

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	164
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Richmond Bridge - funding		
Hansard Page ECA:	136 (19/10)		

Senator ABETZ asked:

Senator ABETZ—... who can have a discussion with me about the Richmond Bridge?

Mr Hooy—I can do that, Senator.

Senator ABETZ—Thank you very much. Since our last meeting I have learnt all sorts of things but I am, nevertheless, none the wiser of course. There has been a laser scan of the bridge undertaken, is that correct?

Mr Hooy—That is correct, Senator.

Senator ABETZ—Who paid for that? Was it funded federally?

Mr Hooy—That is correct. I am not sure if we funded the total cost but we did provide funding for that.

Senator ABETZ—If you could take that on notice as to the totality of the funding. Was the scanning of the bridge as a result of an offer by the Commonwealth to the state saying that there was a bit of money left in coffers that could be spent on an exercise such as this?

Mr Hooy—I have no recollection, Senator.

Senator ABETZ—All right, could you take it on notice

Answers:

The Tasmanian Government made an application for assistance to fund a laser scan as a first stage in updating the conservation management plan for Richmond Bridge. A funding agreement for \$10,000 (excluding GST) was issued by the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts in March 2007 to assist with the laser scan. The Tasmanian Government advised that it would contribute a further \$25,000 for the laser scan.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	165
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Richmond Bridge – vibration testing results		
Hansard Page ECA:	137 (19/10)		

Senator ABETZ asked:

Senator ABETZ—As I understand it, the vibration testing that was undertaken suggested that, rather than load, the big issue was speed. Have you had the result of those vibration tests forwarded to the Commonwealth?

Mr Hooy—My staff may be aware of them. I am not.

Senator ABETZ—If you could let me know whether they have been passed on to you, please, and whether you can then confirm or advise whether those tests indicated that an important aspect was the issue of speed?

Mr Hooy—We will take that on notice, yes.

Senator ABETZ—And, if that is the case, what action have you undertaken to try to convince the state government, or local council, to reduce the speed limit on the bridge? Could you take that on notice?

Mr Hooy—Certainly.

Answers:

On 6 July 2009, the Department received a copy of an engineer's report that provides the results of tests conducted to ascertain whether vibration monitoring is a practical management tool for Richmond Bridge. The tests indicated that it is a practical tool and the Tasmanian Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) proposes to install vibration monitoring equipment on the bridge in February/March 2010. The tests show that vehicle speed has a large impact on bridge vibration. The Department has since met with representatives of DIER to discuss options for traffic management. DIER will shortly meet with the Richmond Advisory Committee of the Clarence City Council to obtain agreement on traffic calming measures.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	166
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Port Arthur – Buffer zone		
Hansard Page ECA:	140 (19/10)		

Senator ABETZ asked:

Senator ABETZ—Yes, of 114 hectares. With respect, Mr Hooy, I am sure everything you have said tonight will not convince anybody in the Port Arthur area as to the need for this huge buffer zone. But I can ask in relation to the one that is being proposed: why is a little pimple being left out on what I assume is the northern tip? Can you tell us who the owner of the land is?

Mr Hooy—I could not.

Senator ABETZ—Could you take that on notice for us.

Mr Hooy—Certainly.

Answers:

The northern tip of the proposed World Heritage Buffer Zone, identified as Frying Pan Point on the attached map of Port Arthur Historic Site, is included in the proposed buffer zone. It was not apparent from earlier drafts of the map that the entirety of Frying Pan Point was included in the proposed buffer zone. The land at Frying Pan Point is owned by the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and The Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	167
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Heritage funding		
Hansard Page ECA:	5 (20/10/09)		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

Senator LUDLAM—At the last hearings we asked a couple of questions about core departmental funding for Heritage. Some information was provided. It looked as though there was a big apparent difference in the funding between the last financial year and the current financial year. I think I put these questions to you.

Ms Kruk—I think there was a question on notice on that, was there not?

Senator LUDLAM—You assured us that it was not a real funding cut in the heritage division. Can you provide any further information as to that apparent discrepancy?

Ms Kruk—Can I take that on notice? I certainly remember giving that assurance. If I could have a look at the response and come back to you during the course of the day, that is fine.

...

Senator LUDLAM—And anything that gives us some trends for core heritage funding over the last couple of years. You can take that on notice.

Answers:

The information provided in respect of Question No 218 from the May 2009 Budget Estimates hearings, remains current.

There has been no reduction in the direct departmental budget allocation for the Heritage Division between 2008-09 and 2009-10. After deduction of the corporate overhead costs the available funding for the Heritage Division in 2008-09 is \$13.665 million and in 2009-10 is \$13.574 million.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	168
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Heritage Strategies		
Hansard Page ECA:	7 (20/10)		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

Mr Hooy—Yes, Senator. This is with regard to the heritage strategies?

Senator LUDLAM—Yes. That is correct.

Mr Hooy—At the moment, 15 agencies have completed heritage strategies. A further 16 are almost completed. Either they have been considered by council or the department has reviewed a draft strategy. Ten departments have yet to indicate whether or not they propose to undertake heritage strategies.

Senator LUDLAM—Can you provide for us on notice a list of the departments that have been a bit reluctant thus far?

Mr Hooy—I can do that.

Answers:

The following six agencies contacted by the Department have not advised whether they have taken steps to prepare a heritage strategy. The Department has sent follow up correspondence to those agencies.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Australian Federal Police

National Archives of Australia

Australian National Maritime Museum

Australian Sports Commission

Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs

A further two agencies have recently advised the Department that they have commenced preparation of a heritage strategy, and one has advised that it does not own or control any property and is not required to prepare a strategy.

The National Portrait Gallery is now within the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio, and will be considered in the review of the Department's heritage strategy.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	169
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Commonwealth Heritage List – nominations		
Hansard Page ECA:	7 (20/10)		

Senator LUDLAM asked:

Senator LUDLAM—I have one or two more questions, which are about the Commonwealth Heritage List.

Can you tell us how many nominations are scheduled for assessment for the current financial year on that list?

Mr Hooy—I will have to take that on notice.

Senator LUDLAM—Can you give a rough idea? More than 10? More than 20?

Mr Hooy—Only a relatively small number.

Answers:

The Australian Heritage Council is currently assessing five places for the Commonwealth Heritage List. These places, together with the current statutory deadline for providing the Minister with a final assessment, are:

Place and Location	Current Statutory Deadline
Bundanon Trust Area, Nowra, NSW	31/12/2010
Townsville Field Training Area, Qld	30/06/2010
ABC Regional Radio Studio – Great Southern, Wagin, WA	31/12/2010
HMAS Sydney II and HSK Kormoran Battle Site and Wrecks, off WA	30/06/2010
Natural Areas around and within Majura, Pialligo and Jerrabomberra, ACT	31/12/2010

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	170
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Kokoda Track – Air strip funding		
Hansard Page ECA:	9 (20/10)		

Senator BIRMINGHAM asked:

Senator BIRMINGHAM—In terms of the quantum of money that has been committed to the implementation of the joint understanding with the government of PNG, am I right in that that is a \$14.9 million commitment?

Dr Terrill—That is right.

Senator BIRMINGHAM—How is that money broken down?

Dr Terrill...At this stage, I am happy to provide precise figures. But given there is still some money that is unspent in the out years, they would obviously have to be forward estimates rather than actual commitments.

Senator BIRMINGHAM—If you could take that on notice.

Answers:

The Australian Government has committed \$14.9 million over four years (2007/08 to 2010/11) to assist in the protection of the Kokoda Track and Owen Stanley Ranges and to improve the livelihoods of local communities.

Funds include a departmental budget of \$5.095m for staffing and administrative support and an administered budget of \$9.904m. The administered budget forecast is equally split across three areas, they are:

1. Progressing protection of the Kokoda Track and Owen Stanley Ranges with PNG's Department of the Environment and Conservation and undertaking a feasibility study into World Heritage listing
2. Improving sustainable economic development of communities along the Track
3. Supporting management of the Track through the Kokoda Track Authority.

On 5 September 2009, the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts announced an additional \$1.8 million to implement priority activities under the Kokoda Track Safety Package.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	171
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage – Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts		
Topic:	Jobs Fund Heritage		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator CASH asked:

1. What is the total number of applications received under the Heritage Projects Jobs Fund?
2. How many of these applications were assessed as meeting the relevant gateway criteria?
3. How many of these applications were in a Priority Employment Area?

Answers:

1. In 2009-2010, 591 applications were received.
2. 337 applications met the relevant gateway criteria.
3. Of the 157 projects that were funded, 51 are located in a Priority Employment Area.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	172
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Jobs Fund Heritage		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator CASH asked:

1. In Round 1(2009/2010), how many heritage project applications were recommended for approval by DEEWR?
2. How many heritage project applications were recommended for approval by the Local Employment Coordinator?
3. How many projects were recommended by DEEWR in the Local Jobs Stream?
4. Were these recommendations made to the Minister for Environment, Heritage and Arts or their delegate?
5. Who was the Minister's delegate?

Answers:

1. None. DEEWR forwarded all applications received under "Part D Heritage Projects" to DEWHA for consideration.
2. None. See answer to question 1.
3. None. See answer to question 1.
4. Not applicable.
5. All decisions on heritage funding were made by the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts, the Hon Peter Garrett AM MP.

**Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts
Legislation Committee**

Answers to questions on notice

Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts portfolio

Supplementary Budget Estimates, October 2009

Outcome:	5	Question No:	173
Program:	5.2		
Division/Agency:	Heritage Division		
Topic:	Jobs Fund- Heritage		
Hansard Page ECA:	Written Question on Notice		

Senator CASH asked:

1. How many of the Round 1(2009-2010) heritage projects which were recommended for approval, were successful?
2. Were any heritage projects which were not initially recommended, approved?
3. Did any Minister refer a heritage project to DEEWR for recommendation?

Answers:

1. Of the 173 heritage projects which were recommended for approval 157 were successful in the Jobs Fund Round 1 public call under the heritage component (2009-2010).
2. No
3. Not to the knowledge of the Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.