

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

COUNCIL

1127

---

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

---

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

---

### Water: sewerage charge

(Question No. 162)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment, for the Minister for Natural Resources:

Can the minister guarantee that up to and including the year 2000, domestic customers previously served by Melbourne Water will not be charged differing prices per kilolitre of sewerage and waste water disposed of to reflect different costs of providing sewerage services?

**Hon. M. A. BIRRELL** (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Natural Resources is:

The price per kilolitre for sewerage and waste water disposal for domestic customers is fixed at 15 cents per kilolitre until 31 December 1996. The Office of the Regulator-General will determine the price for sewerage and waste water disposal from 1 January 1997.

### Water: supply costs

(Question No. 164)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment, for the Minister for Natural Resources:

Can the minister guarantee that up to and including the year 2000, consumers in the areas previously served by Melbourne Water will not be charged differing prices per kilolitre of water consumed to reflect different costs of supply?

**Hon. M. A. BIRRELL** (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Natural Resources is:

The price per kilolitre for water consumed is fixed at 65 cents per kilolitre until 31 December 1996. The Office of the Regulator-General will determine the price for water consumed from 1 January 1997.

### Conservation and Natural Resources: publication

(Question No. 165)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

In respect of the brochure entitled *The Department of Conservation and Natural Resources*:

- (a) How many copies were produced?
- (b) What was the total cost of production?
- (c) Where was the document distributed?

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer is:

- (a) 10 000 copies.
- (b) \$34 740 to develop and print plus \$7929 for photographs which are being used for other publications and display projects and exhibitions.
- (c) Distribution — to local government, relevant conferences and delegations, CNR offices around the state for general public inquiries, Friends of groups, other groups/organisations with an interest in CNR's operations, libraries, universities, TAFE colleges and secondary schools, coalition MPs, and Information Victoria.

The booklet was designed to meet the need for a simple, easy-to-read explanation of the very complex role of the department. It is a timely and much needed product, and has been well received by the community and staff.

### Water: sewerage charge

(Question No. 166)

Hon. B. T. PULLEN asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment, for the Minister for Natural Resources:

In relation to public consultation over the introduction of the sewerage disposal charge:

- (a) What was the nature of the consultation, giving the period of consultation, the number of persons consulted, and the names of any organisations consulted?
- (b) What was the cost of the consultation?
- (c) Were any public opinion polls conducted or were any telephone polling conducted?
- (d) Did the results of any consultation influence the government's decision to proceed with the sewerage disposal charge?

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Natural Resources is:

- (a) Melbourne Water undertook consultation and market research with respect to the sewerage disposal charge over the period September 1993 to November 1994.  
Market research used focus groups to provide feedback on alternative charging proposals, presentation on customer's bills and information to be included in brochures to be issued with the bills. The focus groups covered a cross section of customers based on water use, property value, region and occupancy type, eg. pensioners, tenants and owners.  
A shopping centre survey was conducted in October 1994 to assess the awareness of the sewerage disposal charge and the type of information customers required to help them better understand their bills.  
Consultation with specific customer groups included the Tenants Union of Victoria and the three regional advisory boards established by Melbourne Water.
- (b) The cost of the consultation and research was \$71 000.
- (c) Public opinion polls or telephone polls were not conducted.
- (d) The results of the consultation and research showed there was strong customer support for the establishment of a user pays component of the sewerage charge. Customers saw the charge as being fair and reasonable, especially when compared to the current basis of charging, that is the value of the property.

### Parks: visitor surveys

(Question No. 167)

Hon. B. T. PULLEN asked the Minister for Conservation and Natural Resources:

In relation to users of parks directly managed by Melbourne Parks and Waterways, and on the basis of visitor surveys, will the minister make available information on where the users of the parks reside, based on either municipal boundaries or postcodes?

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer is:

Visitor survey information has been progressively collected, previously by Melbourne Water, and more recently by Melbourne Parks and Waterways. To date this data is available for 10 of the major parks managed by Melbourne Parks and Waterways.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

COUNCIL

1129

These parks are: Cardinia Reservoir, Sugarloaf Reservoir, Werribee Park, Maroondah Reservoir, Braeside Park, Albert Park, Maribyrnong Valley Parklands (including Brimbank and Pipemakers parks and Horseshoe Bend Childrens Farm), Dandenong Valley Parklands (including Jells, Nortons and Bushy parks and Shepherds Bush), Point Cook Coastal Park and Wattle Park.

Overall, on the information to hand, visitors to the 10 surveyed parks have come from 169 of the 210 metropolitan postcode areas. Those areas not represented are 3785, 3789, 3792, 3026, 3975, 3000, 3090, 3335, 3427, 3428, 3063, 3045, 3062, 3064, 3751, 3755, 3754, 3091, 3096, 3759, 3760, 3763, 3753, 3002, 3061, 3001, 3933, 3913, 3944, 3943, 3942, 3941, 3940, 3936, 3937, 3916, 3928, 3920, 3919, 3927, 3918, many of which are industrial or green wedge non-urban areas.

### Metropolitan improvement rate

(Question No. 168)

Hon. B. T. PULLEN asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

In relation to the parks levy collected from Melbourne ratepayers in 1993-94 in conjunction with their water rates and charges, how much revenue was collected — (i) in total; (ii) on a local government area basis on either new or old boundaries; (iii) what grants or assistances have been given to different areas of Melbourne, based on either new or old local government boundaries in the past two years; and (iv) what criteria and process was used in determining and allocating grants?

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer is:

(i)

The total amount collected through the metropolitan improvement rate was approximately \$58 million.

Up to and including the 1993-94 business year, approximately half the revenue from the metropolitan improvement rate was used to fund the underground rail loop debt and the government's metropolitan planning administration.

Under positive reforms to the metropolitan improvement rate announced by the government in March 1994, all funds raised now go to:

- \* operating Melbourne Parks and Waterways;
- \* funding the Royal Botanic Gardens, the Royal Melbourne Zoo, Healesville Sanctuary etc; and
- \* funding the Melbourne Parks & Waterways program, which provides community and agency grants for open space initiatives throughout greater Melbourne.

(ii)

The attached table (Appendix 1) sets out the 1993-94 MIR revenue according to the local government areas which existed at the time.

(iii)

Except for specific allocations under the Melbourne Parks and Waterways program, funding allocations are not based on local government areas. Appendix 2 (a) sets out the specific 'local government' grants component of the 1993-94 Melbourne Parks and Waterways program. Appendix 2 (b) sets out the specific 'local government' grants component of the 1994-95 Melbourne Parks and Waterways program.

(iv)

The criteria used in allocating grants for 1993-94 are set out in Appendix 3.

The process each year is as follows:

- \* call for applications;
- \* workshops with agencies and community groups;
- \* initial assessment of applications by Melbourne Parks & Waterways officers;
- \* recommendations from independent advisory council to minister;
- \* decision by minister; and
- \* independent audit of entire program by major accounting firm.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1130

COUNCIL

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

APPENDIX 1

Local Government area (old boundaries)	Metropolitan Improvement Rate Revenue 1993-94 (\$M)
Altona	0.7
Berwick	1.2
Box Hill	0.9
Brighton	0.6
Broadmeadows	1.7
Brunswick	0.8
Bulla	0.7
Camberwell	1.5
Caulfield	1.4
Chelsea	0.5
Coburg	0.9
Collingwood	0.4
Cranbourne	1.1
Croydon	0.8
Dandenong	1.1
Diamond Valley	0.9
Doncaster	1.6
Eltham	0.6
Essendon	1.0
Fitzroy	0.4
Flinders	1.7
Footscray	0.9
Frankston	1.5
Hastings	0.6
Hawthorn	0.8
Heidelberg	1.0
Keilor	1.6
Kew	0.5
Knox	2.2
Lilydale	1.2
Malvern	1.0
Melbourne	3.8
Melton	0.5
Moorabbin	1.9
Mordialloc	0.5
Mornington	0.7
Northcote	0.9
Nunawading	1.6
Oakleigh	1.1
Port Melbourne	0.4
Prahran	1.1
Preston	1.3
Richmond	0.5
Ringwood	0.7
Sandringham	0.6
Sherbrooke	0.5
Springvale	1.5
St Kilda	1.0
Sunshine	1.5
Waverley	2.0
Werribee	1.3

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

COUNCIL

1131

Whittlesea	1.4
Williamstown	0.4
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>57.9</b>

**APPENDIX 2(a)**

Melbourne Parks and Waterways Program 1993-94 — Local Government Grants – made direct to councils

MUNICIPALITY	TOTAL
City of Brighton	\$65 000.00
City of Brunswick	\$36 000.00
City of Chelsea	\$50 000.00
City of Croydon	\$10 000.00
City of Dandenong	\$98 000.00
City of Donc. & Templ.	\$112 000.00
City of Essendon	\$103 000.00
City of Frankston	\$40 000.00
City of Hawthorn	\$25 000.00
City of Heidelberg	\$21 000.00
City of Keilor	\$25 000.00
City of Sandringham	\$35 000.00
City of Springvale	\$5 000.00
City of St Kilda	\$10 000.00
City of Williamstown	\$100 000.00
Shire of Bulla	\$11 000.00
Shire of Diamond Valley	\$15 000.00
Shire of Eltham	\$45 000.00
Shire of Flinders	\$576 400.00
Shire of Hastings	\$547 950.00
Shire of Lilydale	\$290 000.00
Shire of Melton	\$20 000.00
Shire of Mornington	\$464 000.00
Shire of Sherbrooke	\$149 300.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2 853 650.00</b>

**APPENDIX 2(b)**

Melbourne Parks and Waterways Program 1994-95 — Local Government Grant Allocation

MUNICIPALITY	GRANT
City of Banyule	\$64 000
City of Bayside	\$278 900
City of Boroondara	\$75 000
City of Brimbank	\$270 000
City of Casey	\$50 000
City of Darebin	\$160 450
City of Frankston	\$103 750
City of Greater Dandenong	\$77 500

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1132

COUNCIL

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

City of Hobsons Bay	\$200 000
City of Hume	\$170 000
City of Kingston	\$125 000
City of Manningham	\$77 500
City of Maribyrnong	\$12 000
City of Maroondah	\$70 000
City of Melbourne	\$365 500
City of Monash	\$180 000
City of Moreland	\$85 000
City of Port Phillip	\$58 000
City of Whitehorse	\$50 000
City of Yarra	\$109 700
Shire of Cardinia	\$6 800
Shire of Mornington Peninsula	\$550 000
Shire of Nillumbik	\$55 000
Shire of Yarra Ranges	\$96 900
TOTAL	\$3 293 000

### APPENDIX 3

The Melbourne Parks and Waterways Program 1993-94 — Grants

The criteria used in allocating grants for 1993-94 were as follows:

#### TYPES OF GRANTS

The Melbourne Parks and Waterways program offered several types of funding for projects over the last two years. Local government grants were offered on a dollar for dollar basis or as an interest-free loan repayable over 10 years. Management agency grants were offered to trusts, committees of management, government departments or statutory authorities, either on the basis of the full cost of the project; or on a cost-sharing basis; or as an interest-free loan repayable over 10 years. Community grants of up to \$5000 were available for community groups taking part in the management and conservation of land, water, vegetation, wildlife and cultural heritage sites. A project may have received up to \$10 000 where two or more groups undertook it on a co-operative basis.

#### GRANTS CRITERIA

Projects were considered for funding only if:

- they were located within the metropolitan improvement rate area;
- they were of strategic or regional significance;
- they were consistent with Melbourne Parks and Waterways program objectives, funding priorities, and government policy;
- they were endorsed by the landowner on whose land the project was to proceed;
- they required no recurrent expenditure funding from the Melbourne Parks and Waterways program; and
- the applicant could demonstrate that the allocation would be spent by the completion date.

#### AGENCY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS CRITERIA

Highest funding priority was given to proposals that:

- were clearly of regional significance;
- maximised on-the-ground works;
- completed or enhanced the creation of strategic open space linkages (including land control or acquisition and the development of shared pathways or other facilities);
- involved some major, lasting environmental improvement;
- improved or protected the natural values of rivers and streams;
- improved and protected the foreshores of Port Phillip Bay;

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

COUNCIL

1133

were based on a management plan, master plan or concept plan that had been endorsed through community consultation and had been adopted by the relevant government agencies or municipality;  
involved considerable community participation;  
involved and encouraged cooperation between agencies, municipalities and community groups;  
provided or enhanced appropriate information, recreation facilities and settings that serve regional or metropolitan-wide community needs;  
enhanced community appreciation, education and interpretation of open space values;  
enhanced access to and safe use of open space for all sections of the community, including people with disabilities;  
were capable of generating revenue to maintain or further develop open space; and  
supported tourism development on parks and waterways.

### COMMUNITY GRANTS CRITERIA

Highest funding priority was given to proposals that  
involved environmental improvement or protection of parks, waterways, corridors or sites of high nature conservation, historic, cultural or landscape values;  
enhanced access to and safe use of open space for all sections of the community, including people with disabilities;  
had benefits which could be shared by the broader community;  
attracted community support for and contribution to the project;  
involved consultation and coordination between community groups and land managers;  
would lead to substantial on-ground improvements (the money was not being used just for maintenance costs);  
displayed forward planning that outlined adequate arrangements for all stages of the project, including on-going maintenance by the land manager;  
attracted contributions from other sources; and  
involved the use of materials that do not contribute to other environmental problems.

### Metropolitan improvement rate

(Question No. 169)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

In relation to 1993-94 expenditure by Melbourne Parks and Waterways, including direct expenditure in the form of grants to other agencies:

- (a) How much expenditure cannot be attributed to place-specific outputs such as overheads?
- (b) How much was spent on a local government basis based on either new or old local government boundaries?

**Hon. M. A. BIRRELL** (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer is:

In regard to expenditure of the metropolitan improvement rate by Melbourne Water (Melbourne Parks & Waterways did not exist as a separate body in 1993-94), I am advised as follows:

- (a)  
Of the total expenditure on \$69.697m (applied against revenue from the metropolitan improvement rate and from other sources in 1993-94) two significant expenditure items were made under long-standing direction and legislation:

\$16.900m to the Consolidated Fund

\$10.126m to the Metropolitan Underground Rail Loop Authority

Of the balance, some \$6.06m cannot be attributed to place specific outputs.

- (b)

See answer to question no. 168.

### Zumstein project

(Question No. 170)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

In relation to the redevelopment of facilities at Zumsteins in the western Grampians/Gariwerd:

- (a) How much money has the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources expended?
- (b) What funds remain unexpended?
- (c) What consultation was conducted with local residents in relation to the plans for redevelopment?

**Hon. M. A. BIRRELL** (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer is:

- (a) In the 1994-95 financial year I am advised that \$96 000 has been spent on the project. This covers salaries, materials and plant.
- (b) The cost of the Zumstein project is dependent on the outcome of the consultation process and finalisation of plans.
- (c) Consultation with the local residents on redevelopment plans included four meetings between the chief ranger and the Northern Grampians Promotion Group's Zumsteins Redevelopment Committee during 1994 and a formal meeting with the Grampians National Park Advisory Committee and with local community representatives in 1995.

### Schools: global budgets

(Question No. 172)

**Hon. M. M. GOULD** asked the Minister for Tertiary Education and Training, for the Minister for Education:

In relation to funding for schools in 1995 what is the allocation in total and by region, respectively, by staffing numbers and/or dollars (where appropriate), for the following components of the global budget for primary and secondary schools — (i) employment of principal class officers; (ii) employment of AST3 and AST2 and head teachers; (iii) core special needs allocations; (iv) school responsibility positions; (v) special school teacher allowance; (vi) non-teaching support staff; (vii) Workcover premium; (viii) superannuation charge; (ix) payroll tax; (x) casual relief teachers; (xi) operating expense grant base and per capita funding; (xii) contract cleaning; (xiii) grounds allowance; (xiv) building area allowance; (xv) multi-site allowance; (xvi) multi-campus allowance; (xvii) multi-campus travel; (xviii) utilities; (xix) maintenance and minor works; (xx) new integration students; (xxi) teacher aids; (xxii) paramedical and interpreter staff; (xxiii) integration equipment grant; (xxiv) physiotherapy grant; (xxv) interpreter grant; (xxvi) paramedical grant; (xxvii) occupational therapy grant; (xxviii) nurse grant; (xxix) literacy intervention grant; (xxx) DSP grant; (xxxi) student at risk grant; (xxxii) non English speaking background; (xxxiii) rurality; (xxxiv) isolation; (xxxv) physical and sports education grant; (xxxvi) professional development grant; (xxxvii) new initiatives; (xxxviii) LOTE grant; (xxxix) telematics grant; (xxxx) artists in school grants; (xxxxi) artist in education grant; (xxxxii) country area program grant; (xxxxiii) priority language program; (xxxxiv) gender equity program grant; (xxxxv) joint community projects grant; (xxxxvi) MARC and MACC vans; and (xxxxvii) transitional funding?

**Hon. HADDON STOREY** (Minister for Tertiary Education and Training) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Education is:

To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available. The honourable member may wish to submit a more focussed and specific question on this matter.

### Catchment and land management division

(Question No. 173)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment, for the Minister for Natural Resources:

- (a) What is the current staff establishment in the Catchment and Land Management Division?
- (b) How many officials are currently associated with Landcare?
- (c) What functions are under consideration for outsourcing?
- (d) Will functions be put out to competitive tender?
- (e) What monitoring of performance will occur and will Landcare groups and conservation groups be involved in monitoring outcomes?

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

COUNCIL

1135

- (f) Will reports be publicly available?
- (g) What criteria will be used as a basis for evaluating the impact of privatising of Landcare and other CALM activities?
- (h) Has the Department of Natural Resources employed a consultant to facilitate outsourcing of CALM; if so, who is the consultant and what fee is being paid?

**Hon. M. A. BIRRELL** (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Natural Resources is:

- (a) Current staff establishment is 422 staff.
- (b) All staff would contribute to Landcare in some ways.
- (c) A pilot project for contracting a non-government agency or private company to deliver extension services under a departmental supervisor is being considered. The honourable member has been briefed on this by Director, Catchment and Land Management
- (d) Yes.
- (e) Monitoring will be carried out based on the specification of performance measures defined in the contract. This will be carried out under the supervision of a steering committee, which will be made up of two department staff and two nominees sponsored by the Catchment and Land Protection Board for a region set up under the Catchment and Land Protection Act.
- (f) Reports will be available to the steering committee and relevant boards. The information from this will be publicly available.
- (g) This is not 'privatisation of Landcare'. Landcare is a partnership between community and government; government supports Landcare through the provision of certain funding and services. The main criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of CALM programs will be:
  - (i) client satisfaction — considered through customer/community survey;
  - (ii) the relative cost of a service delivered to a particular standard;
  - (iii) The report of the relative condition and management of the state's soil and water resources which is a requirement of each Catchment and Land Protection Board as set out in the Catchment and Land Protection Act.
- (h) The department has engaged Rendell McGuckian and Associates to assist with the development of a project brief and specification. The cost is in the order of \$4,000.

### Conservation and environment: privatisation

(Question No. 174)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment:

- (a) What areas in his portfolio are being considered for outsourcing, contracting out or privatisation?
- (b) Are any areas carrying out environmental research or monitoring are being considered for privatisation, outsourcing or contracting out?
- (c) Have any consultants been engaged to examine the potential for privatisation or outsourcing; if so, who are they and what is their brief?
- (d) Have any reports been produced dealing with privatisation, outsourcing or contracting out; if so, what are their titles?

**Hon. M. A. BIRRELL** (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer is:

The Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (CNR) recently announced a range of structural reforms. These are detailed in a document entitled *CNR's Future Framework - The Next Logical Step* which details the current status within CNR of major outsourcing and contracting out initiatives.

With respect to other initiatives, as the honourable member would be aware, over the past five years CNR has undertaken a range of work through outsourcing and contracting out. Contracts have been let in the following service areas:

- Personnel/payroll
- Information technology
- Fleet management
- Fire suppression
- Aviation operations
- Pest, plant and animal control

Construction and maintenance activities.

Contracting out/outsourcing in these areas is not new and was undertaken by CNR prior to the last election. Such initiatives were encouraged by the previous government. I am advised that as at 1 May 1995, no consultants are presently engaged by CNR to specifically examine activities for their potential for privatisation.

With respect to statutory agencies in my portfolio, I have been provided with following information:

The Zoological Board of Victoria is considering contracting out cleaning and ground maintenance. The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) is considering contracting out internal audit and stores supply functions. Outsourcing of information technology was considered by EPA in 1994 but was retained as an in-house service on grounds of cost-effectiveness and efficiency. Melbourne Parks and Waterways has advised that it has largely completed its contracting out program. No other agencies have outsourcing or contracting out under consideration.

Environmental research for Melbourne Parks and Waterways is largely contracted out. No other agencies are considering outsourcing environmental research or monitoring but the EPA will, as an ongoing process, continue to review its services with a view to delivering them in the most cost-effective and efficient way.

Apart from the corporatisation of CNR research, which is under consideration, no agencies have engaged consultants to examine the potential for privatisation or outsourcing. One report dealing with these matters has been produced: *Information Technology Outsourcing Review, March 1994*, which was prepared by the EPA.

### Natural Resources: privatisation

(Question No. 175)

Hon. B. T. PULLEN asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment, for the Minister for Natural Resources:

- (a) What areas in the minister's portfolio are being currently considered for outsourcing and/or privatisation?
- (b) What consultants have been engaged to assist with outsourcing or investigation of privatisation, what are their briefs and what fees and/or costs are involved?
- (c) Are any of the research areas of the portfolio being considered for contracting out, outsourcing or other forms of privatisation?

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer is:

The Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (CNR) recently announced a range of structural reforms. These are detailed in a document entitled *CNR's Future Framework - The Next Logical Step* which details the current status within CNR of major outsourcing and contracting out initiatives.

As at 1 May 1995, no consultants are presently engaged by CNR to specifically examine activities for their potential for privatisation.

With respect to statutory bodies within my portfolio, I have been provided with the following information:

City West Water has advised that current operations are continually being reviewed to improve efficiency and effectiveness, and some internal services, eg. payroll, may be outsourced in the future. Yarra Valley Water is considering outsourcing field-based activities. Melbourne Water is considering outsourcing internal audit, environmental audit, printing services and fleet management.

The government engaged consultants for specific shareholder investment advice in relation to the Victorian Plantations Corporation. The brief included outlining restructuring options and an optional structure or process to maximise proceeds to the state together with an implementation plan.

No other consultants have been engaged to examine the potential for privatisation or outsourcing.

The corporatisation of CNR research is under consideration. Melbourne Water is the only portfolio agency considering contracting out research. This area of research relates to water quality, and would involve Melbourne Water joining the Co-operative Research Centre for Water Quality and Treatment.

### HACC funding

(Question No. 178)

Hon. D. A. NARDELLA asked the Minister for Aged Care:

- (a) What funding under the HACC program, has been allocated and spent in each financial year from 1990-91 to 1994-95; and what proportion are growth funds?
- (b) In respect of each of the above years how much of the growth funds has been allocated to — (i) post acute services; (ii) palliative services; (iii) ethno specific services; (iv) services specifically for people with disabilities; and (v) any other types of specified services?

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

COUNCIL

1137

Hon. R. I. KNOWLES (Minister for Aged Care) — The answer is:

- (a) The following table lists the total HACC appropriation for the financial years in question.

Financial Year	Total Appropriation	Proportion Growth	Per cent
1990-91	\$143.6m	\$20.4m	14.2
1991-92	\$151.7m	\$8.1m	5.3
1992-93	\$159.3m	\$7.6m	4.7
1993-94	\$171.8m	\$12.5m	7.3
1994-95	\$180.3m	\$8.5m	4.7

- (b) Allocations are not made specifically for the purposes of post-acute or palliative care and the total amount of service in these areas is limited, currently, by the terms of the 1985 HACC Agreement. HACC funded organisations would all be expected to deliver services appropriate to the cultural composition of their catchment areas. All HACC funding is directed to people with disabilities (including disabilities due to frailty). However, the following table lists total HACC funding to ethno specific and Koorie organisations up to the 1993-94 financial year:

Financial Year	Ethno specific	Koorie services
1990-91	\$2.0m	N/A
1991-92	\$2.8m	\$0.7m
1992-93	\$2.3m	\$0.8m
1993-94	\$2.9m	\$1.0m

### Water: sales

(Question No. 184)

Hon. B. T. PULLEN asked the Minister for Conservation and Environment, for the Minister for Natural Resources:

- What quantity of water was sold to New South Wales irrigators in 1994-95?
- What were the dates of any sales?
- Has any water been made available for environmental flows to wetlands in Victoria?
- Is there existing government policy in respect of the provision of environmental water for streams and wetlands in Northern Victoria; if so — (i) is this a result of a cabinet decision; and (ii) when was this decision taken and what is the substance of the decision?
- On what occasions has environmental water been provided?

Hon. M. A. BIRRELL (Minister for Conservation and Environment) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Natural Resources is:

- Of 20 000 megalitres offered for sale by tender, 6700 megalitres were sold to New South Wales irrigators.
- Tender bids were processed on 19 January 1995, offers were made to successful bidders on 20 January and individual sales subsequently completed by acceptance of offers.
- In 1994-95, 7600 megalitres of environmental water were not offered for sale but retained in order to provide water for Hird's and Johnson's swamp, if required. A management decision has been taken not to fill these wetlands this year. The unsold proportion (10 600 megalitres) of the 20 000 megalitres offered for sale has also been available for wetland watering.
- There is existing government policy in respect of the provision of environmental water for rivers and wetlands in Northern Victoria.
  - A decision was taken under the previous government by the former Natural Resources and Environment Committee of Cabinet (NRECC). There is a further decision by the Murray Darling Ministerial Council specifically relating to Barmah-Millewa Forest.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1138

COUNCIL

Tuesday, 30 May 1995

---

- (ii) The NRECC decision was taken in August 1968 and had the effect of providing an interim allocation of 27 600 megalitres of water with the same security as water right for flora and fauna conservation purposes in Northern Victoria. The then Department of Conservation, Forests and Lands was provided the flexibility to determine the location, timing and volume of water allocated to wetlands, subject to the physical constraints of the distribution system.

The decision by the Murray Darling Ministerial Council was taken in June 1993 and had the effect of providing both New South Wales and Victoria with 50 000 megalitres for use in the management of Barmah-Millewa Forest. Neither the form of the water entitlement nor the way in which it is to be used have been determined.
- (e) Environmental water was supplied in 1988-89 to the following wetlands: Hird's Swamp; Johnson's Swamp; McDonald's Swamp and Cullens Lake. The same waters except for McDonald's Swamp received environmental water in 1990-91.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Wednesday, 31 May 1995

COUNCIL

1139

Wednesday, 31 May 1995

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### Schools: vandalism

(Question No. 159)

Hon. M. M. GOULD asked the Minister for Tertiary Education and Training, for the Minister for Education:

- (a) What was the number and cost of arson, burglary and wilful damage against schools in each region for each financial year from 1991-92 to 1993-94 and the estimated cost per pupil of that damage?
- (b) What provisions are made for school security?
- (c) What was the total expenditure on school security in each financial year from 1991-92 to 1993-94 and for each region?

Hon. HADDON STOREY (Minister for Tertiary Education and Training) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Education is:

- (a) Reimbursements to schools for burglary and wilful damage under the schools equipment insurance scheme were:

1991-92	635	\$752 736
1992-93	580	\$868 004
1993-94	580	\$867 715

Data are not maintained on a regional basis.

Payments for fire and natural disaster reinstatement, including arson, provide for the clean up, rebuilding of facilities and/or provision of replacement relocatables. Head office payments are not maintained on a regional basis. It should be noted that such payments may not have been made in the year that the fire/natural disaster took place. The costs of arson as a separate entity are not available. The payments were:

	Region	No.	Cost
1991-92	Barwon South-Western	0	\$34 000
	Central Highlands-Wimmera	1	\$67 000
	Eastern Metropolitan	7	\$2 385 000
	Gippsland	1	\$65 000
	Goulburn North-Eastern	1	\$2 000
	Loddon Campaspe-Mallee	1	\$1 000
	Northern Metropolitan	7	\$472 000
	Southern Metropolitan	3	\$1 257 000
	Western Metropolitan	1	\$1 820 000
	Head Office payments		\$420 000
1992-93	Barwon South-Western	1	\$22 000
	Central Highlands-Wimmera	1	\$35 000
	Eastern Metropolitan	3	\$1 223 000
	Gippsland	1	\$95 000
	North West Metropolitan	2	\$79 200
	Southern Metropolitan	1	\$24 400
		Head Office payments	

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1140

COUNCIL

Wednesday, 31 May 1995

1993-94	Barwon South-Western	1	\$2 000
	Gippsland	2	\$1 262 000
	North West Metropolitan	7	\$399 000
	South East Metropolitan	4	\$2 349 000
	Head Office payments		\$515 000

Cost per pupil of fire and natural disaster reinstatement, burglary and wilful damage:

1991-92	\$11.32
1992-93	\$4.60
1993-94	\$8.69

- (b) The Directorate of School Education provides a security alarm installation and maintenance program, a 24 hour alarm monitoring and response service, dedicated security patrols and specialist security management advice to schools.
- (c) Total expenditure for the provision of school security services as detailed in (b) above was:
- |         |             |
|---------|-------------|
| 1991-92 | \$3 116 974 |
| 1992-93 | \$2 950 831 |
| 1993-94 | \$2 999 385 |

These data are not maintained on a regional basis.

### Schools: replacement and maintenance

(Question No. 160)

**Hon. M. M. GOULD** asked the Minister for Tertiary Education and Training, for the Minister for Education:

What is the estimate of the capital replacement cost of Victoria's schools and what is the value of maintenance expenditure on schools as a percentage of the value of the stock?

**Hon. HADDON STOREY** (Minister for Tertiary Education and Training) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Education is:

The estimate of the capital replacement cost of Victoria's schools is \$3 781 500 000. The value of maintenance expenditure on schools as a percentage of the replacement cost of the stock for the financial year 1994-95 is estimated at 1.8 per cent.

### Schools: maintenance

(Question No. 161)

**Hon. M. M. GOULD** asked the Minister for Tertiary Education and Training, for the Minister for Education:

In relation to the allocation of funds to schools for maintenance and minor works:

- What was the amount made available to schools in 1994 in total and by regions, respectively, and on what basis was the total allocation and individual school allocation determined?
- What was the amount held as emergency supplementation by each region in 1994, indicating — (i) how much of the supplementation in each region was distributed to schools as emergency support; and (ii) whether remaining funds were distributed to schools; if so, how?
- How many schools in each region sought supplementation?
- How many schools were provided supplementations through a refundable advance and what is the total amount, by region, made available as advances?
- What was the range and average allocation to schools for maintenance and minor works by region?
- What is the allocation for maintenance and minor works for 1995 in total and by region and on what basis was the total allocation and individual school allocation determined?
- What is the amount held in each region for supplementation for 1995?
- What is the range and average allocation to schools for maintenance and minor works by region?

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Wednesday, 31 May 1995

COUNCIL

1141

Hon. HADDON STOREY (Minister for Tertiary Education and Training) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Education is:

- (a) Over the 1993-94 financial year the regional and total expenditure for maintenance and minor works grants was as follows:

Region	Expenditure (\$ million)
Barwon South-Western Region	\$2.366
Central Highlands-Wimmera Region	\$1.549
Gippsland Region	\$1.960
Goulburn North-Eastern Region	\$2.085
Loddon Campaspe-Mallee Region	\$2.152
North West Metropolitan Region	\$7.119
South East Metropolitan Region	\$10.796
Total	\$28.027

Individual school allocations are determined by way of a set formula which takes into account factors such as the area entitlement of the school, actual area of the school, the state of maintenance of each building, the different costs associated with different types of building construction materials and the higher building costs associated with remote locations.

- (b) (i) The amount of supplementation held by regions and the amount distributed to schools over the 1993-94 financial year was as follows:

Region	Budget for Supplementation	Amount Distributed to Schools
Barwon South-Western Region	\$107 782	\$107 782
Central Highlands-Wimmera Region	\$102 177	\$102 177
Gippsland Region	\$138 370	\$121 378
Goulburn North-Eastern Region	\$87 304	\$87 304
Loddon Campaspe-Mallee Region	\$126 000	\$126 000
North West Metropolitan Region	\$529 528	\$337 803
South East Metropolitan Region	\$487 419	\$487 419
Total	\$1 578 580	\$1 369 863

- (ii) Funds not disbursed to schools as part of the supplementation process were distributed to schools in accordance with their proportion of the total regional expenditure or were reallocated by head office.
- (c) Detailed records have not been kept of the number of schools making inquiries about the availability of supplementation in each region.
- (d) Seven schools were provided with a refundable advance in 1993-94. Central Highlands-Wimmera Region made available \$3000 and North West Metropolitan Region made available \$69 257.
- (e) Maintenance and minor works grants are not calculated on a regional basis.
- (f) & (g) The total maintenance and minor works allocation for the 1994-95 financial year is as follows:

Region	Allocation (\$ million)	Budget for Supplementation
Barwon South-Western Region	\$2.324	\$92 930
Central Highlands-Wimmera Region	\$1.479	\$59 294
Gippsland Region	\$1.910	\$72 672
Goulburn North-Eastern Region	\$1.932	\$74 708
Loddon Campaspe-Mallee Region	\$2.172	\$121 362
North West Metropolitan Region	\$6.791	\$268 466
South East Metropolitan Region	\$10.513	\$393 120
Total	\$27.121	\$1 082 552

Individual school allocations are determined by way of the formula as described in (a) above.

- (h) Maintenance and minor works grants are not calculated on a regional basis.

**Electricity: supply charge**

(Question No. 163)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Local Government, for the Minister for Energy and Minerals:

Can the minister guarantee that the current supply charge for electricity will be capped at its current level of \$33.94 per quarter with the CPI-X formula currently used for domestic consumers until the year 2000?

**Hon. R. M. HALLAM** (Minister for Local Government) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Energy and Minerals is:

In 1993, the government increased the electricity supply charge for domestic consumers to \$33.93 per quarter but simultaneously reduced the electricity energy tariff by 10 per cent. This change was necessary to reduce the cross subsidy between high-use and low-use consumers and was pitched so that the average consumer was left relatively unaffected.

The supply charge to domestic consumers will decline in real terms until the year 2000, as per the same CPI-X formula applied to domestic energy tariffs.

**Education: global budgets**

(Question No. 172)

**Hon. M. M. GOULD** asked the Minister for Tertiary Education and Training, for the Minister for Education:

In relation to funding for schools in 1995 what is the allocation in total and by region, respectively, by staffing numbers and/or dollars (where appropriate), for the following components of the global budget for primary and secondary schools — (i) employment of principal class officers; (ii) employment of AST3 and AST2 and head teachers; (iii) core special needs allocations; (iv) school responsibility positions; (v) special school teacher allowance; (vi) non-teaching support staff; (vii) WorkCover premium; (viii) superannuation charge; (ix) payroll tax; (x) casual relief teachers; (xi) operating expense grant base and per capita funding; (xii) contract cleaning; (xiii) grounds allowance; (xiv) building area allowance; (xv) multi-site allowance; (xvi) multi-campus allowance; (xvii) multi-campus travel; (xviii) utilities; (xix) maintenance and minor works; (xx) new integration students; (xxi) teacher aids; (xxii) paramedical and interpreter staff; (xxiii) integration equipment grant; (xxiv) physiotherapy grant; (xxv) interpreter grant; (xxvi) paramedical grant; (xxvii) occupational therapy grant; (xxviii) nurse grant; (xxix) literacy intervention grant; (xxx) DSP grant; (xxxi) student at risk grant; (xxxii) non-English speaking background; (xxxiii) rurality; (xxxiv) isolation; (xxxv) physical and sports education grant; (xxxvi) professional development grant; (xxxvii) new initiatives; (xxxviii) LOTE grant; (xxxix) telematics grant; (xxxx) artists in school grants; (xxxxi) artist in education grant; (xxxxii) country area program grant; (xxxxiii) priority language program; (xxxxiv) gender equity program grant; (xxxxv) joint community projects grant; (xxxxvi) MARC and MACC vans; and (xxxxvii) transitional funding?

**Hon. HADDON STOREY** (Minister for Tertiary Education and Training) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Education is:

To provide the information requested would require an inordinate amount of time and resources which are not available. The honourable member may wish to submit a more focussed and specific question on this matter.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Thursday, 1 June 1995

COUNCIL

1143

---

Thursday, 1 June 1995

---

---

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

---

### Hospitals: maternity services

(Question No. 153)

**Hon. M. M. GOULD** asked the Minister for Housing, for the Minister for Health:

Which Victorian hospitals who provide maternity services did not provide a postnatal domiciliary service either directly or via a contract as at 1 March 1995?

**Hon. R. I. KNOWLES** (Minister for Housing) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Health is:

On the 80 Victorian public hospitals which currently provide maternity services, only one had not established a postnatal domiciliary service directly or via a contract as at 1 March 1995. However, a number of arrangements are in place for postnatal clients at this rural hospital and discussions are taking place between the department and the hospital with regard to the provision of a postnatal domiciliary service.

It is estimated that 50 per cent of the public hospitals with maternity services have established postnatal domiciliary services since 1 July 1994, indicating that the new policy and funding arrangements which the government put in place at that time have been very successful.

### Planning: planning permit call-ins

(Question No. 185)

**Hon. B. T. PULLEN** asked the Minister for Housing, for the Minister for Planning:

In relation to all ministerial call-ins since 5 October 1992, what are the details of — (i) all call-ins of planning permit applications before local government planning authorities and the Administrative Appeals Tribunal; (ii) the date of the call-in; (iii) the reasons given for the call-in; (iv) the name of the applicant; (v) the decision of the minister; and (vi) the date of that decision?

**Hon. R. I. KNOWLES** (Minister for Housing) — The answer supplied by the Minister for Planning is:

The answer is listed below in the following categories:

*(Attachment (18 pages) referred to in answer has been supplied to honourable member and a copy tabled in the Parliamentary Library)*

