. This new easement containing the 330kV and the 132kV transmission lines joined the existing 92m easement that contained the Holt to Woden 132kV line. From the south side of Stockdill Drive, the use of the existing 92m shared easement through the golf course to route the new 330kV transmission line to the Holt substation was considered the lowest impact to future residential developments and the environment.

Essentially the connection of the new 132kV transmission line from the new Stockdill substation to the existing Holt to Woden 132kV transmission line determined the new 330kV transmission line route from the new substation to the Holt substation through the existing golf course easement.

- (a) As stated above, several routes were considered for transmission lines into the new substation. However, due to the requirement to connect a new 132kV transmission

line from the new substation to the existing Holt to Woden 132kV transmission line, there were no reasonable options other than the route chosen as detailed above.

- (b) As detailed above, the selected route was considered to be the most efficient and logical with the least environmental impact.
- (c) The new 330kV transmission line requires steel towers to be erected to connect the new Stockdill substation and the Holt substation. The steel towers erected are erected in existing utility easements. As detailed above, the options considered were limited in order to keep the transmission lines within shared easements.
- (d) As detailed above, the new transmission line routes were determined on the basis of connecting the new 132kV line to the existing Holt to Woden 132kV line and having the new 330kV and 132kV transmission lines sharing a new easement as well as using the existing 92m easement through the golf course.
- (e) As detailed above.

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

¹ In 2014, the golf course lessee was informed of the likelihood of a future 330kV transmission line being constructed through the golf course easement.

Education Directorate—staffing (Question No 3021)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development, upon notice, on 22 May 2020:

Can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of staff by (a) full-time equivalent and (b) headcount, employed under each classification band of the ACT Public Service Education Directorate (Teaching Staff) Enterprise Agreements (such as CT 1.2, CT 2.1, 3 Year Trained, Executive Teacher) for each year from 2012 to date, noting this detailed information is not contained in annual reports.

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

- 1) The tables below show the Full-time equivalent (Table 1) and headcount (Table 2) by classification for staff employed under the applicable Teaching Staff Enterprise Agreements. The data is reported as at the last pay period of June each year, consistent with the annual reports, and April 2020. The data excludes employees not paid by the ACT Public Service and people on leave without pay. Employees who separated from the ACT Public Service prior to the pay period end date, but received a payment, were included.

NOTE: Not all psychologists employed by the Education Directorate are engaged under the Teaching Staff Enterprise Agreements.

(Data available at the Chamber Support Office).

**Homelessness—COVID-19
(Question No 3022)**

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 22 May 2020:

- (1) What was the (a) number and (b) percentage of (i) adults and (ii) children who were found to be homeless in the ACT during each financial year since 2008-09 to date.
- (2) What estimates, research or monitoring is been done on the impact of COVID-19 and the number of (a) adults and (b) children who are homeless and what are the results.
- (3) What was the rate of repeat homelessness in the ACT during each financial year since 2008-09 to date.
- (4) What was the ACT Government's spending on homelessness broken down by initiative during each financial year since 2008-09 to date and what was the cost per day for homelessness support.
- (5) What was the unmet demand for homelessness services during each financial year since 2008-09 to date.
- (6) How is the ACT Government managing the unmet demand for homelessness.
- (7) What was the (a) number and (b) percentage of (i) adults and (ii) children who were found to be living below the poverty line in the ACT during each financial year since 2008-09 to date.
- (8) What estimates, research or monitoring is been done on the impact of COVID-19 and the number of (a) adults and (b) children living below the poverty line and what are the results.

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

To collect and assemble the information back to 2008-09 solely for the purpose of answering the questions would require considerable resources. The following information is provided in response.

1. Estimates of the number and percentage of adults and children who are homeless in the ACT (or any Australian state or territory) are obtained from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census of Population and Housing. There are no annual estimates of homelessness for any state or territory due to the methodological difficulty of obtaining these.

The Census is undertaken every five years. Table 1 shows the number and percentage of adults and children who are homeless because they have been identified as:

- living in improvised dwellings, tents or sleeping out
- in supported accommodation for the homeless
- staying temporarily with other households

- living in boarding houses
- living in other temporary lodgings
- living in severely crowded dwellings

Table 1. Number and percentage of adults and children who are homeless in the ACT, 2011 and 2016.

(Data available at the Chamber Support Office).

2. Housing ACT is contributing to whole of government monitoring of the impact of COVID19 by providing regular reports on change in service demand. In relation to homelessness, Housing ACT is monitoring the following:
 - Street to Home assistance and outreach provided to people sleeping rough;
 - OneLink service activity and support;
 - Domestic Violence Crisis Service client contacts; and
 - Safer Families Assistance, a \$2000 grant provided to sustain or re-establish a home in the private rental market following the experience of family or domestic violence.

The results are as follows:

- Street to Home has seen an increase in the number of people assisted through outreach support to people sleeping rough in March and April (32 per month) compared to November 2019 (25 in that month);
 - OneLink provided a higher number of occasions of one-off assistance (on average 339 occasions of one-off assistance per month in the January to March 2020 quarter compared with 263 in the previous quarter), and higher than the 259 in the corresponding quarter in 2019.
 - OneLink has a higher number of clients on the waiting list at the end of each month (on average 374 clients in the January to March 2020 quarter). This is higher than 301 clients in the previous quarter (October-December 2019), and higher than 266 clients during the corresponding quarter in 2019.
 - In addition to the placements of clients into specialist homelessness services by OneLink, the demand for emergency accommodation is being met through OneLink's increased use of brokerage for accommodation. Since 28 March 2020 to 5 June 2020, OneLink has provided 529 nights of accommodation, assisting 139 individuals or families. This is compared to eight individuals or families in March 2019, four in April 2019 and four in May 2019.
 - The Domestic Violence Crisis Service received an average of 124 incoming contacts per day during May 2020. Longer time series data is not currently available.
 - Safer Families Assistance has been paid to 130 individuals or families over the current financial year to 31 May 2020.
3. The rate of repeat homelessness for all people in the ACT cannot be directly measured. The Report on Government Services provides a proxy measure taken from the

Specialist Homelessness Services data collection. For clients of Specialist Homelessness Services repeat homelessness is the number of specialist homelessness service clients who change status from 'homeless' to 'not homeless' and back to 'homeless' in the reporting period, divided by the number of clients who experienced homelessness at any time in the reporting period.

Clients of specialist homelessness services are defined as being homeless in each month where at least one of the following describes their housing situation:

- dwelling type is caravan, tent, cabin, boat, improvised building/dwelling, no dwelling/street/park/in the open, motor vehicle, boarding/rooming house, emergency accommodation, hotel/motel/bed and breakfast
- tenure type is renting or living rent free in transitional housing, caravan park, boarding/rooming house or emergency accommodation/night shelter/women's refuge/youth shelter; or if the client has no tenure
- conditions of occupancy is a couch surfer.

Figures for 2019-20, which are supplied by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and provided to the Report on Government Services, will become available in January 2021. The methodology for calculating this indicator was revised in 2017. Data was back cast to 2012-13. Results for years earlier than 2012-13 are not compatible.

Table 2. Number and percentage of specialist homelessness services clients who were homeless in the ACT who had repeat periods of homelessness, 2014-15 to 2018-19.

	Number	Per cent
2012-13	200	5.6%
2013-14	180	5.2%
2014-15	201	6.2%
2015-16	210	6.8%
2016-17	230	7.8%
2017-18	180	7.0%
2018-19	141	5.8%

Source: Report on Government Services 2020

4. The cost per day of homelessness support in the ACT is provided in Table 3. Figures for 2019-20, which are supplied by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and provided to the Report on Government Services, will become available in January 2021.

The financial data in Table 3 is adjusted to 2018-19 dollars (to enable comparison across years with the effects of inflation removed). This adjusted data is available from 2014-15 only.

Table 3. Recurrent cost per day of support for clients of specialist homelessness services in the ACT, 2014-15 to 2018-19.

(Data available at the Chamber Support Office).

Table 4. Homelessness spending by cohort

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17 (GST exc, inc ERO where applicable & Indexation)	2017-18 (GST exc, inc ERO where applicable & Indexation)	2018-19 (GST exc, inc ERO where applicable & Indexation)	2019-20 (GST exc, incl ERO where applicable & Indexation)
Women including domestic and family violence	Not separated into cohorts		\$4,521,802	\$4,856,345	\$5,847,457	\$6,321,499
Men			\$2,973,447	\$3,786,163	\$3,797,534	\$3,760,896
Families			\$1,516,254	\$1,721,294	\$1,781,905	\$2,274,963
Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander			\$1,092,103	\$1,285,868	\$1,170,976	\$1,199,665
Youth			\$4,875,870	\$5,035,826	\$5,250,038	\$5,477,183
General support - Food			\$260,404	\$253,108	\$265,668	\$278,390
General support - Housing			\$3,456,046	\$3,618,875.14	\$4,138,257	\$4,014,092
General support – Info/advice			\$1,288,460	\$1,533,031	\$1,117,912	\$1,182,508
General support – sector			\$172,389	\$176,757.96	\$265,286	\$607,405
Total	\$19,246,182	\$19,532,533	\$20,156,776	\$22,267,268	\$24,295,890	\$25,116,602

Note:

- To collect and assemble the breakdown of homelessness funding by initiative would require considerable resources.
- Breakdown by cohort has been provided back to 2016-17.
- Prior to these years, funding was provided through SAAP- a different Commonwealth model, and some programs under cohorts have ceased, and others commenced.
- Service Funding Agreements, with funding amounts are posted here <https://www.procurement.act.gov.au/contracts>

5. Unmet demand for homelessness services for all people in the ACT is not directly measured. The Report on Government Services provides a proxy measure taken from the Specialist Homelessness Services data collection. For clients of Specialist Homelessness Services, unmet demand for homelessness services is defined as the proportion of clients who do not receive specialist homelessness services that they need using two broad service types — accommodation services and services other than accommodation.

Unmet need for accommodation is measured by the number of clients with an identified need for short-term or emergency accommodation or medium-term/transitional housing or long-term housing who were not provided with or referred for these services (although they may have received other types of services), divided by the number of clients who had a need for short term or emergency accommodation or medium-term/transitional housing or long-term housing. Unmet need for services other than accommodation is measured by the number of clients with an identified need for at least one service other than accommodation (and no need for accommodation services) who were not provided with or referred for a service other than accommodation, divided by the number of clients who had a need for at least one service other than accommodation (and no need for accommodation services).

The unmet demand for homelessness services in the ACT is provided in Table 4. Figures for 2019-20, which are supplied by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare and provided to the Report on Government Services, will become available in January 2021. Data for this indicator is not available prior to 2011-12.

Table 5. Unmet need for accommodation and services other than accommodation for clients of specialist homelessness services in the ACT, 2011-12 to 2018-19.

(Data available at the Chamber Support Office).

6. The ACT Government has an established process for managing unmet demand for homelessness assistance. The role of OneLink is to provide homelessness assistance on a needs-based system. As the central access service for homelessness in the ACT, it identifies, assesses and prioritises different needs of clients, and then connects them with appropriate accommodation and support services. Each client can be connected with one or more services depending how their need(s) can be best met.

At the end of each quarter, OneLink report on the number of people still waiting at the end of each month within the quarter to be connected to any service, both accommodation and non-accommodation support services. Some people waiting at the end of the month may have had some service needs met while still waiting for connection to others.

On 20 April, the ACT Government announced \$3 million in funding specifically to respond to increased demand for homelessness and family and domestic violence services arising from COVID-19. This was part of \$9 million funding package for community services during COVID-19. The ACT Government worked closely with community sector partners to respond and several new programs have commenced and are being monitored. These include the Client Support Fund which commenced on 11 May 2020 and has provided accommodation and support to twenty five individuals and/ or families, the Winter Lodge also opened 11 May 2020 and as at 8 June 2020 has had 26 men access the service. As at 8 June 2020, Axial housing housed 21 rough sleepers, including some entrenched rough sleepers who have previously been unwilling to engage with services.

7. An estimate of the number of people living below the poverty line in the ACT is not readily available from official sources, and any time series of estimates would be considered statistically unreliable due to the small sample size of the ACT in national surveys.

The sector has increasingly moved away from reliance on a single poverty line measure, towards a variety of measures of socio-economic deprivation and/or attainment in considering appropriate policy measures and responses.

The ACT Government monitors and considers a broad range of quantitative and qualitative information regarding the need for access to relevant services in the community. As service needs and levels of demand change the government adjusts its programs and eligibility criteria in response, to ensure adequate access to services for people in need of them.

8. A number of indicators under the ACT Government's Wellbeing Framework, launched in March this year, will examine the financial positions of people living in the ACT and

its impact on their quality of life. These include measures around income inequality and income levels, employment, cost of living, and peoples' self-rated financial position. Data development in relation to these indicators is continuing and an initial 'dashboard' of indicator data will be released later in 2020.

In addition, several non-government organisations are in the process of estimating impacts of COVID-19, and the ACT Government is carefully monitoring findings produced by these groups.

Roads—speed cameras (Question No 3024)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 22 May 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety*):

- (1) What was the total number of (a) mobile speed cameras, (b) fixed speed cameras, and (c) any other type of speed detection cameras or technology available to law enforcement, during each financial year since 2008-09 to date.
- (2) What was the total number of speeding fines issued, broken down by camera or technology type, during each financial year since 2008-09 to date.
- (3) What is the total revenue collected through speeding fines during each financial year since 2008-09 to date.
- (4) What was the average annual revenue generated for each type of speed camera or technology identified in part (1) during each financial year since 2008-09 to date.
- (5) Has any modelling or analysis been done on revenue and speeding or mobile texting cameras; if so, can the Minister outline the nature of the modelling or analysis, when it was conducting, who conducted the modelling or analysis and the results.

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

Road safety cameras are operated in the ACT by Access Canberra and ACT Policing.

Information is provided below separately for each agency.

ACT Policing

(1) – (4)

Information on speed detection cameras used by ACT Policing is not released as this may negatively impact on road safety operations and encourage negative driving behaviours.

Since January this year, the monthly average of speeding Traffic Infringement Notices (TINs) issued has increased from 350 to 508 issued per month. Overall, the number of traffic infringements issued for speeding has increased over the last 5 years by 14.8%.

Access Canberra

Access Canberra operate fixed speed detection cameras, fixed point - to - point (P2P) cameras, fixed intersection speed and red light cameras, and mobile speed detection cameras.

(1)

Camera Type	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14
Mobile Speed Cameras	7	7	7	7	5	4
Fixed Red Light and Speed Cameras	26	26	26	26	25	24
Other Types of Speed Detection Cameras or Technology - Point 2 Point Cameras.	0	0	0	4	4	8

Camera Type	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20 YTD
Mobile Speed Cameras	7	7	7	9	9	9
Fixed Red Light and Speed Cameras	26	26	26	25	25	26
Other Types of Speed Detection Cameras or Technology - Point 2 Point Cameras.	8	8	8	4	4	4

(2)

Infringement Type	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20 YTD
Mobile Camera Infringements	8,320	8,437	9,208	8,242	9,108	7,473	7,561	15,303	20,734	27,259	25,303	23,945
Point 2 Point Camera Infringements	-	-	-	1,500	2,773	2,511	2,684	3,002	2,802	2,561	2,368	3,027
Fixed Red Light and Fixed Camera Infringements	81,254	63,148	52,943	47,859	48,855	43,367	42,226	40,502	38,093	37,958	36,844	27,771
TOTAL	89,574	71,585	62,151	57,601	60,736	53,351	52,471	58,807	61,629	67,778	64,515	54,743

Please note: Point to point cameras did not operate in the ACT until 2011/12.

(3)

Infringement Type	2008/09 (\$)	2009/10 (\$)	2010/11 (\$)	2011/12 (\$)	2012/13 (\$)	2013/14 (\$)
Mobile Camera Infringements	1,418,561.00	1,482,354.98	1,681,464.00	1,531,871.00	1,724,716.00	1,690,663.00
Point 2 Point Camera Infringements	0	0	0	279,761.00	533,985.00	573,815.00
Fixed Red Light and Fixed Camera Infringements	14,221,211.01	11,501,514.00	10,321,806.00	9,407,777.01	10,103,702.00	10,470,448.00
TOTAL	15,639,772.01	12,983,868.98	12,003,270.00	11,219,409.01	12,362,403.00	12,734,926.00

Infringement Type	2014/15 (\$)	2015/16 (\$)	2016/17 (\$)	2017/18 (\$)	2018/19 (\$)	2019/20 YTD (\$)
Mobile Camera Infringements	1,807,397.00	4,049,331.00	5,961,084.97	8,503,861.99	8,251,725.00	8,811,616.00
Point 2 Point Camera Infringements	664,280.00	792,521.00	810,948.00	802,085.00	774,407.92	1,259,467.00
Fixed Red Light and Fixed Camera Infringements	10,870,411.00	11,435,109.00	12,157,514.96	13,214,350.00	12,708,996.96	11,541,364.97
TOTAL	13,342,088.00	16,276,961.00	18,929,547.93	22,520,296.99	21,735,129.88	21,612,447.97

(4)

Camera Type	2008/09 (\$)	2009/10 (\$)	2010/11 (\$)	2011/12 (\$)	2012/13 (\$)	2013/14 (\$)
Mobile Camera Infringements	202,651.57	211,765.00	240,209.14	218,838.71	344,943.20	422,665.75
Point 2 Point Camera Infringements	-	-	-	69,940.25	133,496.25	71,726.88
Fixed Red Light and Fixed Camera Infringements	546,969.65	442,365.92	396,992.54	361,837.58	404,148.08	436,268.67

Camera Type	2014/15 (\$)	2015/16 (\$)	2016/17 (\$)	2017/18 (\$)	2018/19 (\$)	2019/20 YTD (\$)
Mobile Camera Infringements	258,199.57	578,475.86	851,583.57	944,873.55	916,858.33	979,068.44
Point 2 Point Camera Infringements	83,035.00	99,065.13	101,368.50	200,521.25	193,601.98	314,866.75
Fixed Red Light and Fixed Camera Infringements	418,092.73	439,811.88	467,596.73	528,574.00	508,359.88	443,898.65

(5)

The ACT Government conducts internal analysis of expected revenue from road safety cameras as part the normal budget process. Current and forward estimates of road safety camera revenue is included in the ACT Budget.

The Monash University Accident Research Centre was engaged by the Justice and Community Safety Directorate to undertake an evaluation of the ACT road safety camera program. The evaluation examined the performance of the mobile and point to point cameras over the period October 1999 to September 2017. The evaluation focused on the effectiveness of the camera program on reducing crashes and speed and identified opportunities for further improvements in the management, operation and make-up of the program. The evaluation report was released on 20 June 2019 and is available at:

https://www.justice.act.gov.au/sites/default/files/resources/uploads/JACS/Report_-_Evaluation_of_the_ACT_Road_Safety_Camera_Program.PDF.

The evaluation found that each type of road safety camera is associated with crash reduction and cost savings. Mobile speed cameras were found to be the most beneficial element of the ACT road safety camera program and was found to have reduced crashes by 22% crash in a 12-month period (October 2016 to September 2017). Use of mobile speed cameras each year was equated to:

- the prevention of some 120 casualty crashes that could have resulted in a fatality or injury;
- the prevention of some 2,900 property damage crashes (i.e a crash where there is no serious injury or death); and
- more than \$60 million in crash costs (i.e. costs of road trauma in the community) saved each year for the Canberra community.

Decisions to expand the ACT road safety camera program are driven by opportunities to improve road safety outcomes for the ACT community. The ACT Government will expand the road safety camera program by an additional two mobile cameras. This decision was made following strategic analysis in the evaluation that identified potential for a cost-effective expansion of the program to produce further road trauma savings. The expansion of two mobile cameras is expected to prevent an additional 11 casualty crashes and over 170 property crashes per year.

The ACT Government committed funding in the 2019-20 mid-year budget to explore the possible future introduction of mobile phone detection cameras in the ACT to help address the significant safety concerns arising from illegal mobile device use. The Government will consider a range of factors including the efficacy of the cameras in improving road safety, the cost of implementing the cameras and revenue analysis in deciding whether to utilise these cameras as part of the ACT road safety camera program.

Government—contracts (Question No 3025)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Government Services and Procurement, upon notice, on 22 May 2020:

- (1) What was the total (a) number and (b) value of contracts issued by the ACT Government during each financial year from 2008-09 to 2019-20 to date broken down by (i) subject type and (ii) procurement value threshold.
- (2) What was the total (a) number and (b) value of contracts issued by the ACT Government to local ACT businesses or entities during each financial year from 2008-09 to 2019-20 to date broken down by (i) subject type and (ii) procurement value threshold.
- (3) What impact has the Canberra Region Local Industry Participation Policy had on procurement and contracts issued.

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

- (1) The Territory does not hold a central database of all contracts categorised by procurement value thresholds. However, under the *Government Procurement Act 2001*, each Territory entity is required to notify contracts with an estimated value of \$25,000 or more on the publicly available contracts register.

Attachment A provides details of an extract from the Territory's contracts register for the financial year 2019-20 to date (captured as at 16 June 2020), broken down by the contract values corresponding to the tender thresholds in Part 2 of the *Government Procurement Regulation 2007*. The ACT Government contracts register can be found at <https://www.procurement.act.gov.au/registers/contracts-register>.

Overall, according to the Contracts Register, so far during the 2019-20 financial year, there are a total of 798 individual contracts with a total estimated value of \$642,610,942. There are 8 panels established during the same period with a total estimated value of \$712,595,000.

Provision and analysis of data on the previous years commencing from 2008-09 would be an unreasonable diversion of public resources.

- (2) The Territory does not hold a central database that provides identification of the number and value of contracts with local ACT businesses or entities.

- (3) The Local Industry Participation Policy (LIPP) impacts procurement processes by encouraging buyers undertaking procurements between \$25,000 - \$200,000 to seek at least one quote from a respondent located in the Canberra Region and one response from a Small to Medium Enterprise. Businesses responding to a Territory entity procurement between \$200,000 and \$5 million (GST inclusive) are required to complete an Economic Contribution Test (ECT). For procurements \$5 million and above (GST inclusive) respondents are required to submit a Local Industry Participation (LIP) plan.

Regarding contracts, the LIPP ensures that the impact on the local economy has been considered as part of the value for money assessment for all contracts awarded. The contract terms include a clause requiring the successful bidder to comply with the undertakings in their LIP plans.

Attachment A

Extract from the Territory's Contract Register for the Financial year 2019-20
Current as at 16 June 2020

Individual Contracts - valued at \$25 000 or more and less than \$200 000

Category	No. of Contracts	Estimated Value
Community-Based Services	3	\$403,219
Consultancy	142	\$12,178,323
Goods	65	\$5,706,964
Services (non-consultancy)	171	\$14,810,319
Works	153	\$14,273,667
Total	534	\$47,372,492

Individual Contracts - valued at \$200 000 or more and less than \$5 million

Category	No. of Contracts	Estimated Value
Community-Based Services	10	\$7,076,873
Consultancy	52	\$32,012,388
Goods	37	\$36,561,484
Services (non-consultancy)	73	\$52,063,895
Works	71	\$76,193,544
Total	243	\$203,908,184

Individual Contracts - valued at \$5 Million or more

Category	No. of Contracts	Estimated Value
Community-Based Services	Nil	N/A
Consultancy	Nil	N/A
Goods	1	\$118,688,028
Services (non-consultancy)	11	\$119,765,484
Works	9	\$152,876,754
Total	21	\$391,330,266

Panels - valued at \$25 000 or more and less than \$200 000

Category	No. of Panels	Estimated Value
Community-Based Services	Nil	
Consultancy	Nil	
Goods	2	\$195,000
Services (non-consultancy)	Nil	
Works	Nil	
Total	2	\$195,000

Panels - valued at \$200 000 or more and less than \$5 million

Category	No. of Panels	Estimated Value
Community-Based Services	Nil	N/A
Consultancy	1	\$500,000
Goods	Nil	N/A
Services (non-consultancy)	1	\$1,900,000
Works	Nil	N/A
Total	2	\$2,400,000

Panels - valued at \$5 Million or more

Category	No. of Panels	Estimated Value
Community-Based Services	Nil	N/A
Consultancy	1	\$140,000,000
Goods	Nil	N/A
Services (non-consultancy)	2	\$10,000,000
Works	1	\$560,000,000
Total	4	\$710,000,000

**Housing ACT—tenant records
(Question No 3026)**

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) Does Housing ACT, when managing tenants, maintain records on (a) tenant history, (b) behavioural incidences including violence, (c) complaints against the tenant by other Housing ACT tenants, (d) complaints against the tenant by other members of the public, (e) incidences of damage to ACT government property, (f) mental health illness, (g) history of drug dependency, (h) any dependents, (i) marital or de-facto status and (j) criminal history.
- (2) What part of Housing ACT is responsible for maintaining tenant records.
- (3) How is tenant records information stored.
- (4) How is access to these records managed.

- (5) Can the Minister provide a copy of Housing ACT's privacy policy.
- (6) Can the Minister provide a copy of Housing ACT's organisation structure.
- (7) Can the Minister provide details of what each area/branch of Housing ACT is responsible for.
- (8) What part of Housing ACT is responsible for allocating tenancies.
- (9) How is a tenancy allocation decision made.
- (10) Can the Minister provide copies of the Housing ACT allocations policy.
- (11) Can the Minister provide details of any policies and procedures supporting Housing ACT allocation decisions.
- (12) Can the Minister provide details of any internally produced or externally sourced reports or studies into Housing ACT's allocation policy since 2016.
- (13) Can the Minister provide the standard position description for a Housing ACT Housing Manager ie, a Housing ACT employee responsible for inspecting Housing ACT assets and/or visiting Housing ACT tenants.
- (14) What types of induction training is provided to new Housing Managers.
- (15) What support counselling services are available to Housing Managers.

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

1.
 - a. to e., h., i.
Yes
 - f. g. j
Yes, if provided as part of their application for social housing assistance or to support their tenancy.
2. Tenant Experience is the primary unit responsible for tenant records but there are other business units such as Client Review and Response (reviews/ complaints) and Contract Management (maintenance/vacants/deceased estates) or Finance that will place records on either the citizen file, property file or make notations in the Homenet database.
3. Tenant information is stored on the citizen file, property file or within the Homenet Data base.
4. Staff receive access to certain areas of Homenet dependant on their roles and duties. The hard copy files are stored and managed by the Records Management Unit. A file request is made to this unit who then track the file to the staff member. Once returned it is tracked back into the Records Management Unit.
5. A copy of the Community Services Directorate Privacy Policy is available at https://www.communityservices.act.gov.au/home/full_privacy_statement

6. The Housing ACT structure is at Attachment One.
7. Housing ACT is structured in three branches as well as the *Executive, Government and Engagement* team which reports directly to the Executive Group Manager.

Client Services Branch

The Client Services Branch covers Tenant Experience, Gateway Services and Client Review and Response. This branch, through Gateway Services, is responsible for public housing applications and transfers, allocating properties, administering the Rental Bond Loan Scheme and Safer Families Assistance, Occupational Therapist assessments, tenant relocation and management of properties through the Housing Asset Assistance program. Through Tenant Experience the branch manages over 10,500 public housing tenancies.

This includes client services visits, processing rental rebates, managing complaints and linkages to supports. Client Review and Response includes Tribunal Services who look after legal matters for Housing ACT, process Freedom of information requests, Human Rights and Ombudsman matters as well as the Complaints and Information unit. Client Review and Response also manage the internal review processes.

Policy and Business Transformation

The Policy and Business Transformation branch is responsible for housing and homelessness policy through the Housing and Homelessness Strategy and Policy team, who work on matters of a local and commonwealth nature. The branch also includes Insight and Analytics who provide the data and reporting requirements. The remaining units within the branch are Business Solutions who manage Housing ACT systems, records management and facilitate the delivery of Housing ACT's digital strategy; and the Quality and Risk team who are responsible for quality assurance and broad risk management for the group.

Infrastructure and Contracts

This branch is responsible for the portfolio planning, building design and delivery of the public housing portfolio, working on projects such dedicated housing for older Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, Common Ground and Common Ground Dickson as well as the *Growing and Renewing Public Housing Program 2019-2024*. The branch looks after the procurement and governance process for contracts within Housing ACT with the Contract Management team, managing the total facilities contract for the maintenance and upgrading of the public housing portfolio and the Energy Efficiency Scheme.

The branch also includes the Homelessness Service Delivery team who work closely with the ACT Specialist Homelessness Sector to deliver over 50 programs through 28 organisations to provide important services to those in our community who need it most. Finance is also part of this branch managing financial and budget reporting matters alongside Capital and Strategy team, reporting on all capital projects, strategic financial projects and modelling and large development scenario options.

8. Gateway Services within the Client Services Branch is responsible for allocating public housing properties.
9. Information about the Housing ACT Allocations Policy is available at https://www.communityservices.act.gov.au/hcs/policies/allocations_policy

10. Information about the Housing ACT Allocations Policy is available at https://www.communityservices.act.gov.au/hcs/policies/allocations_policy
11. Allocation of homes to tenants is supported by the Public Housing Rental Assistance Program policy. The program is available at <https://www.legislation.act.gov.au/View/di/2013-52/current/PDF/2013-52.PDF>
12. No there have not been any internally produced or externally sourced reports or studies into Housing ACT's allocation policy since 2016.
13. A position description is at Attachment Two.
14. Housing Managers undertake a 10-day training and induction program. Housing Managers shadow more experienced officers when undertaking Client Service Visits and receive ongoing mentorship to develop core capabilities relevant to their role. Housing Managers continue their training and development through 31 online and facilitated learning pathways covering subjects that include Work Health and Safety, Cultural Awareness, Diversity Competence, Complaints Management and Reportable Conduct.
15. Housing Managers meet weekly with their managers to undertake performance and supervision discussions which provides a safe environment for discussions relating to health, safety, wellbeing and mental health. Housing Managers have access to Tenant Support and Community Connection Officers embedded within their teams to provide them with extra support and debriefing relating to complex, challenging or heightened clients. Housing Managers are encouraged and supported to record all adverse matters relating to the workplace on the ACT Government's Riskman system which initiates a review and implementation of short term and long-term preventative actions. In the event of a critical incident, external specialist counselling is arranged to debrief involved staff.

Additionally, Housing Managers, as with all ACT Government employees and their immediate families have access to the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) whenever they are experiencing personal or work-related difficulties. The EAP offers a safe place to discuss concerns with a professional in a confidential environment. The service provides an opportunity to deal with things before they get out of control, provides techniques to learn how to balance work and personal life, and support to work through personal and family issues.

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

Housing ACT—energy efficiency (Question No 3027)

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) How many Housing ACT dwellings (a) have and (b) do not have, an Energy Efficiency Rating (EER).
- (2) Can the Minister provide a volumetric breakdown by EER of Housing ACT (a) houses, (b) townhouses and (c) units.

- (3) How many Housing ACT dwellings (a) have and (b) do not have, solar panels.

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

1. (a) Housing ACT has EERs on 3,496 properties.
- (b) EERs on the remaining 8,274 properties are unknown currently. Housing ACT's EER data reflects information collected over time when properties are purchased from the market or constructed. Housing ACT builds all new properties compliant with EER legislation to a minimum of 6 EER.
2. The table below provides breakdown of properties and their respective EERs.

Rating ¹	0	0.5	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	5.5	6	6.5	7	Total
House	2	6	19	13	29	14	186	68	207	50	70	29	129	54	72	948
Townhouse	3	-	20	1	25	9	95	38	136	28	49	10	222	73	118	827
Flat	4	-	17	-	22	3	51	9	274	55	102	31	442	159	542	1,711
Other ²	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	3	-	-	10
Total	13	6	56	14	76	26	332	116	617	135	221	70	796	286	732	3,496

¹ EERs are at a point in time and do not reflect any subsequent improvements that may affect the rating

² Other includes boarding houses, share rooms and community rooms.

3. Housing ACT data does not currently include a component that allows for the reporting on the number of properties with solar panels across the portfolio.

In response to COVID-19, the ACT Government announced close to \$9.75 million in funding for a program of infrastructure projects that were ready to start immediately; projects that will support local jobs, businesses and the Canberra community through the pandemic.

As part of the program, \$365,000 has been allocated to the installation of solar panels on ten residential disability group homes and two larger complexes within public and community housing properties.

Housing ACT—maintenance (Question No 3028)

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) Can the Minister provide for the financial years (a) 2018-19 and (b) 2019-20 to 31 March 2020, the total Urgent (4) (i) maintenance items and (ii) maintenance items completed within four hours.
- (2) Can the Minister provide for the financial years (a) 2018-19 and (b) 2019-20 to 31 March 2020, the total Priority Next Day (i) maintenance items and (ii) maintenance items completed by 6 pm the next calendar day.
- (3) Can the Minister provide for the financial years (a) 2018-19 and (b) 2019-20 to 31 March 2020, the total Priority (D5) (i) maintenance items and (ii) maintenance items completed within five calendar days.

- (4) Can the Minister provide for the financial years (a) 2018-19 and (b) 2019-20 to 31 March 2020, the total Normal Repairs (D20) (i) maintenance items and (ii) maintenance items completed within 20 calendar days.

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

On 1 November 2018, the Total Facility Management (TFM) service contract was awarded to Programmed. To ensure consistency of work order classification between the two contracts, the below information includes only the Programmed works orders.

1. The contract with Programmed requires that a minimum of 94% of work orders are attended to and closed within 4 hours where there is an immediate risk to the property or tenant.
 - i. In 2018-19 financial year, 7,696 U4 works orders were raised and 7,025 completed within four hours. The remaining 671 required additional time to finalise the works and were completed shortly thereafter, or no longer required urgent attention and were rescheduled or cancelled.
 - ii. During the 2019-20 financial year up to 31 March 2020, 10,101 U4 works order were raised and 9,451 completed within 4 hours. The remaining 650 required additional time to finalise the works and were completed shortly thereafter, or no longer required urgent attention and were rescheduled or cancelled.
2. The contract with Programmed requires that a minimum of 94% of work orders are attended to and closed by 6pm the following day where there is the potential for an immediate risk to the property or tenant.
 - i. In 2018-19 financial year, 4,141 PND works orders were raised and 3,123 completed by 6pm the next day. The remaining 1,018 required additional time to finalise the works and were completed shortly thereafter, or no longer required urgent attention and were rescheduled or cancelled.
 - ii. During the 2019-20 financial year up to 31 March 2020, 4,813 PND works orders were raised and 3,846 completed by 6pm the next day. The remaining 967 required additional time to finalise the works and were completed shortly thereafter, or no longer required urgent attention and were rescheduled or cancelled.
3. The contract with Programmed requires that a minimum of 94% of work orders are attended to and closed within 5 days where the loss of amenity would cause a major inconvenience to the tenant
 - i. In 2018-19 financial year, 7,575 D5 works orders were raised and 4,697 completed within five days. The remaining 2,878 required additional time to finalise the works and were completed shortly thereafter, or no longer required attention within 5 days and were rescheduled or cancelled.
 - ii. During the 2019-20 financial year up to 31 March 2020, 10,745 D5 works orders were raised and 7,315 completed with five days. The remaining 3,430 required additional time to finalise the works and were completed shortly thereafter, or no longer required attention within 5 days and were rescheduled or cancelled.

4. The contract with Programmed requires that a minimum of 98% of work orders are attended to and closed within 20 days for all other repairs that are not uncovered above or part of the planned program (such as painting, kitchen upgrades etc.).
- i. In 2018-19 financial year, 10,038 D20 works orders were raised and 4,489 were completed within 20 days. The remaining 5,549 required additional time to finalise the works and were completed shortly thereafter or were rescheduled or cancelled.
 - ii. During the 2019-20 financial year up to 31 March 2020, 12,879 works orders were raised and 6,829 completed within 20 days. The remaining 6,050 required additional time to finalise the works and were completed shortly thereafter or were rescheduled or cancelled.

Gaming—point of consumption tax (Question No 3029)

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 5 June 2020 (*redirected to the Treasurer*):

- (1) What revenue has been collected since the Point-of-Consumption (POC) Tax on the three racing codes was introduced, broken into financial year.
- (2) Can the Minister provide any internal reports on plans or options to change the rate of the POC tax.

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

(1)

	2018-2019¹	YTD 2019-2020²
	\$'000	\$'000
Betting Operations Tax	5,269	10,140

1. Betting Operations Tax commenced 1 January 2019, hence only 6 months was collected in 2018-19.

2. Year to date as at May 2020.

Betting Operations Tax is a self-assessed point of consumption tax payable by all betting operators whose Net ACT Betting Revenue from ACT bets exceed the tax-free threshold. It includes all bets not just the three racing codes. The information collected to administer this tax does not detail the code the bet relates to. Hence this figure relates to all bets placed in the ACT, not just the three racing codes.

- (2) No work has been done on options to change the rate of the POC Tax.

Municipal services—play space upgrades (Question No 3030)

Mrs Kikkert: asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) What specific amenity upgrades and refresh works will be undertaken at the play spaces at (a) Totterdell Street (south), Belconnen, (b) Kesteven Street, Florey, (c) Tattersall Crescent, Florey, (d) Allman Crescent, Macquarie, (e) Vagabond Crescent, McKellar and (g) Flower Place, Melba.
- (2) For each play space referred to in part (1), can the Minister provide (a) if seating is being upgraded and refreshed, what kind and how much, (b) if shade infrastructure is being upgraded and refreshed, how many and where and (c) if new pieces of equipment are being upgraded and refreshed, what kind.
- (3) For each play space referred to in part (1), when (a) are these upgrades and refresh works expected to be completed or (b) were they completed, if they have already been done.
- (4) Are there now plans to undertake amenity upgrades and/or refresh works at any other play spaces in the Belconnen District; if so, can the Minister provide details as for those listed in parts (1) to (3).

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

1.

Totterdell Street (South), Belconnen	Kesteven Street, Florey	Tattersall Crescent, Florey	Allman Crescent, Macquarie	Vagabond Crescent, McKellar	Flower Place, Melba
Eastern seat replace timber and repaint, remove western seat and install stainless steel seat, new concrete footpath	Add certified playground soft fall, repaint equipment	Concrete base to sign, add certified playground soft fall, repaint equipment, tables and chairs, repair damaged concrete edging, redo whole granite seating area, install partial fence with gate to roadside edge, install stainless steel seat and repaint other seat	Replace raised edge timber, concrete base to sign, repaint equipment, remove existing bench seat and install stainless steel seat, extend path	Replace timber boarder, concrete base to sign, install certified playground soft-fall, paint equipment, install stainless steel seat	Repair damaged concrete boarder, concrete base to sign, remove gravel from soft-fall and add certified soft-fall, construct swale to redirect water, repaint equipment, remove and replace seat

2. (a)

Totterdell Street (South), Belconnen	Kesteven Street, Florey	Tattersall Crescent, Florey	Allman Crescent, Macquarie	Vagabond Crescent, McKellar	Flower Place, Melba
Install stainless steel seat	No	Install stainless steel seat and repaint other seat	Install stainless steel seat	Install stainless steel seat	Install stainless steel seat

(b)

Totterdell Street (South), Belconnen	Kesteven Street, Florey	Tattersall Crescent, Florey	Allman Crescent, Macquarie	Vagabond Crescent, McKellar	Flower Place, Melba
No	No	No	One new shade sail	No	No
Shade sails have also been installed in Dunlop, Greenway, Hughes, Isaacs, Isabella Plains and Monash					

(c)

Totterdell Street (South), Belconnen	Kesteven Street, Florey	Tattersall Crescent, Florey	Allman Crescent, Macquarie	Vagabond Crescent, McKellar	Flower Place, Melba
No new equipment installed; all equipment has been repainted	No new equipment installed; all equipment has been repainted	No new equipment installed; all equipment has been repainted	No new equipment installed; all equipment has been repainted	No new equipment installed; all equipment has been repainted	No new equipment installed; all equipment has been repainted

3. (a)

Totterdell Street (South), Belconnen	Kesteven Street, Florey	Tattersall Crescent, Florey	Allman Crescent, Macquarie	Vagabond Crescent, McKellar	Flower Place, Melba
Waiting on metal plates, works expected to be completed early July 2020.	Completed prior to 30 June 2020	Completed prior to 30 June 2020	Completed prior to 30 June 2020	Completed prior to 30 June 2020	Completed prior to 30 June 2020

(b) Refer to response above.

4.

Transport Canberra and City Services undertakes regular audits of playgrounds and has a recurring program of maintenance and refresh works that it conducts throughout the year. Further upgrades to playgrounds in the Belconnen district will be considered as part of this process.

Youth homelessness—government funding (Question No 3031)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 5 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development*):

- (1) How much has the ACT Government budgeted specifically for measures to address youth homelessness in each financial year from 2011–12 to 2018–19, inclusive.
- (2) How much in total was spent on measures to address youth homelessness in each financial year from 2011–12 to 2018–19, inclusive.
- (3) Can the Minister list specific measures funded, which government agency/ies or external service provider/s were responsible for the measure, and how much funding each measure received in each financial year from 2011–12 to 2018–19, inclusive.

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

In response to the above questions the following information is provided.

1. In 2011, following consultation with the youth homelessness sector, a procurement process was undertaken with seven new programs formed under the *Modernising Youth Homelessness Reform*. These programs reflect new models of services, incorporating a focus on early intervention at a point of crisis to prevent young people entering homelessness; and supporting young people in the community rather than in a service. Table 1 outlines funding for youth homelessness support from 2011-12 to 2018-19.

Table 1

2011-12* (GST & ERO exc)	2012-13 (GST & ERO exc)	2013-14 (GST & ERO exc)	2014-15 (GST & ERO exc)	2015-16 (GST & ERO exc)	2016-17 (GST exc, inc ERO where applicable & Indexation)	2017-18 (GST exc, inc ERO where applicable & Indexation)	2018-19 (GST exc, inc ERO where applicable & Indexation)
\$1,800,289	\$4,227,844	\$4,287,602	\$4,4709,71	\$4,541,122	\$4,875,870	\$5,035,826	\$5,250,038

Note: the 2011-12 figure reflects a part payment of funding from March to June 2012 as new services were established.

2. See question one.
3. To collect and assemble the requested information back to 2011-12 solely for the purposes of answering the question would require resources to be taken away from business as usual activities. Information on measures/ outputs is provided for 2018-19.

In 2018-19, the ACT Government allocated \$5.2 million to eight programs within the ACT Specialist Homelessness Sector that support young people. Programs include crisis accommodation, transitional housing, counselling and living skills.

Youth services in the ACT Specialist Homelessness Sector have extensive experience and expertise in supporting the unique needs of young people aged 16 to 26 years. Collectively, these programs provided 242 support places and 112 accommodation places at any one time. In addition, Gudan Gulwan Youth Aboriginal Corporation, received funding of \$80,624 from the ACT Government to support up to six young Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people at any one time.

Table 2

2018-19 Funding (Excl. GST, ERO; Incl. indexation*) *Indexation is cumulative	2018-19 ERO	Program Outputs
\$400,456.65	\$10,210.29	<p><u>Barnardos – Friendly Landlord Service (ages 16-25 years)</u> The service supports young people to engage with the private rental market by offering access to help to sustain a tenancy, mentorship, advocacy, life skills training, and warm referral services. Specifically, the service is contracted to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Services to a minimum of 80 young people at any one time; • Tenancy/Property Management for 30 properties used to accommodate 60 young people at any one time; and • Case Management Plans in place for 100% of service users where applicable.

\$330,812.11	\$8,434.59	<p><u>Barnardos - Youth Identified Accommodation and Support Program (YIASP) (ages 15-19 years)</u></p> <p>The service facilitates accommodation arrangements establishing agreements to respect both parties needs and interests; and provides rental assistance and to assist young persons to reside with a support family of choice (no accommodation provided directly). Specifically, the service is contracted to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Services to a minimum of 20 young people at any one time; and • Case Management Plans in place for 100% of service users where applicable.
\$503,944.48	\$13,426.95	<p><u>Barnardos - Our Place: Youth Integrated Education and Accommodation Service (ages 16-21 years)</u></p> <p>The service provides shared accommodation for young people through a foyer model including mentoring and life skills. Service users must be engaged in study to be eligible for the program. Support Services to a minimum of 24 young people at any one time. Specifically, the service is contracted to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenancy/Property Management for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 15 properties at any one time, including one used as an office; ○ Tenancy Management for 14 units to accommodate up to 24 young people at any one time; and • Case Management Plans in place for 100% of service users where applicable.
\$307,597.26	\$37,683.31	<p><u>CatholicCare - Youth Housing Support Service (ages 15-25 years)</u></p> <p>The service offers support including early intervention, outreach, case management and crisis support assisting young people to identify/respond to issues sustaining longer term accommodation. Specifically, the service is contracted to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Services to a minimum of 35 young people at any one time; and • Case Management Plans in place for 100% of service users where applicable.
\$284,382.42	\$0.00	<p><u>Conflict Resolution Service – “Family Tree House” Crisis Mediation Service (ages 13-20 years)</u></p> <p>The service provides crisis mediation focussed on resolving family conflict and keeping young people at home if safe to do so, including crisis support, mediation, outreach, warm referral and action plans. Specifically, the service provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Services to a minimum of 20 young people at any one time; and • Case Management Plans in place for 100% of service users where applicable.
\$2,576,847.78	\$334,776.53	<p><u>Salvation Army - Youth Emergency Accommodation Network (YEAN) (ages 16-25 years)</u></p> <p>The service provides supported emergency accommodation within a case management framework through four housing clusters (each with 3 houses) including 24/7 staffing for crisis support. Specifically, the service is contracted to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Services to a minimum of 24 young people; • Tenancy/property management for 12 properties; and • Case Management Plans in place for 100% of service users where applicable.

\$214,737.88	\$2,301.43	<p><u>St Vincent de Paul - Young Parents Accommodation Support Program (ages 16-25 years)</u></p> <p>Supported accommodation outreach and tenancy management support for young parents with children. Provides 4 accommodation places and support services for up to 24 young people at any one time. Specifically, the service is contracted to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Services to a minimum of 24 young people at any one time; • Tenancy/Property Management for four properties used to accommodate 4 young people (and their children) at any one time; and • Case Management Plans in place for 100% of service users where applicable.
\$179,915.61	\$32,472.06	<p><u>Ted Noffs – “Take Hold” Mentoring and Living Skills Program (ages 16-25 years)</u></p> <p>The service provides mentoring and life skills training for young people including individual advocacy and warm referral and support to access/maintain tenancies. Specifically, the service is contracted to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Services to a minimum of 15 young people at any one time; and • Case Management Plans in place for 100% of service users where applicable.

AIHW Specialist Homelessness Services Collection data shows over the past three years (from 2016-17 to 2018-19), the number of young clients (15 – 24 years old) accessing the ACT specialist homelessness sector has reduced by 20.4%.

ACT Health—expenditure (Question No 3032)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) In relation to the notifiable invoices register, what was the purpose for the payment of \$35,008.60 to Gartner Australasia Pty Ltd on 16-04-20 and why was it described as “Memberships”.
- (2) Why were various payments made in April 2020, totalling \$2,144,511.92, described collectively and generically as “Buildings & Fitout – WIP” with no further information provided and what was the purpose of each payment.
- (3) Why were two payments made in April 2020 to Shaw Building Group Pty Ltd totalling \$714,856.09 described generically as “Capital work project” with no further information provided and what was the purpose of each payment.
- (4) Why did it take (a) 42 days to pay the invoice for \$171,072.00 from the Australian National University and (b) 70 days to pay the invoice for \$26,499.00 from Lamson Concepts.
- (5) What contractor services were provided for the payments of (a) \$747,881.30 to Brookfield Global Integrated Solutions Pty Ltd and (b) \$754,170.21 to Progility Pty Ltd.

- (6) What medical equipment was supplied by Varian Medical Systems Australia for the payment of \$3,100,804.08 and why did it take 65 days to pay the invoice.
- (7) Why was the Health Care Consumers Association paid \$28,470.08 to have a representative on Design User Groups
- (8) Are the Design User Groups referred to in part (7) associated with SPIRE; if not, what are they associated with.
- (9) How many Design User Groups are there and (a) what is the purpose of each one, (b) who sits on each one, (c) who, other than public servants, is paid to sit on them and (d) how much is paid for this purpose.

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

- (1) Gartner Australasia Pty Ltd is a research and professional advisory organisation. The payment is for a 12-month professional membership which provides research, advisory support, training and professional development.
- (2) Canberra Health Services (CHS) categorises notifiable invoices into broad categories for the purposes of reporting. This categorisation is consistent with the approach used by a number of ACT Government Directorates and balances transparency with efficient business processes.

Breakdown of \$2,144,511.92 Buildings & Fitout – WIP is as follows:

(Data is available at the Chamber Support Office).

(3) Breakdown of \$714,856.09 Capital Works Projects is as follows:

(Data is available at the Chamber Support Office).

- (4)
 - (a) The delay in the payment to the Australian National University was because of:
 - A new team member learning the system in Accounts Payable Invoice Automation System.
 - The Executive Director for the Division who had to approve the invoiced expenditure was re-deployed to the COVID-19 response team and approval was ultimately redirected to the business manager.
 - (b) Delay in the payment to the Lamson Concepts was because the invoice was sent through to the incorrect person originally, taking a number of days to find its way to the correct team. Facilities Management then queried the invoice placing a hold on it for the company to reply, once they received the reply it was processed as per normal.
- (5)
 - (a) Brookfield Global Integrated Solutions Pty Ltd has been contracted to provide facilities management services at the University of Canberra Hospital including building maintenance, distribution and patient support, pest control, security, cleaning, maintaining gardens and grounds, help desk and food services.

- (b) Progility Pty Ltd has been contracted to provide CHS with a Clinical Communications Platform, hardware, support and maintenance. This includes the switchboard console.
- (6) Varian Medical Systems Australia was used to purchase the Medical Linear Accelerator (LINAC) machine. Due to the value of the order, the invoice required additional approvals processes which delayed payment.
- (7) The National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards (NSQHS) guidelines are utilised as part of the planning of health infrastructure at Canberra Hospital. The NSQHS guidelines establish the requirement for consumer input into the infrastructure planning and design process. Consistent with this requirement, the membership of the design user groups for the SPIRE Project includes consumer representatives, with representatives from the Health Care Consumers Association (HCCA). Consistent with the approach adopted by ACT Health Directorate and CHS, the relevant project makes payment to the HCCA when it provides representatives.
- (8) Yes.
- (9) In 2019, the project established 10 specialised user groups to inform the early planning and design for the new SPIRE facility. The user groups consist of approximately 120 clinicians, support staff, and consumer representatives. The user groups are facilitated by Major Projects Canberra and CHS, in addition to their teams of specialist health advisers.

The user groups provide advice and input into the following key aspects of the project's planning:

- Emergency Department
- Surgical Inpatient Unit
- Intensive Care Unit
- Medical Imaging
- Mental Health Short Stay Unit
- Perioperative and Interventional Suite
- Loading Dock and Logistics
- Helipad and Retrieval Service
- Acute Cardiac Care Unit and Interventional Cardiac Laboratories
- Central Sterilising Services

Clinicians participating in the user groups are not paid additional monies to be part of this planning process. Representatives from the Health Care Consumers Association (HCCA) are also part of the user group process and (as per the answer to question 7 above) the HCCA is paid for providing a representative for this process.

The SPIRE Project also has a series of key consultative groups that are informing the early planning and design process. One of those groups is the Consumer Reference Group (CRG), which provides guidance, advice and health service consumer insights on matters of design, accessibility, safety (including cultural safety) and amenity in relation to the SPIRE Project's building expansion design and construction. The CRG membership comprises representatives from:

- Health Care Consumers Association
- ACT Mental Health Coalition
- People with Disabilities ACT
- Council on the Ageing
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body
- Multicultural Advisory Council ACT
- Carers ACT

In accordance with the Territory's "Consumer, Carer and Community Representative Reimbursement" procedure (as attached), the members of the CRG are reimbursed for their participation in the CRG meetings.

Hospitals—emergency department performance (Question No 3034)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) Why were less than half of all people who presented to an emergency department during the second quarter of 2019-20 seen on time.
- (2) Why were less than 20 percent of patients in the urgent category who presented to The Canberra Hospital emergency department during the second quarter of 2019-20 seen on time.
- (3) Why has there been a deteriorating trend in the timeliness of emergency departments in the 20 years of the ACT Labor, and, latterly, the ACT Labor/Greens governments.
- (4) Noting the quarterly performance report on health services, for the second quarter of 2019-20 was due at the beginning of March 2020, more than two weeks before the public health emergency in the ACT was declared, why did the Minister, on 7 May 2020, in answer to a question without notice, which the Minister took on notice, about why the second quarter report was late, say "during March there were a lot of pressures across our entire health system" and having taken the question on notice, why did the minister repeat this reason in the answer provided on 21 May 2020 when she said "key health services personnel and ACTHD staff were being re-prioritised to manage the COVID-19 public health emergency".
- (5) Why was the report for the first quarter of 2019-20 late.
- (6) What reasons did the directorate give to the Minister as to the reasons for the lateness of the performance reports for the (a) first quarter and (b) second quarter of 2019-20.
- (7) What action did the Minister take and when did the minister take it, to follow up with the directorate as to why the reports for (a) the first quarter and (b) the second quarter of 2019-20 were not submitted on time, by the beginning of December 2019 and March 2020 respectively.
- (8) Noting the Minister told the Assembly on 7 May 2020 that she had "no reason to believe that there will be a delay in future reporting, but I will certainly keep an eye on it", (a) was the report delivered on time; if not, why was it late and when was it delivered and (b) what action did the Minister take, and when did she take it, to monitor and follow-up on its delivery.

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

(1-2)

Total Emergency Department (ED) presentations grew by 2.5 per cent in the first half of 2019-20 compared to the same period in 2018-19. However, the most urgent and complex presentations in triage Categories 1 to 3 increased significantly by 38.3 per cent, 18.8 per cent and 7.3 per cent respectively over the same period.

Canberra Health Services Emergency Department presentations remained high throughout this period. This can be seen in the graphic on page 14 when comparing Quarter 2 of 2019-20 to the same quarter of the previous year.

Canberra Health Services strategic planning includes hospital-wide actions targeting improvement in seen on time performance. Performance improvements have already been observed as these actions are being implemented.

- (3) Total Seen on Time (SoT) has been publicly available since 2006-07. As can be seen below, the SoT outcome has fluctuated over time. The Government has recognised that the results for 2017-18 and 2018-19 do not meet community expectations and has invested in infrastructure and staffing to increase ED capacity, while Canberra Hospital has also developed a Timely Care Strategy to address bed block and improve the patient experience.

Proportion of ED presentations seen on time (SoT) – ACT SoT is the percentage of patients starting treatment within the recommended timeframe for all triage categories combined.													
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
SoT (%)	54	58	60	62	55	55	51	61	59	59	62	49	46
Data source: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) reports on <i>Emergency Department Care</i> 2006-07, 2008-09, 2012-13, 2017-18 and 2018-19.													

There are many factors that can impact emergency department performance, including:

- growth in emergency department presentations:
 - AIHW data shows that ACT ED presentations grew by around 4 per cent per year on average over this reporting period.
 - In several years, presentations growth exceeded 5 per cent and in 2016-17 exceeded 6 per cent;
- increasing hospital admissions and complexity of patient presentations.

In addition to work on the Timely Care Strategy, the Government is investing in additional staffing and infrastructure to improve emergency department performance, including:

- an additional two senior staff specialists for Canberra Hospital's ED;
- 12 additional beds at Canberra Hospital to reduce bed block;
- increasing Calvary Public Hospital Bruce's ED capacity by 50 per cent (22 treatment spaces), with new spaces having opened in a staged way during 2020, increasing the ACT hospital system's overall ED capacity by 20 per cent;
- providing alternative forms of clinical treatment through walk-in centres to allow the right treatment in the right place;

- investing in initiatives such as Hospital in the Home (HITH), and the Geriatric Rapid Acute Care Evaluation (GRACE) program, which provides treatment in residential aged care facilities and aims to reduce emergency department presentations and hospital admissions;
 - communicating strategies and educating consumers on their treatment options as an alternative to emergency; and
 - targeting initiatives for known high demand periods, such as during flu seasons.
- (4) As described in response to QON No. 10 from the 2018 19 Annual and Financial Reports process, the ACT Health Directorate aims for Quarterly Performance Reports (QPR) to be published 70 80 calendar days following the end of each quarter. It is therefore not accurate to state that the Quarter 2 QPR was due at the beginning of March 2020.

As per my response to a question taken on notice on 7 May 2020, dated 21 May, my office received the draft QPR on 31 March. This is approximately two weeks after the report was due. Release was subsequently delayed because I sought additional information and analysis.

It is important to note in regard to these timeframes that the World Health Organization declared the novel coronavirus outbreak a public health emergency of international concern on 30 January 2020. The first COVID-19 case confirmed in Australia was 25 January. While the COVID-19 pandemic was declared a public health emergency in the ACT in mid-March, key health services personnel and ACTHD staff were being re-prioritised to manage the ACT response to the COVID-19 pandemic well before this declaration.

- (5) The Quarter 1 2019-20 QPR was published on 18 December 2019. This is within the 70 to 80 calendar day timeframe described in response to QON No. 10 from the 2018 19 Annual and Financial Reports process. Please refer to this response for the background to this timeframe.
- (6) (a) N/A – see response to question 5 above.
- (b) See response to question 4 above.
- (7) (a) N/A – see response to question 5 above.
- (b) During March 2020, I was conscious that the nation and ACT were facing a global pandemic of a kind not experienced in any of our lifetimes. While I and my office continued to monitor business as usual activity, including the production of the QPR, my view was, and remains, that effectively responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency was the highest priority.
- (8) (a) Please refer to response to QON 3064, dated 6 July 2020. In addition to the information provided in that response, senior staff in Digital Solutions Division were engaged during the relevant period in finalising the tender process for the new Digital Health Record.

As anticipated in the response to QON 3064, the report was received in my office on 10 July. An error in data presentation was identified and an updated report was received in my office on 16 July and released on 17 July.

- (b) I and my office regularly seek advice on the progress of QPRs. As noted in the response to part (a), the delivery of the Quarter 3 QPR was in line with the response to QON 3064.

**Planning—status of projects
(Question No 3037)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) For the “Planning framework supporting delivery of Stage 2 of Light Rail to Woden” project, what (a) is the current status of the project and (b) are the next steps and when are they expected to occur.
- (2) For the upcoming land release at Watson sections 74 and 76, what (a) is the current status of preparations for land release and (b) are the next steps and when are they expected to occur.
- (3) For the Western Edge Study, what (a) is the current status of the project and (b) are the next steps and when are they expected to occur.
- (4) For the Planning Review, what (a) is the current status of the project and (b) are the next steps and when are they expected to occur.

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

- (1) a) The Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) will seek to engage consultants to undertake planning and technical studies on the City to Woden corridor in the coming weeks.

b) Following completion of the consultant’s planning and technical studies on the City to Woden corridor, the City to Woden Planning Framework will be developed in 2021. The Planning Framework will be informed by planning and technical studies, and community consultation to be undertaken in 2021.
- (2) a) The due diligence studies required for the land release of both sites are substantially completed. The planning studies have taken into account the outcomes from the 2018 community engagement and the Watson Community Association’s ‘2019 Plan for Watson’.

b) To allow for residential use on the sites the zoning needs to be changed. A draft variation to the Territory Plan is required. This will follow the usual Territory Plan variation process, which includes community comment on the proposed zoning changes, as set out in the *Planning and Development Act 2007*.
- (3) a) A number of preliminary and background investigations have commenced to assess the suitability of the western edge of Canberra to potentially accommodate new residential areas. These investigations include existing infrastructure, landscape character and visual assessment, air quality, bushfire risk, cultural heritage, ecological and water values.

- b) The outcomes of these investigations will lead to and inform further investigations including environmental surveys in the current multi-year program.
- (4) a) The ACT Planning Review and Reform Project is underway. The project is taking an integrated approach with an initial strengthening of the current planning framework to enable a long-term transition toward a clearer and more flexible planning system. As a result of the review work to date, five focus areas have been identified that provide the framework to address gaps, challenges and opportunities to move toward an improved planning system. The five focus areas are: system structure; strategic planning; development controls; development assessment; and system operation.
- b) EPSDD will continue to work on the review through 2020 and 2021.
-

Trees—removal (Question No 3038)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 5 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for City Services*):

- (1) Have any trees needed to be cut down for the initial phase of the 5G network rollout; if so, were any of these on private land and can the Minister provide the details.
- (2) Were any of these regulated or registered tree; if so, can the Minister provide details.
- (3) Is the ACT Government aware of whether any trees will need to be removed as part of the remainder of the rollout of the 5G network; if so, (a) will any of these be on private land, (b) has a process been developed, or will there be, regarding what trees are protected and which ones might be removed and (c) will the ACT Government require telecommunications companies to replant a smaller tree, or plant a tree elsewhere to offset any tree removal.

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

- (1) Zero.
 - (2) See above.
 - (3) Transport Canberra and City Services is not aware that any trees will need to be removed as part of the rollout of the 5G network.
-

Children and young people—care and protection (Question No 3039)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

For the most recent year that data is available for, and for each of the preceding four years, can the Minister provide information about (a) how many times parents of children in the care and protection system have requested information about why decisions have

been made in relation to their children's care using the Freedom of Information process, (b) how many of these requests have been granted and (c) how many of these requests have been denied.

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

The below data includes parents and kinship carers requesting access to information about their children/family who have been involved with Children and Youth Protection Services. Note however this data does not solely include parents with children who have been removed from their care.

Data is collected by financial year.

a.

Time Period	Applications received with the above criteria
July 2015 – June 2016	16
July 2016 – June 2017	22
July 2017 – June 2018	11
July 2018 – June 2019	42
July 2019 – May 2020	16

b.

Time Period	Applications granted in line with the Act
July 2015 – June 2016:	14
July 2016 – June 2017:	18
July 2017 – June 2018:	2
July 2018 – June 2019:	27
July 2019 – May 2020:	11

c.

Number	Cause	Detail
July 2015 – June 2016		
1	Withdrawn	Information being sought was classified as sensitive under the <i>Children and Young People Act 2008</i> i.e Child Concern Report
1	Access Refused	Child Concern Reports
July 2016 – June 2017		
2	Withdrawn	Information being sought was classified as sensitive under the <i>Children and Young People Act 2008</i> i.e. Child Concern Report or Accessed via a different avenue
2	Access Refused	Child Concern Reports
July 2017 – June 2018		
4	Invalid	No ID being provided
4	Withdrawn	Informal or access information via a different avenue, e.g. informally
1	Access Refused	Child Concern Reports.

July 2018 – June 2019		
1	Invalid	No ID being provided
1	Closed	Unable to contact with the applicant after receipt of their application
1	Access Refused	Health Records
1	Informal	Processed informally
3	Combined/Withdrawn	4 applications combined into 1 with 3 withdrawn
4	Withdrawn	Classified as sensitive under the <i>Children and Young People Act 2008</i>
4	Access Refused	Child Concern Reports
July 2019 – May 2020		
1	Withdrawn	Information sought was captured within an application already received from the applicant.
4	Access Refused	Child Concern Reports or third-party personal information.

Municipal services—fix my street (Question No 3040)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) How many staff are allocated to the Fix My Street request management.
- (2) How long is the average email response to Fix My Street.
- (3) What is the average time taken to fix these requested issues.
- (4) How many Fix My Street requests are there each month and what is the breakdown of these requests by the category of (a) cycle and footpaths, (b) grass, trees and shrubs, (c) parks and public spaces, (d) roads, parking and vehicles, (e) streetlights, (f) water and (g) other.

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

- (1) Fix My Street allows a member of the public to raise an incident about a topic. Workflows built within the system automatically direct correspondence to the responsible area of government. No staff perform this function.
- (2) As the system cannot output an average word count for each response type, the analysis required to answer this question would require an unreasonable diversion of resources, especially in light of COVID-19 business continuity priorities.
- (3) Between 1 July 2019 to 31 May 2020, there were 20 Fix My Street requests directed to teams within Access Canberra, and therefore within my portfolios, for a response. The average resolution time for these requests was 14.11 calendar days. These 20 incidents related to reports of illegal parking and the time to resolution includes any investigation required to verify issues linked with the report received.

(4) Please see table below.

Category	Jul 19	Aug 19	Sep 19	Oct 19	Nov 19	Dec 19	Jan 20	Feb 20	Mar 20	Apr 20	May 20
Cycle Footpath	287	356	293	294	332	300	359	450	390	463	505
Grass Trees Shrubs	425	421	464	722	929	560	1017	837	740	832	762
Parks and public places	224	221	211	258	271	219	257	276	289	262	310
Roads Parking and Vehicles	1043	1101	992	1078	924	893	944	1210	1039	906	984
Streetlights	646	445	307	314	255	260	248	358	351	446	428
Water	100	114	107	93	95	91	193	248	196	167	143
Other	13	14	7	4	14	7	10	6	4	1	7

Transport—integrated network (Question No 3046)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

- (1) What is the current status of the development of the “Moving Canberra: Integrated Transport Strategy” process.
- (2) When will the final strategy be released.

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

- (1) The Government consulted on Moving Canberra between December 2018 and March 2019.

Since the public consultation, a number of changes have occurred within our transport network. Most significantly, the introduction of the Climate Change Strategy (the Strategy) that sets the goal of zero net emissions by 2045 in the ACT. Public transport in the ACT accounts for 60% of all Government emissions, and as a result of the Strategy all diesel buses will be phased out by 2040, to ensure a smooth transition the work is being guided by our Zero Emission Bus Transition plan which is currently in development.

Other changes as such as the opening of Light Rail, the commencement of the 2019 bus network, and more recently the impacts of COVID-19 have seen fundamental changes to our travel behaviours.

The Government is now considering these developments alongside the feedback received from the consultation before finalising the Transport Strategy.

- (2) The final strategy will be released later this year once due consideration has been given to these issues listed above.

**Energy—gas connections
(Question No 3047)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability, upon notice, on 5 June 2020:

What is the number of dwellings in the ACT, by dwelling type, (a) connected to the natural gas network and (b) not connected to the natural gas network.

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

- (a) In 2016 the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) recorded 155,263 private dwellings in the ACT¹, with 95,520 'separate houses'; 25,280 'semi-detached or townhouse' type dwellings; 21,405 'flats or apartments' and 194 'other dwellings'. The Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorates integrated emissions reduction pathways model, used to inform the development of the *ACT Climate Change Strategy 2019-2025*, projected the number of total private dwellings to reach 166,863 in the year 2020.

At the end of Q2 2019-20 the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) recorded 124,520 residential gas customers in the ACT, between the three gas retailers – Evoenergy, Energy Australia and Origin Energy². In its Gas Network 2021 Draft Plan, Evoenergy reports a total of 150,000 residential and small business gas customers in the ACT³. This number is larger than the number quoted by AER because it includes small business as well as residential connections. The number of gas customers in Q2 2019-20 cannot be reconciled with the 2016 ABS household dwelling data, as the data for gas connections is not specified at the dwelling type level, nor is it applicable across years.

- (b) The number of dwellings in the ACT connected to the natural gas network is best estimated using the data reported by the AER for residential gas customer connections, however; the number of *dwellings* not connected to the gas network cannot be definitively stated.

¹ https://quickstats.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2016/quickstat/CED801

² <https://www.aer.gov.au/retail-markets/performance-reporting/retail-energy-market-performance-update-for-quarter-2-2019-20>

³ <https://www.evoenergy.com.au/-/media/evoenergy/about-us/gas-5-year-plan/evoenergy---gn21-draft-plan-2021-26.pdf?la=en&hash=D04BBDE11D4BCD148225DFC1B8A3E452BC3E5B15>

**Environment—Mugga Lane tip
(Question No 3048)**

Ms Lawder asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) Can the Minister please advise when the ACT Government and/or its contractors changed from capping the Mugga Lane Resource Management Centre tip face with soil, to capping the tip face with tarpaulins.

1(2) What was the reasoning behind this change taking place.

- (3) How thick is the tarpaulin.
- (4) Can the Minister provide a copy of the (a) operating procedures for use of the tarpaulin, (b) plans for, and results of, the trial of the use of the tarpaulin and (c) documentation for application, and approval of the change to the Environmental Authorisation relating to the change from using soil for capping to tarpaulin.
- (5) How many complaints have been made regarding the tip smell since the beginning of 2016.
- (6) Can the Minister provide a breakdown, by how many complaints each year in this period (as outlined in the Environmental Authorisation), including those passed on from the Environment Protection Authority to the Authorisation holder.
- (7) Can the Minister provide a copy of the (a) guidelines and any documentation for the system to deal with odour complaints and other odour-related issues and (b) program and results of field odour surveys around the site boundary.
- (8) Can the Minister provide the annual report (as required by the Environmental Protection Authority) for (a) Remondis (EA 0375) and (b) ACT NoWaste (EA 0402), for the years to end of June (i) 2015, (ii) 2016, (iii) 2017, (iv) 2018 and (v) 2019.

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

- (1) On 16 July 2019, the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) approved a 12 month trial on covering the tip face with tarpaulins, an alternate day cover to soil. The trial is for the period 1 September 2019 to 1 September 2020. Remondis starting using the Tarpomatic system on 3 September 2019.
- (2) Remondis Australia requested the use of a tarpaulin cover technology (*Tarpomatic* system) instead of soil, as day cover, a requirement under their contract with ACT NoWaste for the operation of the Mugga Lane landfill. An essential part of landfilling operations is the placement of cover over wastes. The purpose of daily cover is to:
 - minimise landfill odours
 - control litter
 - prevent the spread of fire
 - control disease vectors such as birds, flies, mosquitoes and rodents
 - ensure that the landfill is trafficable

Traditionally daily cover has been in the form of soil. Materials other than soil, such as foams, mulch, papier-mâché, gravel or cover mats, may also achieve these purposes and may meet other operational needs. However, alternate cover materials to soil should only be used when an assessment of their appropriateness for use at that specific landfill has been undertaken by the landfill operator and the use of those materials approved by the EPA. This is the purpose of the trial, notwithstanding tarpaulin cover technology is widely used throughout landfill sites both nationally and internationally.

- (3) The *Tarpomatic* system being trialled by Remondis is approximately 0.60 mm thick based on a weight of 340 grams per square metre (gsm) and is classified as a super

heavy duty tarpaulin. As a comparison, a light duty blue tarpaulin is 80gsm with an approximate thickness of 0.06mm and medium duty silver tarpaulins are approximately 200gsm with an approximate thickness of 0.25mm.

(4) (a) No, the Tarpomatic Trail Methodology (Methodology) is a proprietary product and as such is Commercial in Confidence.

(b) No, plans are not required to be submitted. The trial is managed in accordance with the Methodology.

The trial has not been completed. A final report on the trial is due to the EPA by 30 September 2020.

(c) There has been no change to Environmental Authorisation (EA) No. 0375. Under clause 25.8 of the EA, Remondis must cover and uncover the active tipping face on a daily basis using soil or another material as approved by the EPA.

On 12 June 2019, Remondis applied to the EPA to use an alternate daily cover (ADC), the *Tarpomatic* system, instead of using soil. Final EPA approval was issued on 16 July 2019.

(5) Since the beginning of 2016, Access Canberra received 124 odour complaints alleging the source to be Mugga Lane Resource Management Centre (MLRMC) as follows:

- 2016 – 83
- 2017 – 28
- 2018 – 7
- 2019 – 3
- 2020 – 3

For 2016, of the 83 complaints, 58 of these were from your office, with 50 of these being anonymous.

For the period 2016 to 2020, there has been a significant decrease in the number of odour complaints received alleging the source to be the Mugga Lane Resource Management Centre. 70% of complaints received for the period 2016 to 2020 have come from your office, 86% of which have been anonymous.

(6) Please refer to the response to question 5.

(7) (a) All complaints received by the EPA and other parts of Access Canberra are managed initially by the Access Canberra Complaints Management Team.

In response to previous odour complaints, the activities at the MLRMC have been investigated by the EPA with operations being found compliant with their approvals and operations being undertaken to minimise odour.

As a result of previous investigations all complaints received by the EPA from the Complaints Management Team are handled as a desktop exercise. On receiving a complaint, the EPA contacts the operators on the site to ascertain if there have been any significant operational events (planned or unplanned) which would impact on odour generation.

The EPA will only escalate their response if anomalies are raised as a result of the initial enquiry. This would include whether there are identified non-compliance with agreed operational conditions or there has been a significant environmental incident. To date all responses received have indicated no events have occurred which would demonstrate unsatisfactory operation resulting in the need for further investigation.

It is not feasible for these facilities to be zero emitters of odour and under certain climatic conditions, odour may be detected beyond the MLRMC boundary. However, the EPA will continue to monitor the situation to ensure all operators in the MLRMC are compliant with their environmental approvals.

- (b) Odour modelling undertaken by ACT NoWaste as part of the Environmental Impact Statement for the landfill expansion shows that odour impacts would be acceptable for nearby built up and residential areas, essentially attenuation through a distance of over one kilometre. As a comparison, the ACT Governments Separation Distance Guidelines for Air Emissions only specifies a separation distance of 500 metres for a landfill.

Notwithstanding this, ACT NoWaste as the asset owner have been concerned by the increase in odour complaints from the MLRMC in recent years and in late 2017 established a program to undertake routine odour monitoring of the MLRMC and surrounding areas.

The purpose of the work is to proactively conduct a series of ambient odour field surveys to assess the intensity of odours in the area surrounding the MLRMC, and undertake infield gas measurements to quantify the effectiveness of the tarpaulin covers being trialled by Remondis with approval from the EPA.

To date, eight rounds of monitoring have been undertaken as follows:

- Round 1 – 21, 22 and 23 December 2017
- Round 2 – 19, 20 and 21 June 2018
- Round 3 – 17, 18 and 19 December 2018
- Round 4 – 17, 18 and 19 June 2019
- Round 5 – 27, 28 and 29 August 2019
- Round 6 – 26, 27 and 28 November 2020
- Round 7 – 25, 26 and 27 February 2020
- Round 8 – 2, 3 and 4 June 2020

These surveys showed the findings of field odour surveys in relation to odour sources within MLRMC and surrounding areas and they identify approximate extent of the odour plume downwind of the identified sources and presents the odour characteristics of the odours emitted from these sources.

The surrounding industries may also contribute to the odour types and sources and include:

- Boral asphalt plant – bitumen, asphalt odours - 1,100 m
- Re.Group Material Recovery Facility – garbage, putrid odours - 290 m
- Hume asphalt plant – bitumen odours - 1,450 m
- Dry waste facility – no odours emanated - 1,150 m

The odour surveys revealed that the odour intensities observed beyond the MLRMC boundary were *Distinct*, *Weak*, *Very Weak* and *Non-perceptible* in the nearest residential area and industrial park. No odour has been found at the *Strong*, *Very Strong* or *Extremely Strong* intensity.

The 'Distinct' and 'Weak' odours could prove to be a possible cause for nuisance if kept unchecked (which can become more likely in situations where complainants become sensitised to the odour).

In addition to the above works, a short infield surface gas monitoring program in the vicinity of the active cells within the MLRMC using a gas detector has also been established. The purpose of this monitoring program was to quantify the gases released from the active landfill cells in order to monitor the performance of the tarpaulin covers. The monitoring program conducted in this round focused on measuring the infield concentrations of hydrogen sulphide (H₂S).

To date four rounds of monitoring has been undertaken and it is recommended that the program is continued on an ongoing basis. Furthermore, odour samples were also collected using the AS/NZS 4323.4 Flux chamber technique to quantify the effects of the tarpaulin covers on the odour emissions from the surface of the landfill cells.

On analysis of the odour samples, it was observed that the use of tarpaulin covers causes a significant reduction in odour emissions. However, caution should be used in reporting exact reduction effectiveness as some odour leakage may occur around the edges of the tarpaulin but a clear inhibiting ability (probably greater than 50%) in reducing odour emissions was identified. The results of this work will be considered by the EPA in the evaluation of the Tarpaulin trial.

(8) (a)

- (i) **2014/2015** – there is no Annual Report for end 2015 because the requirement for an Annual Report was only included in the EA in September 2016.
- (ii) **2015/2016** – see response above.
- (iii) **2016/2017** – report attached ([Attachment A](#)).
- (iv) **2017/2018** – report attached ([Attachment B](#)).
- (iv) **2018/2019** – report attached ([Attachment C](#)).

- (b) EA No. 0402 is the former Stromlo landfill that was used as the repository for building demolition waste from fire affected residential build sites from the 2003 Canberra bushfires. The site opened and closed in 2003 with no requirement for Annual report as it was an emergency landfill.

- (i) N/A
- (ii) N/A
- (iii) N/A
- (iv) N/A
- (v) N/A

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

**Suburban Land Agency—sales
(Question No 3049)**

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

For sales that the Suburban Land Authority (SLA) settled in the financial years of (a) 2017-18, (b) 2018-19 and (b) 2019-20 to 31 March 2020, made to (i) SLA contracted valuers, (ii) SLA contracted suppliers, (iii) SLA staff, (iv) SLA Board members, could the Minister provide details of (A) property address, (B) settlement date, (C) sales price, (D) list price, (E) any capital valuations obtained related to the pricing of the property, (F) whether a conflict of interest was declared or not and (G) the date of the conflict of interest declaration.

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

In relation to contracted valuers and contracted suppliers, the Suburban Land Agency (SLA) engages a range of suppliers most of whom have no access to information that is not publicly available. It would be onerous for the SLA to get the names of all parties who had worked for SLA contractors in order to confirm they have not bought land. The ACT Government Purchase of Goods Agreement includes provisions requiring that: *'The Supplier warrants that no conflict of interest exists or is likely to arise in the performance of the Services and its other obligations under this Deed and must, if a conflict or risk of conflict arises, notify the Territory and comply with any requirement of the Territory to eliminate or deal with that conflict or risk'*.

Only one SLA staff member purchased land that the SLA settled between 2017-18 and 2019 20. The property address has not been provided for privacy reasons, however the block settled on 12 April 2018. It was sold at auction for \$720,000 with an undisclosed reserve of \$570,000. Consistent with the SLA's valuations policy, two independent valuations were obtained for the property. The staff member completed an intent to purchase land declaration on 27 February 2018. The staff member was not involved in the valuation, price setting, sales or marketing processes for the block.

No SLA Board members have purchased land from the SLA.

**Suburban Land Agency—sales
(Question No 3050)**

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

Can the Minister provide details for (a) 2017-18, (b) 2018-19 and (c) 2019-20 year to date, for all non-residential sales where the company selling the property for the Suburban Land Authority also provided a valuation to inform pricing and/or auctions reserves on the same property in relation to (i) date of sale, (ii) property address, (iii) property zoning, (iv) name of the company and (v) name of the entity that bought the property.

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

During the time periods in question there have not been any occurrences where a company selling a property on behalf of the Suburban Land Agency has also been engaged to provide valuation advice that has been used to determine pricing.

Planning—development applications (Question No 3051)

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) In relation to a possible development on Block 2 Section 57 Greenway, for an eight-storey complex of 144 units at 305 Anketell Street (currently zoned as CZ2 according to ACTMAPI), who is the current owner of the lease located at Block 2 Section 57 Greenway?
- (2) What will be the process and cost of having it reclassified into a residential zone category suitable for an eight-storey residential structure or greater, assuming the zone classification reflected in ACTMAPI is correct.
- (3) What would be the appropriate residential zone category for an eight-storey residential structure.
- (4) How many storeys are generally permissible for a development proposal under RZ4 or RZ5.
- (5) If a development application (DA) is submitted for this development, what community consultation would be expected (or required) to occur during the DA consultation period.
- (6) What action is taken in regard to the community feedback on a DA.
- (7) Would action be taken to have a DA modified in response to community feedback.
- (8) What is the process and steps that the DA proponent must take in order to have the block (Block 2 Section 57) reclassified to another zone category eg RZ4 or RZ5 compared with the current CZ2.
- (9) Is it possible for the proponent to subsequently seek a variation to the number of storeys previously approved once a DA is approved for a specified number of storeys within a residential zone category.
- (10) Would the change referred to in part (9) require a completely new DA or a variation to the previously approved DA.
- (11) Would a new round of public consultation be required.
- (12) If there was significant public concern with a development of the nature that might be proposed for Block 2 Section 57 Greenway, what role would the Government have in conducting further public consultations or in mediation between the

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

- (1) The current lessee of Block 2 Section 57 Greenway is Simunic Brothers No 3 Pty Ltd.
- (2) The Commercial CZ2: Business Zone permits residential use and is currently zoned appropriately for an eight storey residential structure.
- (3) The Residential RZ5 High Density Residential Zone is the residential zone that permits the highest density. The Commercial Zone already permits residential use and therefore a TPV is not required to change the zone to Residential.
- (4) As a rule, RZ4 permits a maximum 3 storey height and RZ5 permits up to a maximum 6 storey height. Both rules in the Multi-unit Housing Development Code have a relevant criterion that if met could permit a greater height.
- (5) After a DA has been lodged in the merit track or impact track, the application must be notified to the public. Major notification requires letters to be sent to the adjoining neighbours and a sign placed on the site. The application will be on public notification for a period of at least 15 working days.
- (6) The decision maker must consider each representation received by the authority in relation to the application that has not been withdrawn. Representations are provided to the applicant and they may choose to respond to the matters raised.
- (7) Action may be taken to require a DA to be modified through a conditional approval.
- (8) The process for changing a zone is through a Territory Plan variation as described at https://www.planning.act.gov.au/planning-our-city/territory_plan/varying-the-territory-plan
- (9) Yes.
- (10) Either is possible. An application to amend the approval under S197 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007* may be considered if the decision maker is satisfied after the amendment, the development approved will be substantially the same as the development for which approval was originally given. Otherwise a completely new DA could be made.
- (11) A completely new DA would require a new round of public notification. A S197 amendment results in public notification unless waived under S198B of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*.
- (12) The planning and land authority may give public notice to extend the public notification period. The authority may also require public notification of any amendments to a proposed development.

However, it is incumbent on the proponent to respond to the representations received and should they choose to seek approval to amend their development proposal. It is not the role of the planning and land authority to mediate an outcome between the community and the DA proponent.

**ACT building levy—revenue
(Question No 3052)**

Mr Parton asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) How much has the ACT Building Levy raised in the financial years of (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17, (c) 2017-18, (d) 2018-19 and (e) 2019-20 year to date.
- (2) What was the total cost of running the construction compliance, licensing and regulation functions within Access Canberra in the financial years of (a) 2015-16, (b) 2016-17, (c) 2017-18, (d) 2018-19 and (e) 2019-20 year to date.

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

- (1) (a) \$19,036,924
(b) \$17,802,263
(c) \$20,420,670
(d) \$23,041,997
(e) \$19,325,407 (as at 30 June 2020)
- (2) The structuring of Access Canberra and allocation of staff to multiple legislative functions at varying points of time, makes the calculation of staff dedicated purely to construction compliance, regulation and licensing difficult to calculate, as well as support functions, such as data services, client service and community education engagement, which form an integral part of the regulation of the construction industry. It would therefore be an unreasonable diversion of resources.

**Canberra Hospital—engineering reports
(Question No 3053)**

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) How many engineering reports have been commissioned relating to The Canberra Hospital (TCH) during 2020 to the date on which this question was published on the Questions on Notice Paper.
- (2) Who has been commissioned to perform each report, what is the topic of the report, how much will it cost and what is the due date for delivery of the report.
- (3) How many engineering reports have been received related to TCH during (a) 2019, (b) 2018, (c) 2017 and (d) 2016.
- (4) Who prepared each report referred to in part (3), what is the topic of each report and how much did it cost.

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

- (1) 21.

- (2) See Attachment A. Reports have been finalised and funded through several funding sources including project delivery allocations and Canberra Health Services Facilities Management. Engineering reports are generally commissioned through a diversity of projects and the associated costs are not able to be separated out from broader project costs.
- (3) (a) 2019: 14
(b) 2018: 27
(c) 2017: 37 and
(d) 2016: 34.
- (4) Refer to response in Question two.

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

Planning—Ginninderry (Question No 3055)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development*):

- (1) In relation to the Ginninderry Development on Parkwood Road, is green waste services provided by Canberra Sand and Gravel relocating as a result of the ongoing Ginninderry Development; if so, is the ACT Government able to advise the nature of the development at this location (ie whether the area will be developed as playing fields or apartment complexes).
- (2) When is development of this area planned to commence.

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

- (1) Green waste services provided by Canberra Sand and Gravel are relocating. The development at this location is dependent on environmental testing which is currently underway. Ginninderry has commenced preliminary master planning works for this area.
- (2) Future development is planned to commence from 2022 when Transport Canberra and City Services has completed the capping of the West Belconnen Landfill.

Heritage Festival—COVID-19 (Question No 3056)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) Given that the 2020 Heritage Festival website currently includes the statement 'We hope to reschedule the Festival later this year', based on current expert health advice, is it the Minister's expectation that the festival will take place at some point this year, or is it more likely that the 2020 festival will be cancelled.

- (2) What steps are currently being taken to prepare for the festival to take place later this year and what is the expected date.
- (3) What changes or alterations to the festival are being considered in order to allow it to take place later this year.
- (4) What plans have been made (or are in development) to allow for the festival to be held in a COVID-safe way.
- (5) When does the Minister expect a final decision of the fate of the 2020 festival to be made and/or announced.

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

- (1) The 2020 Canberra and Region Heritage Festival has been cancelled.
- (2) N/A
- (3) N/A
- (4) N/A
- (5) The decision to cancel the 2020 Heritage Festival was made on 16 June 2020. Stakeholders have been directly notified and the public informed on 18 June 2020 via announcements on the website and social media. Planning is underway to deliver the 2021 festival.

Children and young people—adoptions (Question No 3057)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) How is the timeliness of the domestic adoption process measured for known child adoptions in the ACT.
- (2) Over the past five financial years, what has been the measured timeliness of this kind of adoption for (a) all known child adoptions in the ACT, (b) known child adoptions of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander background and (c) known child adoptions of non-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander background.

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

1. The making of an adoption order for a child or young person in the ACT is one that is carefully considered by the ACT Supreme Court. Each adoption process is unique and requires the applicant to demonstrate that the adoption is in the best interests of the child or young person. This process differs for each individual child, and as such cannot be measured by a timeline.

The process of seeking an adoption order for a child or young person in the care of the Director-General includes, but not limited to, the following:

- obtaining consent from the birth parents is a requirement, as is the case for all adoptions in Australia. Often this requires the identification and location of one of the birth parents;
- if consent is not obtained voluntarily, a request for dispensation of the birth parents' consent must be lodged with the Supreme Court by providing compelling evidence to demonstrate that the adoption is in the child's best interest. At any stage, the child's birth parents can seek legal representation opposing the application;
- a child's cultural identity may be raised or disputed and this needs to be considered and investigated as part of the adoption process;
- the child's views and wishes are considered;
- contact agreements and arrangements are in place (where appropriate) and these arrangements are working effectively; and
- establishing that the child or young person is in a stable and secure placement with the prospective adoptive parent/s.

The decision to progress with the adoption of a child is one of the most serious legal actions that can be taken. Adoption legally and permanently changes the parental rights and responsibilities for a child from the birth parent to the adoptive parent. The ACT Government takes this responsibility very seriously and all care is taken to provide comprehensive information to the Supreme Court to inform the best decision possible in the best interests of the child or young person.

2.

- Refer to response to Question 1.
- No Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander child or young person has been adopted in the past five financial years in the ACT.
- Refer to response to Question 1.

Children and young people—adoptions (Question No 3058)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

In relation to known child adoptions in the ACT, given that the 2018–19 annual report for the Community Services Directorate states that the Strategic Policy body is 'progressing a culturally appropriate policy position for permanency or adoption' (p 48), has Strategic Policy finalised this policy position; if so, can the Minister provide it as an attachment to this answer or if it cannot be attached, when will it be publicly released; if not, when does the Minister expect this policy position to be finalised.

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

On 2 October 2019, the Community Services Directorate (CSD) hosted a workshop with members of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community to agree a policy position on adoption for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people who are on a Care and Protection Order. The workshop consensus confirmed a policy position that adoption is not suitable or appropriate for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people who are on a Care and Protection Order, without exception.

The workshop was facilitated by experienced Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander consultants and brought together key Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community leaders and service providers, as well as members of the community with lived experience of a range of human services, including Child and Youth Protection Services.

CSD formally enacted the policy position in January 2020, and its implementation has reinforced the long-standing practice of not supporting adoption for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children. The policy is provided at [Attachment A](#).

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

Children and young people—respite care (Question No 3059)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) In relation to respite care in the context of foster care and kinship care, given respite care provides short periods of alternative care for a child from their existing care arrangement, either through regular, ongoing, planned occasions or in response to an emergency, what is the longest length of time that a child or young person may be in respite care.
- (2) Is it possible for a child to be in respite care for multiple weeks or even multiple months in one go; if so, in what circumstances might this occur.
- (3) If a child is in respite care for a longer period of time, is it typically with a single respite carer, or might it involve more than one.
- (4) If a child is in respite care for a longer period of time with more than one respite carer, what is the largest number of respite carers that a child has been placed with sequentially during a single period of respite.
- (5) Given that respite care provides carers with breaks from daily demands or helps them cope with unforeseen circumstances, such as illness, is respite care used in any other circumstances; if so, what are they.
- (6) Is respite care ever used to provide temporary care to a child whilst a placement decision undergoes reassessment.

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

1. Respite care is a case management practice that typically provides short periods of alternative care for a child or young person from their existing care arrangement. This occurs either through regular ongoing planned occasions of respite or in response to an emergency involving the child or young person's existing carer.

Respite care is not defined by a timeframe and is considered on a case by case basis and in response to the individual needs of carers and the children in their care.

2. Respite care is assessed on a case-by-case basis. Respite care is usually for short periods of time, however, depending on the circumstances a longer period may be considered. For example, if a carer's health or medical needs impact their ability to care for a child.
3. The preferred option is for respite care to be planned and provided by a single carer household. If there was a circumstance that required a longer period of respite or unplanned respite care, every effort is made to maintain respite care arrangements with a single carer household or other carers that may have an existing relationship with the child.
4. The stability, health and wellbeing of a child or young person in out of home care is of paramount concern. For most children, the aim is to limit the number of placements and the amount of time that a child is out of their usual placement home wherever possible.

After careful consideration of the question, and advice provided by the Community Services Directorate, I have determined that the information sought is not in an easily retrievable form, and that to collect and assemble the information sought solely for the purpose of answering the question would be a major task, requiring a considerable diversion of resources. In this instance, I do not believe that it would be appropriate to divert resources from the provision of direct services, for the purposes of answering the Member's question.

5. Please see response to Questions 1, 2 and 3. Respite care is used to respond to a range of individual circumstances some of which are planned and others unplanned. It could be used to facilitate for carers to have breaks, attend to urgent family situations, respond to a health crisis or respond to the individual needs of a child.
6. Yes, in limited circumstances. A child may be placed with a respite carer who is able to meet the needs of the child pending the outcome of the placement decision and possible reassessment of the carer. These types of arrangements are usually made in response to an urgent or escalating situation that may be unsafe for a child.

Children and young people—parental contact (Question No 3060)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) On what grounds may a supervised contact visit between children in care and birth families be terminated by a caseworker.
- (2) Are birth parents allowed to explain to their children any restrictions that limit the kind, frequency, or duration of their contact with those children; if not, why not.
- (3) Can a supervised contact visit be terminated if birth parents attempt to explain the restrictions that limit their contact; if so, for what purpose and how often does this occur.
- (4) Who explains to children in care and protection what restrictions on contact visits have been placed on their birth parents, or are they left to assume that limited contact or changes in contact are the parents' choice.

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

1. Supervised contact can be terminated should the person/s having contact with the child or young person behave in a manner which is deemed unsafe, inappropriate or detrimental to the safety, health or wellbeing of the child or young person. Contact can also be terminated should the person/s present as under the influence of drugs or alcohol.
2. Clear and transparent communication between all members of the Care Team and the child or young person is pivotal to building trust and creating positive relationships. However, this communication must be age appropriate and delivered in a way which will not impact the child in an adverse way. The child's safety, health and wellbeing are the highest priority and their wellbeing will be prioritised over the needs and wishes of the adults in attendance.
3. Please see the answer to question 1.
4. All members of the Care Team have a role in helping children and young people understand their time in care. The Care Team is made up of case managers, carers, family members and supporting professionals. Case managers ensure the child has been given adequate information about the decision-making process in an age appropriate way. Case managers will allow time so children can explain their views, ask questions and talk about the issues until they understand them properly.

Depending on the child's circumstances, contact can be changed for a wide variety of reasons. For example, should a parent attend a contact session under the influence of illicit substances, the parent will be asked to leave. In this circumstance, staff present, and the carers will have a role in explaining, in an age appropriate way, that the parent is currently too unwell to see the child or young person that day.

Children and young people—parental contact (Question No 3061)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) Given that a Children's Court magistrate may order frequency and duration of contact between children and their birth parents, but as mentioned on p 75 of the Glanfield Inquiry, child protection authorities in the ACT can reduce or limit this contact without explanation, as a percentage, how frequently does this occur.
- (2) On what grounds are contact provisions reduced below what has been ordered or recommended by Children's Court magistrates.
- (3) Has reducing or limiting contact ever been used as a means of trying to control a birth parent who has been deemed difficult to work with, too critical or too demanding.
- (4) Given that the Care and Protection Principles include that a child's 'contact with his or her family must be encouraged', how does the Minister reconcile this principle with the practice of reducing contact below what has been ordered or recommended by Children's Court magistrates.

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

1. In making a Care and Protection Order, under the *Children and Young People's Act 2008*, the Childrens Court will either stipulate the specifics of contact arrangements through a 'specific contact provision' or order that contact arrangements be determined by a stated person. When contact is determined by the Childrens Court through a 'specific contact provision' any changes to contact must be agreed by the Childrens Court. This requires an application to the Court to amend the child's Care and Protection Order.
2. In most matters heard by the Childrens Court, the stated person who can determine contact arrangements is the Director-General of the Community Services Directorate. If contact arrangements have been ordered by the Childrens Court in this way, arrangements can be changed without the involvement of the Childrens Court.

Changes to contact are considered by the child's Care Team and in consultation with relevant people such as family members, carers and other professionals involved with the child and their family. These changes are then recorded in the child's Care Plan and distributed to the relevant people.

Should an affected person not agree with changes to contact arrangements they can seek to have them changed by negotiating to achieve a different outcome, or alternatively make an application to the Childrens Court seeking that the Care and Protection Order be amended to include a specific contact provision.

3. Contact arrangements are complex and emotional situations for those involved, particularly children who have usually experienced significant trauma. CYPS has advised that it seeks to work in partnership with those who have an interest in the contact arrangements whilst ensuring that the best interests of children and young people are paramount. It is important to identify risks, consider where the contact will occur, the need for supervision and whether the child feels safe. Consideration is also given to potential emotional distress and further trauma impact for a child having contact with a parent.
4. See response to Questions 1, 2 and 3. For many children and young people who are in the out of home care it can be the case that contact with birth parents is a source of trauma and distress for them. In these circumstances, contact arrangements are, quite properly, reviewed and discussed in Care Team meetings with the best interests of children and young people at the forefront of all those considerations.

Planning—Lawson (Question No 3062)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for Planning and Land Management*):

- (1) Is the land that will be developed as Lawson North by Defence Housing Australia a national land site under the oversight of the National Capital Authority; if so, does the ACT Government have any role of oversight, influence or approval in relation to the development of Lawson North and what specific roles does the ACT Government exercise.

- (2) Outside of the roles referred to in part (1), has the ACT Government sought to provide input into the development of Lawson North in any way; if so, can the Minister please describe.
- (3) What mechanisms exist to make sure that Lawson North integrates well with Lawson stages 1 and 2, sold for development by the ACT Government.

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

- (1) Land to be developed as Lawson North national land and managed by the National Capital Authority (NCA) under Development Control Plan 12/09 (Belconnen Naval Transmission Station) (DCP12/09). The ACT Government does not have any role in the oversight or approval of the development. The ACT Government reviewed DCP12/09 in 2012 and will provide comments on the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* referral when the development proposal is referred to the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment.
- (2) The NCA invited the ACT Government to comment on the amended draft DCP12/09 on 19 October 2012. The ACT Government provided comments received from the ACT Heritage Council and the Environment Protection Authority.
- (3) Integration and connection with Lawson south is provided for in DCP12/09, available at <https://www.nca.gov.au/development-control-plan/lawson-block-2-section-6-block-1-section-16-dcp-1209>.

Planning—McKellar shops (Question No 3063)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for Planning and Land Management*):

- (1) On what date was the McKellar Shops site sold to a private developer.
- (2) Since the date referred to in part (1), how many leaseholders has this site had.
- (3) What is the timeframe in which the leaseholder of a commercial property in the ACT must develop the site; if there is no timeframe, why not?
- (4) What are the penalties for failing to develop a commercial site in a timely manner, and how are these applied.
- (5) Does the ACT Government have the power to resume possession of a block of undeveloped land and compensate the leaseholder; if so, can the Minister the details for each instance when this power has been used.

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

- (1) The original lease was granted to a private owner in 1985. The most recent lease was granted in 2012.

- (2) Two since 2012.
- (3) Time frames for development are dependent on lease conditions, development approvals, and building approvals. There is no requirement to redevelop an already developed site. This is because a site may have an existing structure on it that is appropriate for use. There is a requirement for leases to be used in accordance with the lease purpose and leaving a site unused for an extended period of time may constitute a failure to comply with this provision of the lease.
- (4) Failure to develop a site that is unused may constitute a failure to use a lease in accordance with the lease purpose clause. Penalties for non-compliance with the terms of a lease, including lease purpose clauses, are outlined at Chapter 11 of the *Planning and Development Act 2007*. These penalties are generally not applied where there is a current development approval as the leaseholder has demonstrated their intention to use the site in accordance with its lease purpose. Under the development approval system, an approval may expire if not commenced or completed within the specified time and a new approval will be required to continue with the development. Undertaking development without approval also attracts penalties.
- (5) Both the *Planning and Development Act 2007* (the Act) (see Part 11.6) and territory leases (99-year leases) include provisions to terminate a lease in specified circumstances following a contravention of the Act or a provision of the lease. These powers have not been used since the commencement of the Act.

ACT Health and Canberra Health Services—performance reports (Question No 3064)

Mrs Dunne asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) Has the Minister received the quarterly performance report for the third quarter of 2019-20 from ACT Health and Canberra Health Services; if not, why not and when will the Minister receive the quarterly performance report; if so, when will the Minister publish the quarterly performance report and what is the reason for the delays.
- (2) When will the quarterly performance report for the fourth quarter be published.

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

- 1. It is anticipated that the Quarter 3 QPR will be with my office in early July and will be published shortly thereafter.

The Quarter 3, 2019-20 Quarterly Performance Report (QPR) has not yet been received by my office. The reason for the delay is that key staff have been required to reprioritize their work to focus on our response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

- 2. It is anticipated that the Quarter 4, 2019-20 QPR will be published in September 2020.
-

**Transport Canberra—bus shelters
(Question No 3065)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020
(*redirected to the Minister for Transport*):

- (1) How many requests for bus shelters has the ACT Government received for the bus stops on (a) Coulter Drive (between Belconnen Way and Redfern Street) and (b) Bindubi Street (between Belconnen Way and Bandjalong Crescent).
- (2) Does the ACT Government have any plans to build bus shelters at any of the abovementioned locations; if so, when will construction commence.

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

- (1) Transport Canberra has received the following requests:
 - a. three requests for a bus shelter on Coulter Drive; and
 - b. no reported requests for bus shelters along Bindubi Street.
 - (2) Transport Canberra has identified three bus stops on Coulter Drive as being suitable for shelter installation. Pending site investigation and design, it is expected that shelters will be installed as part of a shelter relocation program later in 2020.
-

**Municipal services—footpaths
(Question No 3066)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) What is the current status of the community paths program in relation to the new bus stop connections on Southern Cross Drive, Florey.
- (2) When are works expected to (a) commence and (b) finish.

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

- (1) Paths are being built to bus stops 5003 and 5028 on Southern Cross Drive.
 - (2) (a) Construction of the path to bus stop 5003 has commenced and design work for bus stop 5028 is being undertaken, and subject to clearances for services construction, it is expected to commence in July; and
 - (b) Bus stop 5003 is due to be completed in July 2020 and bus stop 5028 is due to be completed in late July/early August 2020.
-

**Green waste services—relocation
(Question No 3068)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020
(*redirected to the Minister for Recycling and Waste Reduction*):

- (1) Is the ACT Government aware of a new location, or any proposed locations, for the green waste services provided by Canberra Sand and Gravel on behalf of the Territory given they will be relocating due to the ongoing Ginninderry Development.
- (2) Is the ACT Government able to confirm when relocation will be taking place.

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

- (1) A new location for green waste drops off services provided by Canberra Sand and Gravel in Belconnen is yet to be identified. A longer-term solution for the acceptance of green waste for Belconnen and North Canberra is being investigated as part of Waste Infrastructure Planning.
 - (2) The licence for the facility will cease on 30 June 2021 to facilitate site remediation and handover to the Ginninderry Joint Venture.
-

National Multicultural Festival—planning (Question No 3069)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) What is the current state of planning for the 2021 National Multicultural Festival.
- (2) Is planning proceeding on the assumption that the festival will go ahead; if so, what changes or alterations to the festival are being considered to allow for the festival to go ahead in a COVID-safe way.
- (3) If planning for the 2021 festival is not proceeding, does this signal a delay or a cancellation and if a delay, when does the Minister expect a final decision to be made regarding whether the 2021 National Multicultural Festival will go ahead.
- (4) What information about the 2021 festival has been shared, to date, with community groups and past/potential festival participants.
- (5) If planning is currently not proceeding, what are the dedicated festival staff currently engaged with.

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

1. Planning for the 2021 National Multicultural Festival (the Festival) is currently underway noting that the current COVID-19 pandemic and associated restrictions are being carefully considered as part of this process.
2. Refer to Question 1.
3. Refer to Question 1.
4. The Festival continually engages with the community and as part of these ongoing engagements the Festival Director met with all Showcase Leaders on several occasions.

The planning work and engagement to date included seeking views on how the Showcase Leaders envisage the event taking place in 2021 and several new ideas were explored.

5. Refer to Question 1.

Arts—cultural diversity (Question No 3070)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for the Arts, Creative Industries and Cultural Events*):

- (1) Which key arts organisations reflect multicultural ethnicity through curated programming that is managed by a board of ethnically diverse peoples.
- (2) Which publicly-funded Arts Board best reflects the multicultural groups of the ACT.

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

- (1) All Key Arts Organisations programs and services are funded by the ACT Government (artsACT) on the basis of access and participation across the community. The boards and staff of Key Arts Organisations are strongly encouraged to include members from diverse backgrounds.

artsACT do not currently record the ethnicity of board members of Key Arts Organisations.
- (2) While artsACT receives reports from Key Arts Organisations including about board membership, it does not collect specific information on diversity.

Roads—traffic calming (Question No 3071)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Roads and Active Travel, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) What criteria must be met for a location to be classified as a 'high pedestrian area' (ie minimum average number of pedestrians per hour).
- (2) What findings were considered for determining Lhotsky Street, Charnwood, as a 'high pedestrian area'.
- (3) When was pedestrian traffic last measured for Lhotsky street and what were the results during school drop-off/pickup hours (8am–9.30am, 2.30pm–4pm).
- (4) When was pedestrian traffic last measured for Lhotsky street and what were the results outside of school drop-off/pickup hours.

- (5) What factors were taken into account for determining the 40km/h speed limit for Lhotsky Street.
- (6) What factors were taken into account when making the decision to install two 20km/h speed humps on Lhotsky Street.
- (7) Will the ACT Government consider increasing the 40km/h speed limit on Lhotsky Street outside of school drop-off/pickup hours; if not, why not.

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

- (1) A location is identified as a 'high pedestrian area' if it meets one item from Category A, or meets two items from Category B, or meets one item from Category B and two items from Category C, or meets four or more items from Category C in the below table:

Category A	Category B	Category C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to Retail/Commercial Area • Adjacent to a shopping strip > 200m 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to a shopping strip < 200m • Adjacent to bus interchange • Adjacent to rail station 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to preschool/childcare centre • Adjacent to retirement village • Adjacent to medical centre or community facilities • Adjacent to sporting complex • Adjacent to entertainment centre/hotel/restaurants • Adjacent to recreational area/park

- (2) Lhotsky Street is adjacent to a retail and commercial area with pedestrian generators such as the Charnwood Group Centre, St Thomas Aquinas Primary School/Church, Ducklings Early Education Childcare Centre, Ginninderra Christian Church and Brindabella Christian College.
- (3) There have been no pedestrian surveys undertaken on Lhotsky Street during school drop-off/pickup hours.
- (4) There have been no pedestrian surveys undertaken on Lhotsky Street outside of school drop-off/pickup hours.
- (5) Lhotsky Street is the main access road to the Charnwood Group Centre and carries high volumes of traffic throughout the day via Tillyard Drive and Florey Drive. The close proximity of the Charnwood shops, two schools (St Thomas Aquinas Primary School and Brindabella Christian College) and the Ducklings Early Education Childcare Centre generates risks to vulnerable road users within the road environment both during school hours and outside of school hours. Research shows the risk of death and serious injury to pedestrians and cyclists is reduced considerably where the speed of vehicular traffic can be lowered to 40 km/h or less.
- (6) The 40km/h speed precinct in the Charnwood Group Centre was implemented in 2015, and the scheme was evaluated in 2016. The evaluation results indicated that motorists' travelling speeds on Lhotsky Street were in excess of the 40km/h speed limit.

Additional speed humps were implemented in 2017, within the 40 km/h speed zone on Lhotsky Street, to slow travelling speeds and provide a self-regulating travel speed environment for motorists. The 20km/h speed advisory signs are also provided to inform motorists of the desirable and comfortable speed to travel through and over these traffic calming devices.

The most recent speed survey indicates the speed humps have been effective in reducing travel speeds, thereby further improving road safety for all road users.

(7) No. Refer to (5).

Roads—accident black spots (Question No 3072)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Roads and Active Travel, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) How many accidents have occurred at or near the intersection at Archdall and Mileham Streets (Dunlop, Macgregor) in (a) 2016-17, (b) 2017-18, (c) 2019-20 and (d) 2020 to the date this question on notice was published.
- (2) Has a traffic study ever been conducted in this location; if so, what were the findings in relation to speeding.
- (3) What measures will the ACT Government take to address reports of speeding in this area.
- (4) Will the ACT Government consider installing speed humps on Archdall Street near this intersection.

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

(1)

Period	No. of reported crashes at or near the Archdall Street and Mileham Street intersection
(a) 2016-17	0
(b) 2017-18	1
(c) 2018-19	0
(d) 2019 to date*	0

*2020 preliminary data subject to change

- (2) The most recent traffic surveys on Archdall Street were completed in 2017, and indicated the road carried approximately 1,632 vehicles per day travelling at an average speed of about 55km/h.
- (3) Speeding is managed through enforcement by ACT Policing.

- (4) Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) considers a range of factors such as traffic volume and speed data, crash history and surrounding land use to identify the need for, and priority of, traffic calming measures on residential streets. Given the above results, there are no immediate plans for any speed humps at this location. TCCS will continue to monitor the intersection and take action as necessary.
-

**Aranda—footpaths
(Question No 3073)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Roads and Active Travel, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) What is the total number of streets in the suburb of Aranda and how many have footpaths on at least one side of the street.
- (2) Out of the total length of streets in Aranda, what percentage of streets have an adjacent footpath on (a) one side and (b) both sides, of the street.

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

- (1) There are 44 streets in Aranda and approximately 10 streets/roads in Aranda have footpaths (23%).
 - (2) (a) Approximately 23%, by length, of all streets/roads in Aranda have adjacent footpaths on one side of their length;
(b) approximately 12%, by length, have footpaths on both sides.
-

**Alexander Maconochie Centre—Pacific Islander detainees
(Question No 3074)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) What percentage of inmates at the Alexander Maconochie Centre are Melanesian, Polynesian and Micronesian, and what percentage of the community are they.
- (2) What programs are provided for inmates, and do inmates engage in any cultural practices whilst incarcerated.

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

- (1) As of 22 June 2020, seven of 463 (1.5 per cent) of detainees at the Alexander Maconochie Centre (AMC) identify to ACT Corrective Services (ACTCS) as Melanesian, Polynesian and Micronesian. As of 2016, the ACT population was 397,393 and 2291 (0.58 per cent) of the ACT community are Melanesian, Polynesian and Micronesian.

- (2) ACTCS provide a range of offence specific, offence related and wellbeing programs to provide vital links for detainees to develop essential skills and thereby increase both community safety and their likelihood of reintegration into community life. Many programs provide opportunities for cultural and religious engagement. Please refer to the table below.

Some programs are facilitated on a continuous basis, while others are scheduled periodically or on a rotating schedule basis. A range of additional programs are facilitated in conjunction with or by community-based service providers.

Program	Description
Sex Offender Program Suite	The program encourages men who have committed sexual offences to develop skills, abilities, knowledge and commitment to develop meaningful, satisfying and fulfilling lifestyles which will protect them from future desires and decisions to re-offend.
Cognitive Self Change Program	A cognitive behaviour therapy-based program that defines criminality as being rooted in a set of learned cognitive behaviours that can be changed by identifying risk thinking and relacing this with new thinking and developing accountability for those choices.
Domestic Abuse Program	The program explores links between behaviours, thoughts and feelings in relation to offending with a clear focus on accountability and assisting them to gaining insight and skills to engage in nonviolent, non-abusive and respectful relationships.
Violence Intervention Program	The program aims to reduce the participant's risk of violent recidivism by increasing their self-awareness, self-management, conflict resolution skills, and better regulate affective responses and behavioural outcomes.
First Steps Alcohol and Drug Program	A drug educational program for detainees with offending behaviour relating to substance abuse.
Self-Management and Recovery Training (SMART) Program	A psychoeducational program which assists with problematic behaviours, such as alcohol, drugs, cigarettes, gambling, food, shopping, internet use etc.
Solaris Therapeutic Community	Uses a therapeutic community approach to treatment and ongoing recovery.
Anger Management Program	An introduction to anger management, it targets the emotional and physiological components of anger and conflict resolution skills.
Introduction to Recovery	An offence related program in the form of a self-paced booklet.
Circles of Security	The program is designed to improve the developmental pathways of children and their parents and promote secure attachments within the family unit.
Stress Less Program	A cognitive behaviour therapy based psychoeducational program focussed on managing and reducing depression, anxiety and stress.
Keeping Myself Well	A self-paced booklet to support wellbeing.
Elders Visitation Program	The Elders Visitation program engages ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community leaders to meet with detainees on a monthly basis to provide cultural advice and support.
Elders Healing Program	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees referred to the Elders Healing Program by the Indigenous Services Unit will meet with local Elders with experience and qualifications in responding to cultural trauma and recovery.
Elders Music Expression Program	The program encourages Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees to express themselves through musical lyrics and song composition.

Program	Description
Yarning Circle Program	The Yarning Circle Program is facilitated by Indigenous Elders and Community leaders to provide culturally safe group settings where issues and solutions can be discussed by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees.
Indigenous Art Program	The AMC Indigenous Detainee Art Programs aims to create a safe space where participants can explore traditional and contemporary Aboriginal art and culture through facilitated activities. Detainees who complete artworks through the programs have the opportunity to display their work in exhibitions coordinated throughout the year, sell their work through the <i>ACTCS Indigenous Detainee Art Catalogue</i> ; and gift their work to family members and friends.
Cultural and Land Management Program	The Cultural and Land Management Program educates Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees about cultural studies, native plants and foods, and general plant propagation and maintenance.
NAIDOC AMC Family Day	NAIDOC AMC Family Day is an opportunity for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander detainees and their families to come together to mark NAIDOC Week, and an opportunity to acknowledge and celebrate Indigenous culture.
Individual faith services and denomination specific pastoral care	The AMC Chaplaincy Unit identifies volunteer religious and spiritual leaders to provide individual faith services and pastoral care visits to detainees of all different demonisations.
Religious ceremonies and celebrations at the AMC	AMC religious ceremonies and celebrations include Friday Prayers, Indigenous Chapel, Christian Chapel, Christmas, Easter, Eid, and detainee weddings.
Sourcing and providing religious texts and devotional materials on request	The AMC Chaplaincy Unit sources and provides texts and materials such as bibles, crucifixes, rosemary beads, prayer caps, Qur'ans and Buddhist prayer beads.
Seasons for Growth Program	A loss and grief education program to strengthen social and emotional wellbeing following significant loss.
Bereavement support and services	The AMC Chaplaincy Unit coordinates small memorial services to support detainees who may be grieving the loss of a family member or community leader.
Meditation and mindfulness programs	The AMC Chaplaincy Unit facilitates meditation and mindfulness programs to help detainees to unhook from unproductive thought patterns and behaviours and pay attention to the present moment.
Angel Tree Program	The AMC Chaplaincy Unit supports the Angel Tree Program to provide Christmas presents for the children of detainees.
Kairos Prison Ministry Program	Kairos Prison Ministry International is an interdenominational Christian ministry that aims to address the spiritual needs of incarcerated men, women, youth, and their families.
Courses delivered through Emmaus and the Crossroads Bible Institute	Correspondence courses that enable detainees to undertake theological studies.

Government—consultants and contractors (Question Nos 3075-3103, 3105-3112)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs; the Minister for Advanced Technology and Space Industries; the Minister for the Arts, Creative Industries and Cultural Events; the Attorney-General; the Minister for Building Quality Improvement; the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services; the Chief Minister; the Minister for Children, Youth and Families; the Minister for City Services; the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability; the Minister for Community Services and Facilities; the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health; the Minister for Disability; the Minister for Education and

Early Childhood Development; the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety; the Minister for the Environment and Heritage; the Minister for Government Services and Procurement; the Minister for Health; the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development; the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety; the Minister for Mental Health; the Minister for Multicultural Affairs; the Minister for Planning and Land Management; the Minister for Police and Emergency Services; the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence; the Minister for Recycling and Waste Reduction; the Minister for Roads and Active Travel; the Minister for Seniors and Veterans; the Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality; the Minister for Sport and Recreation; the Minister for Tertiary Education; the Minister for Tourism and Special Events; the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment; the Minister for Transport; the Treasurer; the Minister for Urban Renewal and the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for Government Services and Procurement*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide the total number of consultants or labour hire contractors, such as those engaged through Contractor Central or through other processes, who were engaged during each financial year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 date.
- (2) What was the total cost for each financial year for each directorate.
- (3) Further to part (1), can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of consultants or labour hire contractors, including those engaged outside the Contractor Central system or whose contracts were below \$25,000, who were engaged during each financial year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 to date, and advise (a) the period the contractor was engaged, (b) the directorate that engaged the contractor, (c) the name or contractor agency of the contractor if attached to a business, (d) the nature of the work, (e) the total value of the work, (f) the contract name and number and (g) whether the contractor was paid directly by the ACT Government; or whether payment was made through another party.
- (4) In relation to part (3)(g) if payment was made through another party, can the Minister provide (a) the name of the third party, (b) why the third party facilitated the payment and (c) whether there were additional fees or costs associated with the payment and the value of those costs.
- (5) Further to part (1), what was the total number of labour hire contractors or consultants that were engaged who were previously employed by the ACT Government or ACT public servants during each financial year.
- (6) Further to part (1), what was the total number of labour hire contractors or consultants that were later offered permanent employment during each financial year.
- (7) How are long term contracts engaged through Contractor Central or with consultants directly tracked and managed in each directorate and across the public service.
- (8) What determines whether a public servant will be employed, or a consultant or labour hire contractor.
- (9) Has the use or work of consultants or labour hire contractors changed in relation to COVID-19 and any associated initiatives; if so, how.

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

- (1) The information requested is not held centrally other than the engagements undertaken through Contractor Central. While information is available from Contractor Central it only came into operation in April 2017 and is a subset of all contract labour hire. Consequently, the data from Contractor Central would not accurately represent all contract labour hire activity.

Notably, a review and assessment of the broad extent of labour hire activity in the ACT Public Service is scoped within the ACT Government's Insecure Work and Outsourcing Taskforce.

Explicit roles of the Taskforce include:

- a. urgently reviewing the existing use of labour-hire in the ACTPS;
 - b. identifying factors leading to the use of labour-hire;
 - c. identifying immediate measures to reduce the use of labour hire in favour of direct employment; and
 - d. recommending policy and practice changes necessary to minimise the use of labour-hire and promote permanent employment on an ongoing basis.
- (2) The total cost of contract labour hire is not a standard reportable item in directorate financials. Extracting the information to determine reliable figures would be unreasonably burdensome on directorates.
- (3) As described at the response to Question 1, the information requested is only available from Contractor Central from April 2017 which will not accurately represent all contract labour hire activity.
- (4) As described in response to Question 3.
- (5) While the previous employment history of a candidate would be considered at engagement this information is not centrally tracked or retained within existing records.
- (6) As above this information is not captured centrally.
- (7) Tenure reports from Contractor Central were previously provided to directorates quarterly and are now available as a self-service through the new Beeline Vendor Management System. Tenure information is also being examined by the Insecure Work and Outsourcing Taskforce.
- (8) This is determined by the hiring business area on a case by case basis consistent with the requirements set out in the employment framework.
- (9) There has not been a significant change in the volume of engagements that directly correlates to COVID-19. No assignments have been cancelled by Directorates as a result of COVID-19 to date.

Government—consultants and contractors (Question No 3104)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs; the Minister for Advanced Technology and Space Industries; the Minister for the Arts, Creative Industries and Cultural Events; the Attorney-General; the Minister for

Building Quality Improvement; the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services; the Chief Minister; the Minister for Children, Youth and Families; the Minister for City Services; the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability; the Minister for Community Services and Facilities; the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health; the Minister for Disability; the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development; the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety; the Minister for the Environment and Heritage; the Minister for Government Services and Procurement; the Minister for Health; the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development; the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety; the Minister for Mental Health; the Minister for Multicultural Affairs; the Minister for Planning and Land Management; the Minister for Police and Emergency Services; the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence; the Minister for Recycling and Waste Reduction; the Minister for Roads and Active Travel; the Minister for Seniors and Veterans; the Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality; the Minister for Sport and Recreation; the Minister for Tertiary Education; the Minister for Tourism and Special Events; the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment; the Minister for Transport; the Treasurer; the Minister for Urban Renewal and the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Speaker*):

- (1) Can the Minister provide the total number of consultants or labour hire contractors, such as those engaged through Contractor Central or through other processes, who were engaged during each financial year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 date.
- (2) What was the total cost for each financial year for each directorate.
- (3) Further to part (1), can the Minister provide a breakdown of the total number of consultants or labour hire contractors, including those engaged outside the Contractor Central system or whose contracts were below \$25,000, who were engaged during each financial year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 to date, and advise (a) the period the contractor was engaged, (b) the directorate that engaged the contractor, (c) the name or contractor agency of the contractor if attached to a business, (d) the nature of the work, (e) the total value of the work, (f) the contract name and number and (g) whether the contractor was paid directly by the ACT Government; or whether payment was made through another party.
- (4) In relation to part (3)(g) if payment was made through another party, can the Minister provide (a) the name of the third party, (b) why the third party facilitated the payment and (c) whether there were additional fees or costs associated with the payment and the value of those costs.
- (5) Further to part (1), what was the total number of labour hire contractors or consultants that were engaged who were previously employed by the ACT Government or ACT public servants during each financial year.
- (6) Further to part (1), what was the total number of labour hire contractors or consultants that were later offered permanent employment during each financial year.
- (7) How are long term contracts engaged through Contractor Central or with consultants directly tracked and managed in each directorate and across the public service.
- (8) What determines whether a public servant will be employed, or a consultant or labour hire contractor.

- (9) Has the use or work of consultants or labour hire contractors changed in relation to COVID-19 and any associated initiatives; if so, how.

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

- (1) to (3) The available information is set out below. The information has been drawn from the relevant part of the Office's annual reports over the time period requested.

Total expenditure

Year	Total expenditure on contractors/consultants by the Office of the Legislative Assembly	Total expenditure by non-executive MLAs on contractors/consultants
2011-2012	\$452k	\$1k
2012-2013	\$281k	\$22k
2013-2014	\$252k	\$107k
2014-2015	\$315k	\$99k
2015-2016	\$220k	\$48k
2016-2017	\$218k	\$118k
2017-2018	\$268k	\$64k
2018-2019	\$536k	\$54k

Breakdown by year

The following tables show more detailed information for contracts entered into by the Office valued at \$25k or greater in the periods for which information is sought.

2011-2012

Name of contractor	Description and reason for contract	Total expenditure (GST exclusive)
Merrill Corporation Australia Pty Ltd	Recording and transcription of the proceedings of the Assembly and public hearings of committees	\$138,268
Sand Consulting Pty Ltd	Support and maintenance of web streaming and Daily on Demand systems	\$47,293
Spotless Facilities Services Pty Ltd	Maintenance of building services	\$116,987
National Cleaning Services Australia Pty Ltd	Cleaning services	\$192,128
Guida Moseley Brown Pty Ltd	Refurbishment of Legislative Assembly chamber facades, roof and roof drainage—design and documentation	\$50,000
Mr Peter Bayne	Legal advice to the relevant Assembly standing committee on the scrutiny of bills and subordinate legislation	\$62,243
Mr Stephen Argument	Legal advice to the relevant Assembly standing committee on the scrutiny of bills and subordinate legislation	\$40,923
Mr Ron McLeod AM	Conduct of an independent workplace audit in accordance with the resolution of the Assembly of 14 February 2012	\$60,700

HBA Consulting Pty Ltd	Provide assistance to Mr Ron McLeod AM with the conduct of an independent workplace audit in accordance with the resolution of the Assembly of 14 February 2012	\$61,000
------------------------	---	----------

2012-2013

Name of contractor	Nature of services provided	Amount (GST inclusive)
Merrill Corporation Australia Pty Ltd	Recording and transcription services	\$101,951.97
Sand Consulting Pty Ltd	Support and maintenance of web streaming and audio-visual replay systems	\$56,412.95
Spotless Facility Services Pty Ltd	Maintenance of building	\$103,546.61
Integrated Technical Management Pty Ltd	Maintenance of building	\$23,754.72
National Cleaning Services Australia Pty Ltd	Cleaning services	\$233,693.00
Peter Bayne	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$75,854.75
Stephen Argument	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$46,711.79
HBA Consulting Pty Ltd	Organisational structure review	\$55,000.00
iSentia	Media monitoring service	\$29,481.17

2013-2014

Name of contractor	Nature of services	Amount (GST Inclusive)
Stephen Argument	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$49,566.96
Peter Bayne	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$78,036.00
iCognition Pty Ltd	Records management	\$38,927.42
Integrated Technical Management Pty Ltd	Building maintenance	\$152,035.42
iSentia	Media monitoring	\$43,253.49
Merrill Corporation Australia Pty Ltd	Recording and transcription	\$138,362.52
National Cleaning Services Australia Pty Ltd	Cleaning services	\$226,067.87
Sand Consulting Pty Ltd	Support and maintenance of the webstreaming and audio-visual replay systems	\$53,930.87
Stephen Skehill	Ethics and integrity advice	\$34,010.64

2014-2015

Name of contractor or consultant	Nature of services	Amount (GST inclusive)
Centre for International Economics	Specialist advice to Select Committee on Estimates 2015-2016	\$29,662.00
Cox Architecture Pty Ltd	Design consultant for "Accommodation – staff relocation" project	\$36,105.30
O'Connor Marsden & Associates Pty Ltd	Internal Review of Payroll and Employee Benefits	\$38,845.00

iSentia	Media Monitoring	\$50,253.69
Stephen Argument	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$50,658.00
Peter Bayne	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$79,752.96
DTI Corporation Australia Pty Ltd (Formerly known as Merrill Corporation Australia Pty Ltd)	Recording and transcription	\$146,955.84
Integrated Technical Management	Building maintenance	\$149,295.11
Sand Consulting Pty Ltd	Audio visual broadcasting systems upgrade	\$168,407.25
National Cleaning Services Australia Pty Ltd	Cleaning services	\$248,369.04

2015-2016

Name of contractor	Nature of services	Amount (GST inclusive)
ASI Locksmiths	Lock system upgrade	\$41,150.24
Built Pty Ltd	Expansion of the Legislative Assembly	\$6,699,754.05
Cox Architecture Pty Ltd	Design consultant for Expansion of the Assembly project	\$49,018.15
DTI Corporation Australia Pty Ltd	Recording and transcription	\$118,537.39
Fredon Security Pty Ltd	Security upgrade and maintenance	\$54,229.47
iCognition Pty Ltd	Procedural Information Production System	\$136,885.77
Integrated Technical Management	Building maintenance	\$200,606.73
iSentia	Media Monitoring	\$47,656.20
National Cleaning Services Australia Pty Ltd	Cleaning services	\$256,555.27
Peter Bayne	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$80,338.71
SAI Global Limited	Standards online subscription	\$83,367.64
Sand Consulting Pty Ltd	Broadcasting system upgrade and maintenance	\$121,516.47
Stephen Argument	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$51,030.13

2016-2017

Name of contractor	Nature of services	Amount (GST inclusive)
Aurora Office Furniture	Office furniture	\$127,142.00
Daniel Stewart	Legal advice to the scrutiny committee	\$25,000.00
Design Craft Furniture Pty Ltd	Office furniture	\$48,621.71
DTI Corporation Australia Pty Ltd	Recording and transcription	\$110,622.33
Fredon Security Pty Ltd	Security upgrade and maintenance	\$42,759.37
iCognition Pty Ltd	Procedural Information Production System	\$55,685.85
Integrated Technical Management	Building maintenance	\$195,414.47
Kenneth Crispin QC	Commissioner for Standards	\$25,930.00
National Cleaning Services Australia Pty Ltd	Cleaning services	\$247,438.06
P.A. People Pty Ltd	Broadcasting system upgrade	\$236,809.90

Peter Bayne	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$55,657.77
SAI Global Limited	Standards online subscription	\$78,641.20
Sand Consulting Pty Ltd	Broadcasting system upgrade and maintenance	\$79,447.21
Sound Advice Australia Pty Ltd	Broadcasting system upgrade	\$26,620.22
Stephen Argument	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$51,438.40

2017-2018

Name of contractor or consultant	Nature of services	Amount (GST inclusive)
Argument, Stephen	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$52,463
Built Pty Ltd	Kitchen and bathroom upgrades	\$393,711
Eglaze Australia Pty Ltd	Double glazing of the Assembly building windows	\$428,785
Fredon Security Pty Ltd	Security maintenance	\$37,072
EPIQ Australia Pty Ltd	Recording and transcription	\$192,595
iCognition Pty Ltd	Procedural Information Production System	\$82,133
Integrated Technical Management Pty Ltd	Building maintenance	\$255,568
Jones Lang LaSalle Public Sector Valuations Pty Ltd	Asset valuations	\$27,500
Kaz Electronics Pty Ltd	Repairs and maintenance	\$82,916
Millennium Hi-Tech Group Pty Ltd	Cleaning services	\$232,217
SAI Global Limited	Standards online subscription	\$89,588
Sand Consulting Pty Ltd	Broadcasting system maintenance	\$78,443
Stewart, Daniel	Legal advice to scrutiny committee	\$76,444
Videocraft Equipment Pty Ltd	Broadcasting system upgrade	\$56,412

2018-2019

Name of contractor	Nature of services	Total (GST Inclusive)
ACT Light Control	Assembly building upgrades	\$43,555
Argument, Stephen	Legal advice to the scrutiny committee	\$53,902
Built Pty Ltd	Construction of the eighth minister's suite	\$154,395
Designcraft Furniture Pty Ltd	Supply of new furniture	\$45,459
Eglaze Australia Pty Ltd	Double glazing in the Assembly building	\$878,707
EPIQ Australia Pty Ltd	Recording and transcription	\$204,260
Ford Kelly Executive Connection Pty Ltd	Executive recruitment services	\$39,600
iCognition Pty Ltd	Procedural Information Production System	\$133,975
Integrated Technical Management Pty Ltd	Building maintenance	\$261,469
Millennium Hi-Tech Group Pty Ltd	Cleaning services	\$260,112
Oakton Services Pty Ltd	Process digitisation review	\$84,466
SAI Global Limited	Standards online subscription	\$112,256
Sand Consulting Pty Ltd	Broadcasting system maintenance	\$73,602
Star Electrical Pty Ltd	Reception Room audiovisual upgrade	\$50,948
Steward, Daniel	Legal advice to the scrutiny committee	\$78,540

- (4) The Office does not maintain this information.
- (5) The Office does not maintain this information.
- (6) The Office does not maintain this information.
- (7) The Office maintains its own internal contracts registers for contracts entered into by the Office and by non-executive MLAs. The Office publishes contracts that are over \$25k on the whole-of-government contracts register in accordance with the relevant legislative requirements.
- (8) The Office typically engages contractors or consultants where specialist expertise is required that is not able to be drawn from within the Office's permanent workforce.
- (9) There have been no notable changes to the Office's arrangements for engaging contractors or consultants during the period of the coronavirus pandemic.

Consistent with the advice to ACT Directorates that contractors can continue to be paid for services they would have provided had those services not been discontinued or scaled back due to COVID-19 changes to business operations, the Office has allowed its external transcription and monitoring contractor to claim for work it would otherwise have performed.

Government—promotional materials (Question Nos 3113-3141, 3143-3150)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs; the Minister for Advanced Technology and Space Industries; the Minister for the Arts, Creative Industries and Cultural Events; the Attorney-General; the Minister for Building Quality Improvement; the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services; the Chief Minister; the Minister for Children, Youth and Families; the Minister for City Services; the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability; the Minister for Community Services and Facilities; the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health; the Minister for Disability; the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development; the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety; the Minister for the Environment and Heritage; the Minister for Government Services and Procurement; the Minister for Health; the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development; the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety; the Minister for Mental Health; the Minister for Multicultural Affairs; the Minister for Planning and Land Management; the Minister for Police and Emergency Services; the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence; the Minister for Recycling and Waste Reduction; the Minister for Roads and Active Travel; the Minister for Seniors and Veterans; the Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality; the Minister for Sport and Recreation; the Minister for Tertiary Education; the Minister for Tourism and Special Events; the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment; the Minister for Transport; the Treasurer; the Minister for Urban Renewal and the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Chief Minister*):

How much has been spent on promotional material during (a) 2017-18, (b) 2018-19 and (c) 2019-20 to date broken down by (i) type of promotional material, such as signs, banners, leaflets and other relevant categories, (ii) general topic, reason or campaign and (iii) quantity.

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

The ACT Public Service is currently responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency and a detailed response to these questions would require a considerable diversion of public sector resources and time.

Government campaigns, over \$40 000, that are presented to the Independent Reviewer are tabled every six months. This information is available at <https://www.parliament.act.gov.au>

The ACT Government uses a creative agency panel process for the purchase of the following services:

- Advertising
- Marketing
- Communications and engagement
- Digital
- Graphic design
- Photography and video
- Media placement and advice.

More information on the Creative Services Panel is available on the ACT Government Contracts Register at: <https://www.procurement.act.gov.au/registers/contracts-register>

In March 2020, current creative services expenditure across ACT Government was provided in response to QON 10.

Government—promotional materials (Question No 3142)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs; the Minister for Advanced Technology and Space Industries; the Minister for the Arts, Creative Industries and Cultural Events; the Attorney-General; the Minister for Building Quality Improvement; the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services; the Chief Minister; the Minister for Children, Youth and Families; the Minister for City Services; the Minister for Climate Change and Sustainability; the Minister for Community Services and Facilities; the Minister for Corrections and Justice Health; the Minister for Disability; the Minister for Education and Early Childhood Development; the Minister for Employment and Workplace Safety; the Minister for the Environment and Heritage; the Minister for Government Services and Procurement; the Minister for Health; the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development; the Minister for Justice, Consumer Affairs and Road Safety; the Minister for Mental Health; the Minister for Multicultural Affairs; the Minister for

Planning and Land Management; the Minister for Police and Emergency Services; the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence; the Minister for Recycling and Waste Reduction; the Minister for Roads and Active Travel; the Minister for Seniors and Veterans; the Minister for Social Inclusion and Equality; the Minister for Sport and Recreation; the Minister for Tertiary Education; the Minister for Tourism and Special Events; the Minister for Trade, Industry and Investment; the Minister for Transport; the Treasurer; the Minister for Urban Renewal and the Minister for Women, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Speaker*):

How much has been spent on promotional material during (a) 2017-18, (b) 2018-19 and (c) 2019-20 to date broken down by (i) type of promotional material, such as signs, banners, leaflets and other relevant categories, (ii) general topic, reason or campaign and (iii) quantity.

Ms Burch: The answer to the member's questions is set out in the below tables:

Type	Quantity	Purpose	Expenditure (excludes GST)
Signage			
Digital screen on ground floor (facing London Circuit)	1	Assembly promotion	\$5622.73
New Member portrait (photography + print)	1	Assembly promotion	\$595.00
Signage subtotal			\$6217.73
Print resources			
Update of 9 th Assembly members brochure	Electronic brochure	Assembly promotion	\$100.00
2018 Assembly sitting calendar	2500 bookmarks 500 business cards	Assembly promotion	\$835.00
Postcard reprint (emblems Bluebell and Gang-gang)	10,000 of each	Parliamentary education	\$1774.00
Folder for education materials given to the public	3000	Assembly promotion	\$4064.84
Print subtotal			\$6773.84
Gift store			
Coaster with Assembly logo	50	Assembly promotion	\$853.80
Gift subtotal			\$853.80
Other			
Canberra Times monthly advertisement "What's happening in your Assembly"	9	Assembly promotion	\$10 251.60
Other subtotal			\$10 251.60
Total expenditure			\$24 096.97

2018-2019—Promotional expenditure			
Type	Quantity	Purpose	Expenditure (excludes GST)
Signage			
Members' portraits (reprints)	2	Assembly promotion	\$150.00
Reinstall Digital screen on ground floor (after double glazing project)	1	Assembly promotion	\$320.00
Signage subtotal			\$470.00

Print			
White single pocket folder with Assembly logo	1500	Parliamentary education	\$1368.93
2019 Assembly sitting calendar	3000 bookmarks 500 business cards	Assembly promotion	\$860.00
Print subtotal			\$2228.93
Other			
Canberra Times monthly advertisement "What's happening in your Assembly"	8	Assembly promotion	\$10 131.24
Seniors week expo 2019	1 stall	Assembly promotion	\$150.00
2019 30th Anniversary Open Day media campaign package	1	Assembly promotion	\$4495.73
Other subtotal			\$14 776.97
Total expenditure			\$17 475.90

ACT Policing—motorcycle gangs (Question No 3151)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

For each year since its commencement to date, can the Minister advise in relation to Taskforce Nemesis, (a) the number of crimes or offences investigated broken down by type, (b) the number and type of warrants executed, (c) the number of arrests made broken down by crime or offence type, (d) the number of charges laid broken down by crime or offence type and (e) items seized, and approximate value if known.

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

Criminal Motorcycle Gang membership has traditionally been relatively stable, however, changes to criminal gang membership in recent years highlight a shift towards more fluid concepts of membership. As at 21 June 2020 there are four known Criminal Motorcycle Gangs operating in the ACT. The total number of members associated with the ACT chapters of these Criminal Motorcycle Gangs is estimated at approximately 30-40 people. This is a decrease from the previously reported numbers of approximately 70 members in 2018-19.

ACT Policing remains committed to combating criminal gangs. Through a multi-faceted and collaborative approach, ACT Policing works to detect and disrupt the operations of criminal gangs, apprehend those responsible for criminal activities, target their illicit proceeds and uphold community safety.

ACT Policing cannot provide data prior to 2019 as to do so would require a manual review by the Taskforce Nemesis team – an onerous task that which would unreasonably divert police resources.

ACT Policing has provided statistics extracted from its Police Real-time On-line Management Information System (PROMIS) from **1 January – 31 December 2019 and 1 January to 28 June 2020.**

For the purposes of the below breakdown tables of data the following offence types are defined as:

- **Other offences against the person:** includes affray, kidnapping and menace/harass/threaten/offend other person
- **Offences against justice procedures:** includes breach of parole/bail/family violence order, contempt of court and pervert the course of justice

(a) the number of crimes or offences investigated broken down by type:

Offences attached to jobs with Nemesis special category		
Offence	2019	2020*
Assault	8	4
Other offences against the person	25	1
Robbery	2	0
Blackmail and Extortion	1	0
Burglary	1	0
Fraud	2	1
Theft	1	0
Property damage	7	1
Offences against justice procedures	5	0
Weapons offences	12	6
Drug offences	1	1
Traffic offences	5	8
Total	70	22

*Please note these figures are current as at 28 June 2020

(b) the number and type of warrants executed:

Jobs with Nemesis special category and reported or confirmed incident type WARRANTS(SEARCH)		
Incident Type	2019	2020*
WARRANTS(SEARCH)	39	8

*Please note these figures are current as at 28 June 2020

(c) the number of arrests made broken down by crime or offence type:

- There were 27 Nemesis related arrests in 2019 and 2 in 2020. This does not include where offenders were summonsed and charged before the court.
- As a single arrest can incorporate multiple charges ACT Policing can only provide a breakdown by offence type for individual charges.

Charges cleared by arrest attached to jobs with Nemesis special category		
Offence	2019	2020*
Assault	3	0
Other offences against the person	11	7
Robbery	3	0
Blackmail and Extortion	2	0
Burglary	1	3
Fraud	1	0

Motor vehicle theft	1	0
Property damage	1	2
Offences against justice procedures	17	3
Weapons offences	1	6
Drug offences	0	2
Total	41	23

*Please note these figures are current as at 28 June 2020

(d) the number of charges laid broken down by crime or offence type:

Charges attached to jobs with Nemesis special category		
Offence	2019	2020*
Assault	11	0
Other offences against the person	32	7
Robbery	5	0
Blackmail and Extortion	2	0
Burglary	2	3
Fraud	1	1
Motor vehicle theft	2	0
Property damage	1	2
Offences against justice procedures	18	4
Weapons offences	6	8
Drug offences	3	4
Traffic offences	3	6
Total	86	35

*Please note these figures are current as at 28 June 2020

(e) items seized, and approximate value if known:

- ACT Policing prefers to not report on the value of forfeited assets only due to the unpredictability in the value of assets subject to restraint.
- Developments in these proceedings can result in changes to the estimation of asset values and ultimate realisable asset values. Such changes may affect reported totals.

Registered property attached to jobs with Nemesis special category		
Seized Item Type	2019	2020*
CURRENCY	11	1
DRUGS	108	19
FIREARM	12	0
VEHICLE	8	5
WEAPON	2	2
OTHER EVIDENCE	242	115
Total	383	142

*Please note these figures are current as at 28 June 2020

**Vehicles—registration
(Question No 3152)**

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

Can the Minister advise, for each year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 to date, the number of vehicles registered broken down by type, such as caravan and passenger vehicle and advise (a) average cost of registration (excluding variable costs such as CTP) for each type and (b) total value of revenue collected for each type of vehicle.

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

- (1) Please refer to Attachment A.
 - (a) See above.
 - (b) See above.

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

Parking—revenue (Question No 3153)

Mr Coe asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) Can the Minister advise, for each year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 to date, the number of public carparks revenue broken down by (a) region and (b) type.
- (2) Can the Minister advise, for each year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 date, parking revenue broken down by region.
- (3) Can the Minister advise, for each year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 date, the number of parking fines (a) issued broken down by region, (b) disputed, (c) disputed and withdrawn, (d) disputed and upheld, (e) disputed and are currently outstanding and (f) paid.
- (4) Can the Minister advise, for each year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 to date, the average length of time taken to make a determination on a parking fine dispute.
- (5) Can the Minister advise, for each year since 2011-12 to 2019-20 to date, the number of (a) parking inspectors by full-time equivalent and headcount and (b) devices or other tools used to assist in issuing parking fines.

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

- (1) The following data reflects revenue received from ACT government public carpark payments and is the only easily accessible data that can be provided at this time. Additional information including data prior to 2014 will need to be retrieved from archives or external sources and therefore would require an unreasonable diversion of resources.

Region	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Belconnen	\$1,058,938	\$1,273,133	\$1,163,444	\$1,146,849	\$1,164,919	\$1,134,560
Inner North	\$7,109,121	\$9,308,507	\$10,950,161	\$11,255,700	\$11,879,368	\$11,364,672
Inner South	\$1,018,802	\$1,214,282	\$1,277,994	\$1,326,191	\$1,430,037	\$1,484,651
Woden	\$3,203,506	\$2,385,688	\$2,854,426	\$2,799,426	\$3,846,946	\$3,607,206
Tuggeranong	\$992,699	\$1,302,680	\$1,564,159	\$1,712,336	\$1,858,133	\$1,715,727
Grand Total	\$13,383,066	\$15,484,290	\$17,810,184	\$18,240,502	\$20,179,403	\$19,306,816

- (2) Please refer to the response to question 1.
- (3) Please see Attachment A. Information provided is as at 24 June 2020.
- (4) A parking infringement dispute may go through various statuses before being finalised, the Rego.ACT system does not track this over time. Due to this reason, the analysis required to answer this question would require an unreasonable diversion of resources.
- (5) (a)

**Parking Operations
Historic Staff Data
FY 2011-12 to 2019-20**

Financial Year	Number of Parking Inspectors / Staff	
	Full Time Equivalent	Head Count
2011-12	28.6	29
2012-13	25.6	26
2013-14	29.6	30
2014-15	31.6	33
2015-16	29.6	32
2016-17	25.0	25
2017-18	27.5	30
2018-19	30.0	32
2019-20	33.0	35

- (b) Personal Data Assistant (PDA) – Handheld devices used to administer Parking Infringement Notices
- One PDA per officer (relative to yearly staffing numbers)
 - Approx. one spare PDA per four officers (relative to yearly staffing numbers)

Licence Plate Recognition (LPR) Cameras – LPR Cameras were introduced in 2017

- 2017-2018 – Two LPR Cameras in operation
- 2018-2019 – Four LPR Cameras in operation
- 2019-2020 – Six LPR Cameras in operation

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

**Housing—redevelopment
(Question No 3154)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Housing and Suburban Development, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) In relation to social and affordable rental housing in West Basin and Curtin horse paddock, are there currently any plans to ensure that a minimum proportion of the new dwellings in the City to the Lake redevelopment area will be social and/or affordable rental housing; if so, can the Minister provide details regarding the planned amount of social and affordable rental housing.

- (2) Are there currently any plans to ensure that a minimum proportion of any new dwellings on the ACT Government's portion of the Curtin horse paddocks site will be social and/or affordable housing; if so, can the Minister provide details regarding the planned amount of social and affordable rental housing.
- (3) Has the Government given any consideration to selling sites to community housing providers in either of the abovementioned redevelopment areas at below market value.
- (4) Has the Government given any consideration to offering planning incentives to encourage the provision of social or affordable housing in either of the abovementioned redevelopment areas.

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

- (1) Under the ACT Housing Strategy, the ACT Government has set a target of 15 per cent of the annual residential land release program for public, community and affordable housing. This includes affordable rental and affordable purchase.
- (2) Refer to Q1 response.
- (3) The *Planning and Development Act 2007* does not permit the sale of market value leases for below market value. However, any restrictions on the site are reflected in its market value.
- (4) The planning for these sites is at early stages.

The ACT Housing strategy includes a number of incentives to encourage the provision of social or affordable housing across the ACT.

Municipal services—mowing (Question No 3155)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) What are the operational protocols for the City Services mowing team to determine the cutting height for mowing grass.
- (2) What is the standard cutting height for each season.
- (3) What adjustments are made to this standard in response to drier or wetter conditions.
- (4) What adjustments are made for mowing under trees in order to retain soil moisture after significant rainfall.
- (5) What measures is the Government taking or planning in order to ensure adequate water supply to trees listed on the ACT's Tree Register.

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

- (1) Mowing heights vary depending on the use of the space and the purpose of the mowing. User needs, amenity, public safety, fire management, turf health, irrigation,

environmental and conservation outcomes are all considered when determining the appropriate cutting height for grass.

- (2) Dryland (non-irrigated) grass, which makes up the majority of the mowing program, is mown to 75mm.
- (3) The height standard is not amended based on these conditions, however areas are not mown if the ground is too soft after rainfall, or too dry where there is little vegetative growth, to avoid damage to vegetation and equipment.
- (4) None.
- (5) The Government has implemented a program of watering and mulching beneath highly significant trees on unleased public land (including registered trees) to help support tree health following the drought conditions from 2018 to early 2020. For example, interventions to support tree health were carried out beneath Registered trees on the Ainslie Avenue median and across City Hill, and beneath native remnant and planted trees in locations such as Corroboree Park and Hilltop Reserve. Residents are encouraged to water registered trees on leased land.

Environment—wombat conservation (Question No 3156)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) When was the Wombat Working Group established within Parks and Gardens Conservation Services.
- (2) What is the working group's purpose.
- (3) How long will this working group be operational.
- (4) What are the reporting lines for this working group.
- (5) How many staff is this working group comprised of and what are the staff roles.
- (6) What public consultation has this group undertaken.
- (7) What decisions has this group made so far in relation to wombat management and mange treatment in the ACT.
- (8) How many staff in this working group have field experience with mange in wombats.
- (9) Does this working group have a strategy to determine the way forward for the conservation of ACT wombats.
- (10) Does this working group have a strategy to determine the way forward for the management of wombat mange in ACT wombats.

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

- (1) The Wombat Working Group has only recently been established, with the first informal meeting taking place between initial members in December 2019.
- (2) The Wombat Working Group has four main objectives.
 - Provide a mechanism for clear communication and internal information flow regarding issues pertaining to the management of wombat populations in the ACT.
 - Establish a coordinated approach to research, data collection and management actions to enable evidence-based decision-making and planning.
 - Guide development of policy positions related to the various issues of wombat management in the ACT; and
 - Enable effective collaboration and liaison between the ACT Government and external stakeholders. External stakeholders include wildlife carers, the broader ACT community, research institutions, veterinary and wildlife health organisations, and wombat specialist groups, such as the national working group on wombat mange.
- (3) There is no specified timeframe for the operational continuation of the Wombat Working Group. The Wombat Working Group was formed because of a need to communicate and engage on the issue of wombat management. While the need remains, the working group will remain active.
- (4) The working group will report within government including to the ACT Conservator of Flora and Fauna.
- (5) The membership of the Wombat Working Group is still evolving. It is currently comprised of 17 ACT Government staff, from the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate business units of Conservation Research, Natural Resource Management, Parks and Conservation Service, Conservation and Biosecurity, and Water Planning and Policy. This reflects a broad skill set which includes fauna ecologists, regional Landcare facilitators, veterinarians, rangers, licencing and compliance staff, and land management managers.
- (6) The group is actively engaged in ongoing communication and consultation with ACT wildlife carer community groups. Consultation with wildlife carers has been highly productive and includes data sharing and discussions around mange management, both of which are ongoing. Further consultation with other community groups is planned, but to date has been limited by COVID-19 restrictions.
- (7) To date, while discussions around various aspects of wombat management have taken place, there has been no formal decision-making by the group regarding wombat management or mange management in the ACT. Information and outcomes from the recent Commonwealth government roundtable on mange in wombats will be used to inform the ACT's position and actions. The group is currently involved in data consolidation with the wildlife carer groups.
- (8) Two field trials involving the treatment of mange in wombats have been undertaken in the ACT in recent years. Both trials have involved wildlife carer groups and individuals working with ACT government staff. Three qualified veterinarians are on

the wombat working group, two with backgrounds in research, have had direct involvement or oversight of mange treatment trials. Two members are qualified ecologists with extensive field experience in wildlife population monitoring and management. There are also two rangers on the working group who have been involved with mange treatment trials.

Operational Parks and Wildlife Conservation staff (of which there are seven members on the wombat working group) follow standardised protocols for mange assessment to inform decision making around treatment or euthanasia of individual animals in the field.

The 17 members of the working all have field experience in wildlife management including with wombats. The strong collective expertise is considered to be significant at both population and species level, of mange in wombats and the challenges concerning treatment of affected animals. The diversity of members' skills facilitates a holistic and effective approach to this problem.

- (9) Common wombats are a protected species in the ACT under the *Nature Conservation Act 2014*. To gain more robust information on ACT wombat populations, the Wombat Working Group seeks to participate as part of a nationally coordinated approach. Monitoring will provide information on wombat populations within the ACT and the changes in distribution, abundance and prevalence of mange in targeted populations of wombats. This information can then be used to guide conservation and management actions and to develop an evidence-based management plan for the species.

- (10) Two members of the Wombat Working Group recently participated in the national workshop and government roundtable on wombat mange, which was held in June 2020. The online workshop was attended by representatives from five jurisdictions (ACT, Victoria, Tasmania, NSW and South Australia), in addition to wombat mange experts from the University of Tasmania and University of Western Sydney, and veterinarians from Wildlife Health Australia. While this first workshop established a national communications network among attendees, there is further potential for the national network to inform and develop a framework for best practice mange management.

The ACT Wombat Working Group seeks to explore opportunities for the ACT to collaborate with external organisations and other jurisdictions in coordinated and strategic research on mange treatment in wombats. The ACT Wombat Working Group is also developing standardised protocols for the assessment of mange in wombats and decision-making around euthanasia in line with recommendations and practices adopted by other jurisdictions.

Government—hygienic paper supplies policy (Question No 3157)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Chief Minister, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for Government Services and Procurement*):

- (1) What requirements does the Government have for the supply of toilet paper and paper towel.

- (2) Is recycled content a specification for the supply of toilet paper and paper towel to the Government; if so, what is the percentage of recycled content required.
- (3) Do the current supplier contracts allow product substitution by the supplier.
- (4) What company is the current supplier of toilet paper and paper towel to the Government.
- (5) What are the start and end dates of this current contract.

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

- (1) There are currently no specific requirements set by the Government for toilet paper or paper towel. Directorates have the discretion to specify content requirements for available products such as percentage recycled paper.
- (2) As above, there are no requirements set by the Government.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) There is no sole supplier of toilet paper and paper towel to the Government. There are different arrangements for different facilities, for example for leased buildings, toilet paper may be provided as a consumable by the cleaning supplier. However, both WINC and COS provide these products through the whole of government stationery arrangement, which is accessible to all directorates.
- (5) This arrangement expires 31 October 2020 with the option to extend a further two x one-years options. This contract is currently undergoing due diligence processes.

Environment—Ginninderra Creek (Question No 3158)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 19 June 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for City Services*):

Given that destruction of the habitat of Ginninderra Creek, Nicholls, has so far affected the area between the Gungahlin Dam and a concrete ford about 500 metres to the south, (a) is more work planned; if so, where and will it continue towards the Barton Highway and (b) was an environmental assessment carried out; if not, why not; if so, is it publicly available and can the Minister advise where to obtain it from.

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

- a) No further work is planned for this area. The work on Ginninderra Creek was undertaken to enable dam inspectors to undertake dam safety and integrity monitoring and assessment investigations. This monitoring and assessment is required to comply with Dam Safety legislation. The work was essential as creek flow paths were backing up and flooding the Gungahlin Pond Dam spillway. The work extended just past the low-level vehicle crossing which was covered in approximately 300mm of silt, debris and reeds.

- b) There was no requirement for an environmental assessment for these works. The work is covered by the Waterways Works Licence 654. Prior to works, TCCS sought direction from EPSDD Water Policy and the EPA regarding the environmental management requirements for these works, including the need for assessment, signage for public notification, stockpiling and removal of spoil. The works removed the minimum material to achieve safe water flows while protecting habitat for wildlife. The TCCS contractor is required to meet environmental management and restoration requirements under its contract.
-

**Municipal services—fix my street
(Question No 3159)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) What are the requirements for a Fix My Street report to be actioned given that multiple members of the community who have reported issues to Fix My Street in the Belconnen area have advised that more than one report is required to demonstrate community interest in a repair being actioned.
- (2) What is the threshold for sufficient community demand to be demonstrated.

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

- (1) There is no requirement for multiple members of the community to report issues to Fix my Street. Fix my Street requests are prioritised according to urgency.
 - (2) See above.
-

**Waste—recyclable materials diverted to landfill
(Question No 3161)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for Recycling and Waste Reduction, upon notice, on 19 June 2020:

- (1) What percentage of landfill is recyclable material.
- (2) Has this increased over the past five years.
- (3) What is being done by the Government to reduce recyclable materials going to landfill.
- (4) What percentage of landfill in the ACT is organic waste.
- (5) Has this increased over the past five years.
- (6) Is the Minister able to provide a breakdown between household organic waste and commercial organic waste to landfill.

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

- (1) Based on 2017 data, 9.3% from commercial loads and 12% from household waste bins is recyclable material sent to Mugga Lane landfill.
 - (2) The percentage of recyclable material by weight has decreased from 16.3 to 9.3% from 2015 to 2017 from commercial loads and 23.7 to 12% from 2014 to 2017 from households.
 - (3) The ACT Government are carrying out a range of activities to improve recycling outcomes, including;
 - a. Educating the community through the Recycling Discovery Hub, community outreach and the online Recyclopaedia;
 - b. The introduction of the Container Deposit Scheme as a source of high quality, source separated recycling;
 - c. Future introduction of legislation to phase out selected single-use plastics items; and
 - d. Working with our regional council partners to implement the #RecycleRight awareness campaign.
 - (4) The 2018 ACT Waste Feasibility Study notes that 143,048 tonnes of waste were considered organics within the ACT and were landfilled – around 50% of all the waste to landfill. Organic categories include vegetation, paper/cardboard, food organic, timber and other (ie cat litter, animal faeces, ash).
 - (5) The composition of organic waste by weight has decreased in percentage terms from households by 11.6% between 2014 and 2017 and increased from commercial loads by 4.6% between 2015 and 2017.
 - (6) Based on the ACT Waste Feasibility Study, 78,716 tonnes of organic waste landfilled were from commercial sources and 64,332 tonnes were from households.
-

Parking—Gungahlin (Question No 3163)

Ms Lawder asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 3 July 2020
(*redirected to the Minister for Planning and Land Management*):

- (1) Can the Minister inform if there will be any remaining free parking areas in Gungahlin or is all parking in the area transitioning to paid parking
- (2) Given that currently there are various areas of free parking around the Gungahlin town centre, however, recently signs have been erected in these areas indicating that they will soon become paid parking, can the Minister provide a map showing areas of free parking as (a) at 31 December 2019, (b) expected at 30 June 2020 and (c) expected at 31 December 2020.

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

- (1) All ACT Government managed parking in the Gungahlin town centre is free as at 30 June 2020. There are currently no plans to introduce paid parking to ACT Government managed parking in the Gungahlin town centre. Privately operated car parks set their own pricing and restrictions.
 - (2) (a) All Government managed parking in Gungahlin town centre was free of charge as at 31 December 2019. Privately operated car parks set their own pricing and restrictions. A map of parking areas in Gungahlin town centre is available on the Access Canberra parking website:
<https://www.accesscanberra.act.gov.au/ci/fattach/get/332731/1565742686/redirect/1/filename/Gunghalin+Parking.pdf>
 - (b) All Government managed parking in Gungahlin town centre was free of charge as at 30 June 2020. See the map linked at 2(a).
 - (c) All Government managed parking in Gungahlin town centre is proposed to continue to be free of charge at 31 December 2020. See the map at 2(a).
-

Access Canberra—vehicle registrations (Question No 3164)

Ms Lawder asked the Minister for Business and Regulatory Services, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) Can the Minister confirm that when an individual registers a vehicle through Access Canberra after passing a registration inspection and change of ownership that (a) it takes three days to formally process and (b) during this period, the individual has to pay for an additional three-day permit.
- (2) If an individual does have to pay for an additional three-day permit, why is this the case.

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

- (1)
 - (a) From 20 July 2020, and as a result of easing restrictions, customers may now attend any service centre to establish registration for a motor vehicle and will have their transaction processed immediately and be given their numberplates at the time of the transaction. Customers can still choose to undertake their registration transaction process online and collect their number plates from the Access Canberra Environment, Land and Planning Shopfront in Dame Pattie Menzies House, Dickson. The option of purchasing an *unregistered vehicle permit* (UVP) whilst their registration transaction is being processed is also available if they wish to drive their vehicle before the registration process has been completed.

Prior to 20 July 2020, in response to the COVID-19 requirements, Access Canberra made changes to its service delivery via its Service Centres to ensure the safety of staff and customers. These changes included reducing the number of people allowed in Service Centres at any one time (which has meant queues

outside of the service centres at times), reducing the opening hours and implementation of hygiene measures such as hand sanitising, additional cleaning and the installation of Perspex screens. When COVID-19 impacts were still relatively unknown, Access Canberra quickly redesigned several processes, including the establishment of motor vehicles, to give customers a choice in how they could transact –online, over the phone or face-to -face. The public health messaging was encouraging the community not to leave home except for accessing essential services and to limit face-to-face contact wherever possible. Access Canberra changed its messaging in line with this and actively promoted the online service delivery option to encourage people not to attend service centres where possible.

It has been recognised that some of the processes put in place did not suit all customers preferences and needs and did create a delay in finalising transactions for some customers. Access Canberra has continued to find efficiencies in the new digital transaction format to respond to the changing COVID-19 requirements and customer feedback. The teams continue to work hard to process transactions as quickly as possible. Most digital transactions were completed in less than five business days. Access Canberra also made numberplate collection and drop off available from the Dickson. This reduced overall transaction times and enabled more urgent vehicle registrations to be completed in less than two business days.

- (b) Traditionally, Access Canberra only allowed a 1-day UVP (7am to 7pm) for vehicles that have been economically written-off or have a cancelled registration so they can be driven within the ACT to allow for the vehicle to undergo a roadworthy inspection. However, as a result of the 20 January 2020 catastrophic hailstorm over 37,000 insurance claims have been made for damaged motor vehicles. The majority of ACT economically written off vehicles have, or will be, sold through auction houses without registration. Being unregistered, these vehicles require a UVP for the purpose of leaving the auction site and to be driven for inspection and repair.

Access Canberra noted it was proving difficult for vehicle owners to undertake a roadworthy inspection and acquire a roadworthy certificate within the 12-hour timeframe, thus, resulting in owners having to purchase multiple 1-day UVP's. To address this situation, Access Canberra has made changes to its operations thereby allowing ACT economically written off vehicles (from the January hailstorm) to obtain a 7-day UVP without a roadworthy inspection. This 7-day UVP assists the vehicle owner by allowing travel within the ACT for the vehicle to be collected, inspected, repaired where necessary, and to allow the vehicle to be driven while the registration application is processed.

- (2) A UVP allows a vehicle that does not have a registration to legally operate on public roads until the registration transaction process is completed. For example, a UVP lets customers who purchase a second-hand vehicle to undertake necessary repairs and a roadworthy inspection before the vehicle is registered. The cost for an unregistered vehicle permit is costs \$41.30 (for 1 day) or \$48.80 (for 7 days) which both include the compulsory motor accident insurance component. A UVP ensures that there is 3 party insurance coverage in the unlikely case of an accident involving the vehicle.

**Waste—bulky waste collection
(Question No 3166)**

Mr Milligan asked the Minister for City Services, upon notice, on 3 July 2020 (*redirected to the Minister for Recycling and Waste Reduction*):

- (1) In relation to the availability of the bulky waste collection service in Gungahlin that opened for bookings on 1 July 2020, is there a requirement of how many collections the contractor, Suez, must undertake each day to fulfill its contract with the ACT Government for the bulky waste collection service; if so, what is the requirement.
- (2) What is the maximum number of bulky waste collections that the Suez vehicles can physically hold, based on the limit of two cubic metres of household items per bulky waste collection.
- (3) How many bulky waste collections per day does the contractor have the capacity to carry out, taking into consideration time and the maximum capacity of the vehicles.
- (4) Does the booking system for the bulky waste collection service operate on a suburb-by-suburb basis, to reduce time between collections.
- (5) How many bookings for the bulky waste collection service were made in the first day of operation (1 July 2020).
- (6) How many bookings for the bulky waste collection service were made in the first day of operation (1 July 2020) in Gungahlin
- (7) Can the Minister provide the number of bookings made for the bulky waste collection service, that were made on the first day of operation (1 July 2020) in Gungahlin, suburb-by-suburb.

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

- (1) No.
- (2) Each SUEZ vehicle can hold approximately 40-50 cubic metres, depending on the type of vehicle.
- (3) SUEZ confirmed it can complete 150 collections per day (across both regions) based on currently allocated resources.
- (4) The booking system operates on the optimised routes provided by SUEZ.
- (5) 420 bookings were made on 1 July 2020.
- (6) 214 bookings were made on 1 July 2020 from the Gungahlin district.
- (7)

Suburb	Number of bookings
Amaroo	11
Bonner	23
Casey	26
Crace	2
Forde	15

Suburb	Number of bookings
Franklin	11
Gungahlin	20
Harrison	15
Moncrieff	22
Ngunnawal	31
Nicholls	20
Palmerston	13
Throsby	5
Gungahlin District	214

Legislative Assembly—viewing data (Question No 3173)

Ms Le Couteur asked the Speaker, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) Does the Assembly collect data on the number of views of chamber proceedings, both live and on demand.
- (2) Does the Assembly collect data on the number of views of committee hearings, both live and on demand.
- (3) If the Assembly does collect data on the number of proceedings and hearings referred to in parts (1) and (2), is it publicly available, and where is it reported.

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

- (1)-(2) The Office of the Legislative Assembly collects data and prepares quarterly reports on the Assembly on Demand website, noting that the data is an aggregate of both Assembly and Committee hearing videos as both are streamed through the same system.

Data is not gathered on the number of views of the live stream service for Assembly sittings.

Until recently, viewing numbers for live streaming committee hearings has not been collected. However, in the recent months, committee secretariat staff have inquired about viewing numbers for a few individual hearings and these have been provided when requested. When there is more than one hearing in a day, it is not possible to generate accurate figures for each hearing as Google Analytics only provides totals for the day, not defined hours within the day.

- (3) The quarterly reports are used for internal analysis and are not publicly available.

Data showing the total annual number of user sessions for the last three years for the LA, Hansard and Assembly on Demand websites is reported in the Legislative Assembly Annual Report.

**COVID-19 stimulus packages—demographic breakdown
(Question No 3174)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

What is the demographic breakdown of people being employed in COVID 19 stimulus packages such as the Jobs for Canberrans Fund and for the Screwdriver Ready Projects, including how many (a) women have been employed, (b) men have been employed, (c) gender diverse people have been employed, (d) people with disabilities have been employed, (e) people who were unable to receive Jobseeker or Jobkeeper because of their immigration status and (f) people who were unable to qualify for Jobkeeper or Jobseeker for other reasons.

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

There is no demographic data available for Screwdriver Ready Projects. Demographic data for the Jobs for Canberrans Fund (as at 16 July 2020) included:

- a) 108 women (45 per cent) have been employed;
 - b) 131 men (55 per cent) have been employed;
 - c) Data is not available on the number of gender diverse people employed;
 - d) Three people employed identified as having a disability, eight did not respond to the question and 228 answered no;
 - e) and f) Data on people hired who were unable to receive Jobseeker or Jobkeeper because of their immigration status or for other reasons is not yet available. Data is available however for people who have registered for the program. Of the 5441 who registered:
 - i. 3270 (60%) identified as Tier 1 applicants (who are ineligible for Jobseeker or Jobkeeper). This includes:
 - Most temporary and provisional work visa holders;
 - People on SHEV/TPV/Bridging Visa and not receiving Special Benefits;
 - Most Bridging visa holders, including ACT Services Card Holders;
 - Non-protected 444 Special Category Visa holders;
 - Protected 444 Special Category Visa holders who do not meet the eligibility requirements for all welfare payments, including the Job Seeker and Job Keeper payments
 - International students who hold a current Australian student visa with work rights; and
 - People who arrived in Australia on Skilled and family visa (permanent and temporary) after 1 January 2019 who are required to meet the newly arrived resident's waiting period.
-

**Environment Protection Authority—complaints policy
(Question No 3175)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) In relation to investigation of complaints by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), does the EPA have any policy relating to a person who makes a complaint about an issue; if so, is this policy publicly available and where can it be found.
- (2) If the policy referred to in part (1) exists, does it distinguish on the basis of (a) residential status, eg rental tenant versus homeowner and public housing tenant vs private housing tenant, (b) whether or not the complainant has either a Personal Protection Order or a Workplace Protection Order taken out against them that could be regarded as associated with the complaint and (c) vexatious complainants.
- (3) If any classes of complainant do not have their complaints investigated by the EPA, what avenues exist for them to have their complaints investigated.

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

- (1) Access Canberra has an Accountability Commitment and Compliance Frameworks which guide their regulatory approach. In addition, the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has in place the Environment Regulation & Protection Compliance & Enforcement Guideline 2016 (Guideline). The purpose of this Guideline is to set out principles that inform the regulators actions and decisions.

The Accountability Commitment, Compliance Frameworks and Guideline are publicly available on the [Access Canberra website](#).

- (2)
 - (a) No. However, the EPA has an arrangement with ACT Housing that where an allegation is made in relation to an ACT Housing tenant, the EPA will refer the matter to ACT Housing for consideration. The referral will include any evidence obtained by the EPA. The referral does not prevent regulatory action from being undertaken by the EPA.
 - (b) The Guideline does not refer to Personal Protection Orders or Workplace Protection Orders. Where EPA officers are made aware of an order being in place, officers will assess the matter to determine who the appropriate regulatory authority is.
 - (c) No.
 - (3) Depending on the nature of the complaint, complaints may be referred to more appropriate regulatory and enforcement authorities such as ACT Policing. Complainants may be referred to other resolution pathways, depending on the facts and circumstances associated with the complaint. This can include referring parties to the Conflict Resolution Service.
-

**Environment—pest management
(Question No 3176)**

Ms Le Couteur asked the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) How much has been spent on pest plant management for each year over the past five years.
- (2) Is this funding allocation being continued into future years.
- (3) What programs were these funds allocated to.
- (4) Where was activity undertaken.
- (5) How much has been spent on pest animal management each year over the past five years, excluding kangaroo management.
- (6) Is this funding allocation being continued into future years.
- (7) What programs were these funds allocated to.
- (8) Where was activity undertaken.
- (9) How much has been spent on kangaroo management for each year, over the past five years.

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

I do not approve the considerable diversion of public sector resources needed to respond to this question. The Environment division's work within the Environment Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate is focused on the bushfire Recovery program. Information in relation to the Directorate's expenditure is available through Annual Reports and information in relation to kangaroo management is available at <https://www.environment.act.gov.au/parks-conservation/plants-and-animals/urban-wildlife/kangaroos>

**Sport—ovals
(Question No 3183)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Sport and Recreation, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) What size are the (a) Florey, (b) Spence and (c) McKellar ovals.
- (2) What is the size of the smallest sports and recreation oval in the ACT.
- (3) What is the minimum size for an oval to be considered appropriate for sports and recreation.
- (4) What is the estimated minimum cost for the Florey oval to be upgraded for safe and suitable use by Florey primary school.

- (5) What is the estimated minimum cost for the (a) Spence and (b) McKellar ovals to be upgraded for sports and recreation.

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

- (1) The ovals below are non-irrigated ovals suitable for informal community use.
 - (a) Florey = 1.8 hectares (ha).
 - (b) Spence = 2.1ha.
 - (c) McKellar = 1.7ha.
 - (2) Duffy neighbourhood oval is available for limited formal sporting use and is 1.9ha.
 - (3) The minimum size for an irrigated oval suitable for formal sporting use is approximately 2ha. This enables the provision of two combination fields overlaid with either a cricket field or Australian Football League (AFL) field.
 - (4) The existing site is currently suitable for informal use.
 - (5) Estimated costs for an upgrade are subject to assessment of existing infrastructure and the desired level of facility.
-

Planning—Kippax group centre flooding potential (Question No 3184)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Planning and Land Management, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) In relation to the potential flooding in the vicinity of the Kippax Group Centre, given that the 2015 Kippax Group Centre Flood Study Report made five recommendations to alleviate existing flooding problems within and adjacent to the Kippax Group Centre study area and the report noted that “without implementing all the above options, existing blocks have the potential of flooding during a 1 per cent Annual Exceedance Probability storm event”, can the Minister provide an update for each of the following, (a) regrade the trap low point at the Starke Street underpass, (b) clear out and regrade the overgrown vegetated swale from the Starke Street underpass, running parallel with Starke Street, (c) construct a detention basis with an inlet into the existing stormwater network on the corner of Flack Street and Moyes Crescent, (d) regrade the existing grassed swale downstream of the Flack Street underpass and (e) investigate the purpose of the detention basin downstream of Southern Cross Drive and lower the detention basin embankment by up to 1 metre if possible, including when each commenced, when completed, current state of progress if not completed, projected date of completion, reasons for delay, reasons for not following through on the recommendation, etc.
- (2) Has the recommendation in the report that the TRUFLOW model be rerun with a detailed survey of the overland flow paths through the urban open space area within the Kippax Group Centre study area to provide more accurate flood levels to (a) inform the detailed design of the mitigation options listed above and (b) inform building floor levels for future development with the study area, been done; if so, when was it completed, and can the Minister please provide the outcomes; if not, why not and when will it be completed.

- (3) Has the recommendation in the report that flooding along Hardwick Crescent during minor storm events should be further investigated in detail to ensure that this street does not flood, been done; if so, when was it completed, and can the Minister provide the outcomes; if not, why not and when will it be completed.
- (4) What specific steps have been taken to mitigate flooding in Hardwick Crescent since 2015.
- (5) Given that section 5.2 of the report states that stormwater pit and pipe data provided by EDP and Territory and Municipal Services were incomplete, lacking information regarding pipe diameters, invert levels, and locations, why was this data incomplete and is the missing data now available.
- (6) Can the Minister provide a map of the most complete pit and pipe data for the study area referred to in part (5).
- (7) Given that section 10.2.2 of the report states that open spaces within the study area currently provide limited development opportunities due to the risk of flooding, and section 10.2.3 states that mitigation options will increase development opportunities within this area, since the approved masterplan for the Kippax Group Centre includes developing up to 1.6 hectares of green space, what specific mitigation measures have or will be taken to remove the risk of flooding for this new development.
- (8) What are the insurance implications for developments raised in an area known to have a risk of flooding, and what steps will the ACT Government take to address these.
- (9) What impact will development of this area have on potential flooding in the undeveloped area.
- (10) The masterplan for Kippax Group Centre includes the possibility of constructing a road that would link Moyes Crescent with Hardwick Crescent, directly across an area prone to flooding, what form would this road need to take in order to not worsen the risk of flooding in developed areas.

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

- (1) The 2019 Master Plan for Kippax Group Centre was informed by the findings of the 2015 Kippax Flood Study Report. The 2015 Flood Study is currently being updated (revised 2020 study) to incorporate more recent survey information and methods in estimating flooding. This includes updates to account for the latest Bureau of Meteorology rainfall data, ACT Light Detection and Ranging data and infrastructure works since 2015 (by the ACT Government and through new developments) to improve the hydrology and hydraulic modelling since 2015. The final report of the revised 2020 study will have slightly modified recommendations to the previous 2015 study, and will include an estimate of costs for relevant recommendations. Decisions on the recommendations and implementation are yet to be made. The draft report is anticipated to be finalised this year.
- (2) The TUFLOW model was rerun in the revised 2020 study to incorporate more recent survey information and methods in estimating flooding. No detailed design of the draft mitigation measures has been undertaken.

- (3) Hardwick Crescent has been investigated further in the revised 2020 study and it has been identified that minor flooding may occur along this road. The TUFLOW model shows that Hardwick Crescent could have 100mm of water above acceptable flood levels (noting that all streets act as floodways during storms) for approximately 30 minutes during a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP). The overland flow along Hardwick Crescent is contained between the kerbs for the majority of the road. There are no documented flooding complaints from the public at Hardwick Crescent, and the overtopping of the kerb observed in the model does not cause flooding to properties.
 - (4) The nature of flooding along Hardwick Crescent has only recently been confirmed by the revised 2020 study. No works have been undertaken for this location and it would be premature to do so given the proposals for new roads in the area associated with the expansion of the centre are unknown. Due consideration will be given to potential flooding generally, including Hardwick Crescent, as part of the future design.
 - (5) The draft report of the revised 2020 study addresses the reference to incomplete stormwater pit and pipe data as follows:
Stormwater Pit and Pipe data was provided by EPSDD and TCCS in 2015 and was used in the original 2015 Calibre Flood Study. A thorough review of this data revealed some missing information regarding pipe diameters, invert levels, and locations.
ACT Survey was engaged in 2015 to obtain the missing data. The stormwater network for 375mm diameter pipes or greater were added to the TUFLOW model within the TUFLOW Model Area. The extent of the minor network used in the 2015 Calibre Flood Study is displayed in Figure 5-2.
TCCS confirmed that there is no new stormwater infrastructure constructed within the model area since 2015. Therefore, the same stormwater network has been used for this updated 2020 study.
 - (6) An overall plan of the stormwater network in the area, including pit and pipe data, will be provided in the final report of the revised 2020 study.
 - (7) Any new development will be required to have floor levels that are above the 1% AEP +300mm flood level. Existing floodways in the area should be cleared of obstructions or augmented as part of new development. Any development proposal for the site will need to provide a report indicating how the civil engineering issues associated with the development of the site are addressed.
 - (8) No flood prone properties have been identified by the revised 2020 study. It is therefore expected there will be no unusual insurance implications relating to flood risk in the area.
 - (9) The revised 2020 study indicates the need for an augmented floodway adjacent to the Kippax Fair expansion. This should be incorporated as part of the development works.
 - (10) The proposed road linking Moyes Crescent with Hardwick Crescent would be constructed to all relevant standards including those relating to drainage and flooding requirements. These requirements are well established in ACT Government Codes and Standards.
-

**Children and young people—breach of court order complaints
(Question No 3185)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) How many complaints have been received by Child and Youth Protection Services regarding breach of court order allegations for each financial year for the past 10 years.
- (2) How many complaints have been received by the Children and Young People Commissioner regarding breach of court order allegations for each financial year for the past 10 years.

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

1. Child and Youth Protection Services (CYPS) does not record complaint data to this level of specificity. If concerns are raised in relation to a perceived breach of a court order, this may occur directly with the case management area, an application may be filed with the Childrens Court by the affected party, or the affected party may choose to report the alleged breach to police.
2. Advice has been sought from the Justice and Community Safety Directorate. It is understood that the Human Rights Commission does not keep this data and therefore information cannot be provided.

**Children and young people—parental support services
(Question No 3187)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Children, Youth and Families, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) Is the Red Cross Birth Family Advocacy Support Service funded to “support parents when their child has been removed and they want some assistance to access appropriate support services”, as originally envisioned in *A Step Up*; if not, why not; if so, does this include providing assistance to access mental health counselling support services for those needing them.
- (2) What is the current waiting time for birth parents to access the Red Cross Birth Family Advocacy Support Service and how many parents/families are on the waiting list.
- (3) What responsibility, legal or otherwise, does the ACT Government have to provide appropriate support services to birth parents who have been negatively impacted or traumatised by the removal of a child or children.

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

1. As part of *A Step Up for Our Kids*, the Birth Family Advocacy Support Service is funded to assist birth families involved in the child protection system by offering

supports to participate effectively, and in an informed way in the child protection process. It is an independent information and support service for birth families, including kinship carers.

The Birth Family Advocacy Support Service assists families to:

- understand how the child protection system works;
- access targeted services and supports; and
- communicate with Children and Youth Protection Services (CYPS), ACT Together and others involved.

The Birth Family Advocacy Service listens to parents without judgement and offers advice appropriate to their circumstances. The Service recognises that there is significant overlap between contributing mental health factors, the grief and loss after the removal of a child, and ongoing, intergenerational trauma for parents and birth families. In response, the Service has been liaising for several years with services such as the Crisis Assessment and Treatment Team at the Canberra Hospital, as well as linking clients to Relationships Australia, Canberra Alliance for Harm Minimisation and Advocacy, and other mental health services that are able to provide counselling to families in contact with the child protection system.

2. In 2019, the waitlist for Red Cross Advocacy Support Service was 34 families seeking assistance. In June 2019, additional funds of \$338,965 were committed to reduce the waitlist by 50 per cent within four to five months. On 1 July 2020, there were 18 families that were awaiting assistance with an anticipated wait time of 3 to 4 months. Red Cross have reported an increase in service demand during COVID-19.

Red Cross is continuing to triage all referrals and provide those families that are on the waitlist with regular phone contact and assistance, access to Court workshops and referrals to legal services as appropriate.

Red Cross is currently recruiting to a vacant position to further reduce the waitlist and wait times for engagement. It is anticipated that when the new staff member commences, the majority of the families will be allocated to a case manager.

3. When action is taken to ensure the safety and wellbeing of a child or young person that results in them being removed from their parent's care, CYPS engages with parents to understand their needs and provide supports. This includes providing information and advice about services that can assist and support them, support the parent's contribution to care team meetings to support their child or young person, and other supports as identified that would meet their individual needs. In addition, families have access to information such as the 'Working together for kids guides' that contains all information available about where they can seek support, access services and understand child protection processes.

CYPS recognises the distress experienced by families when the child protection system must intervene to ensure the safety and wellbeing of children. CYPS also understands the importance of maintaining contact with birth families and makes efforts to engage and remain in communication with birth families who are involved with the system. These are complex and emotional circumstances and the response is individualised depending on the needs and engagement of each family.

**Transport—infrastructure
(Question No 3188)**

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) In relation to the Fraser West Terminus on Shakespeare Crescent, under the new bus network, the number of buses utilising this terminus has increased from a couple to up to eight buses, what measures will the ACT Government take to cater for this increase.
- (2) Will this bus terminus be permanently located where it is currently, or are there plans to move the terminal to another location; if there are plans to move the terminal, what are other locations are being considered and when will the terminal be relocated.
- (3) If this bus terminus is permanently situated at its current location, are there plans to widen the road to cater for adequate bus parking instead of permitting buses to drive over the kerb and park on the gravelled nature strip.
- (4) If this bus terminus is permanently situated at its current location, are there any plans to establish a separate entryway for pedestrians to safely access the Bicentennial National Trail.
- (5) If this bus terminus is permanently situated at its current location, are there plans to replace the gravel entry of the terminus with bitumen road; if so, when will works commence.
- (6) When will the fixed toilet facilities be repaired and open for use, replacing the current portalooos.
- (7) Was any consultation undertaken by the ACT Government with nearby residents about increasing the number of buses at this terminus prior to the decision being made; if so, (a) with whom, (b) on which occasions, (c) what was the nature of the consultation and (d) what feedback was received.
- (8) What is the noise level for a single bus when the engine is running.
- (9) Have noise levels of buses been measured at this terminus since the increase in buses; if so, when were noise levels assessed and what were the results.
- (10) Are there any mechanical reasons why bus engines may need to stay running when parked at the terminus.

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

- (1) Since the introduction of the new bus network in April 2019, Transport Canberra has extended overflow parking off Shakespeare Crescent at the Fraser West Terminus to accommodate increased bus movements. This work includes laying of compacted gravel, tree trimming and the installation of temporary driver toilets.
- (2) Yes. The bus terminus will remain permanently in the current location on Shakespeare Crescent.

- (3) Yes, more permanent improvements to control bus movements and increase the amenity of the area are being designed and will be consulted with adjacent residents. These designs include additional landscaping to reduce noise and improve the visual amenity of the area, along with new driveways and realigned footpaths to improve access.
- (4) Yes. As part of the landscaping improvements, a pedestrian walking area will be incorporated into the design – with buses kept away from the nearby fencing and walking trail.
- (5) At this stage only some areas of gravel will be replaced with asphalt. This is to allow for the removal and remediation of the site when the current capacity requirements are reduced.
- (6) The existing facilities are currently operational and are supplemented by additional toilets that ensure compliant access for drivers during their breaks. The temporary facilities will remain until a new driver's facility is constructed to replace the existing one.
- (7) No consultation was undertaken with the adjacent residents prior to the implementation of the new bus network.

Transport Canberra has been in more regular communications with a number of residents directly adjacent to the facility in recent months. Their feedback has been included in the design of the improvements, which they will be consulted on prior to their implementation.

- (8) Transport Canberra has a diverse bus fleet, however, generally when idling a (non-zero emissions bus) is less than 70 decibels.
- (9) Yes, Transport Canberra has conducted a noise level assessment in the area. It should be noted that exemptions in the Environmental Protection Act allow buses to idle for up to 5 minutes at the facility.

Transport Canberra are working with drivers to ensure compliance, which has included driver information, staff videos and signage placed on site. In addition to these operational improvements, the proposed landscaping enhancements will assist with managing the noise from idling buses at this location.

- (10) There are no specific mechanical reasons for buses to stay running, however, depending on the weather the vehicles can be affected by the heat or cold and require to be running in order to maintain cabin temperatures at appropriate levels for customers and the drivers.

Transport—ticketing systems (Question No 3190)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) In a letter to me dated 16 June 2020, the Minister stated that “Transport Canberra has installed ticketing vending machines at locations where there is high public transport

use and high volumes of passenger transfers, justifying the proportionate services available from the ticket vending machine investment. Machine locations currently include Light Rail and major bus stations in major town centres (Tuggeranong, Woden, Civic, Belconnen and Gungahlin)”, what was the cost to install MyWay ticketing vending machines at each of these locations.

- (2) What, if any, is the ongoing maintenance cost for the ticketing vending machines in each location.
- (3) Does the ACT Government lease MyWay ticketing vending machines to private vendors; if so, what is the cost to a vendor of leasing such a machine.
- (4) What rules or guidelines apply to leasing such a machine, for example, are there limits on numbers and is there a competitive process.
- (5) How many ticketing vending machines are currently leased out.

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

- (1) The cost to install the ticket vending machines at each of the locations listed is between \$85,681 and \$90,681, the cost is dependent on the nature of individual requirements at each location.
- (2) Ongoing maintenance costs per year for all the ticket vending machines at locations listed above is \$131,280.31.
- (3) No.
- (4) N/A.
- (5) None.

Roads—William Hovell Drive (Question No 3194)

Mrs Kikkert asked the Minister for Roads and Active Travel, upon notice, on 3 July 2020:

- (1) What is the projected timeline for each stage of construction on the William Hovell Drive duplication.
- (2) To which business was the tender awarded to.
- (3) What solutions are being implemented to reduce the effect of noise from traffic on nearby households, particularly Mainoru Place, Elsey Street, Kurundi Place and Florina Place in Hawker.
- (4) Is a dedicated bike lane intended to be included in the design.

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

- (1) Construction staging and associated timeframes are being investigated as part of the current detail design consultancy.

- (2) The detail design consultancy was awarded to SMEC Australia Pty Ltd.
- (3) The detail design includes undertaking a noise study in accordance with Roads ACT's Noise Management Guidelines (2018) to ensure appropriate standards are met. These will include the final wearing surface of the duplicated road being a low noise producing asphalt product.
- (4) There are two dedicated on-road cycle lanes (one in each direction) and an off-road shared path proposed in the design.

Questions without notice taken on notice

Schools—COVID-19

Ms Berry (*in reply to a supplementary question by Mrs Jones on Thursday, 7 May 2020*):

- 1) ACT Education's approach to managing COVID-19 risk has been informed by advice from the ACT Chief Health Officer and the Australian Health Principal Protection Committee. It is tabled below:

Advice	Date published
Australian Health Protection Principal Committee (AHPPC) advice on reducing COVID-19 transmission in schools. (Attachment A)	24 April 2020
Australian Health Department advice on routine environmental cleaning and disinfection in the community. (Attachment B)	First edition: 26 March 2020
Chief Health Officer advice on ACT schools (Attachment C)	6 May 2020

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

Canberra Hospital—infrastructure

Ms Stephen-Smith (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Miss C Burch on Thursday, 21 May 2020*):

From time to time Canberra Health Services (CHS) has commissioned a variety of reports on its facilities and infrastructure.

1. As part of the Strategic Asset Management Plan (SAMP) activities, CHS is developing Asset Management Plans (AMP) for all critical buildings, including Building 1 Tower Block at Canberra Hospital. Building AMP activities include comprehensive maintenance plans and periodic condition audits to inform ongoing maintenance activities and future projects for specific buildings. Outputs from these activities include multiple reports by a variety of specialist contractors and consultants to assist CHS Facilities Management (FM) division work prioritisation, and to inform standardised FM specifications for existing and future building development across the CHS property portfolio.

2. The most recent Building 1 report that was undertaken on behalf of CHS is the regular façade condition audit report which was completed by ARUP in March 2020. The output from this report provides advice on the current condition of the Building Façade and associated infrastructure e.g. building windows and frames, and makes recommendations for remediation over short (< 1year), medium (2 to 5 years) and long term (>5years) periods.

The findings of this report are incorporated into the Risk Control Action Plan (RCAP) entry for the known Building 1 façade risk and the relevant actions plans are updated accordingly.

3. No. Specific engineering reports are not for general distribution. The reports are used by FM Subject Matter Experts to inform current and planned maintenance work and to inform future building asset management. This asset management process is focused on maintaining staff, visitor and patient safety, as well as business continuity across all CHS properties.

Mental health—acute care capacity

Mr Rattenbury (*in reply to a question by Mrs Jones on Thursday, 4 June 2020*):

I am sorry to hear of the experience of this young person.

The ACT Health Directorate advised that mental health care is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week in ACT. Details as follows:

- Calvary Hospital has a team of mental health practitioners available in the emergency Department during the following periods:

Monday	8.30am – 7.30pm
Tuesday	8.30am – 5.00pm
Wednesday	8.30am – 7.30pm
Thursday	8.30am – 7.30pm
Friday	8.30am – 7.30pm
Saturday and Sunday	8.30am – 5.30pm

Staff at the Emergency Department are able to carry out mental health assessments and liaise with the Access Team, part of Mental Health Justice Health Alcohol and Drug services outside of the hours specified above. This service is available 24 hours a day.

- There is a mental health clinician at Canberra Hospital Emergency Department (ED) 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

The Mental Health Consultation Liaison Service (MHCL) undertakes mental health assessments for people who present to ED. At a minimum, there is always at least one mental health clinician rostered on in the department, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The MHCL works in conjunction with the ED staff and is supported by a psychiatrist.

For young people who present to Canberra Hospital ED, the CAMHS Hospital Liaison Team (HLT) triages and assesses children, young people and adolescents with mental health vulnerabilities. HLT operates from 8.30am to 5.00pm Monday to Sunday. If a young person presents during these hours, an assessment is conducted by this team. If they present outside these hours, they are assessed by the MHCL.

Both Calvary Hospital as well as Canberra Hospital confirm mental health staff are rostered to provide mental health support to people that present to an emergency department.

The ACT Health Directorate is not aware that people, having presented, are ever advised that no practitioner is available to see them; they may be advised that there is a considerable waiting time anticipated in relation to demand at time of presentation.

Children and young people—parental contact

Ms Stephen-Smith *(in reply to a question by Mrs Kikkert on Thursday, 18 June 2020):*

In response to Mrs Kikkert's question, I can inform the Assembly:

I refer you to my response of 15 July 2020 to question on notice number 3061.

Children and young people—parental contact

Ms Stephen-Smith *(in reply to a question by Mrs Kikkert on Thursday, 18 June 2020):*

In response to Mrs Kikkert's question, I can inform the Assembly:

Service level data is not kept in relation to the number of supervised contact visits terminated because a birth parent has tried to explain the conditions of the contact visit.

Public housing—renewal program

Mr Gentleman *(in reply to supplementary questions by Mr Wall and Mr Parton on Thursday, 18 June 2020):*

All public housing developments approved by the planning and land authority have been determined to comply with the Territory Plan and *Planning and Development Act 2007*.

All public housing development applications are treated the same as any other development application and assessed against the same Territory Plan requirements.

The independent planning and land authority did not provide any special waivers, exemptions or conditions to public housing developments in the development assessment process.

The ACT Government has provided a partial remission of lease variation charge for public housing developments through the *Planning and Development (Remission of Lease Variation Charges for the Housing Commissioner) Determination 2018* (DI2018-93), effective on 17 May 2018.

Hospitals—specialist waiting lists

Ms Stephen-Smith (*in reply to supplementary questions by Mr Coe and Mr Wall on Thursday, 18 June 2020*):

1. ACT Health Directorate is developing a Territory-Wide Health Service Plan (The Plan). The Plan will identify priorities for health service development and redesign across the ACT.

It will be based on a comprehensive assessment of health service needs across the care continuum on a geographic basis and for priority population groups and will consider the range of public health services provided by Canberra Health Services, Calvary Public Hospital Bruce and other organisations in the community.

This will include consideration of the capacity and capability of ear, nose and throat (ENT) services in context of the prioritisation of service needs across the broader public health system.

2. The ACT Government remains committed to continuing to increase and improve the information available on the public health system, which includes information about waiting times to see specialists.

In 2019-20, the median waiting time for ACT patients to receive their procedure once they had seen a specialist and were placed on the elective surgery waiting list were:

- Urgency category 1 (i.e. surgery required within 30 days): 16 days
- Urgency category 2 (i.e. surgery required within 90 days): 70 days
- Urgency category 3 (i.e. surgery required within 365 days): 198 days

Planning—master plans

Mr Gentleman (*in reply to a question by Mr Coe on Thursday, 23 July 2020*):

The master plan program produced 15 master plans that were completed from 2011 through to 2019.

Finalised	Master Plan
May 2011	Dickson Group Centre
July 2011	Kingston Group Centre
July 2012	Kambah Group Centre
September 2012	Tuggeranong Town Centre
September 2012	Erindale Group Centre

Finalised	Master Plan
November 2013	Pialligo
December 2014	Oaks Estate
December 2014	Weston Group Centre
November 2015	Woden Town Centre
November 2015	Mawson Group Centre
September 2016	Belconnen Town Centre
September 2016	Calwell Group Centre
September 2018	Tharwa Village
November 2018	Curtin Group Centre
March 2019	Kippax Group Centre

Planning—Gungahlin cinema

Mr Gentleman (*in reply to a question and a supplementary question by Mr Milligan on Thursday, 23 July 2020*):

Parking is addressed in Part B of the attached Notice of Decision for DA201936502.

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