

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 1

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

In tight fiscal times, can the Minister outline how this Government will continue to protect Queensland's environment?

ANSWER:

The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is contributing significantly to the fiscal recovery of the State by implementing a range of savings measures totalling \$93.9 million in 2012-13. These savings do not reflect a reduction in front-line services. Rather, they have been arrived at through re-positioning of the department's policy, priorities and business practices to achieve efficiency dividends and strip away green tape. These changes will increase the department's ability to deliver priority environmental protection, in particular by regulating industry operations to ensure that they are meeting the environmental standards and outcomes that Queenslanders expect.

In order to ensure the continued and improved protection of Queensland's natural environment, the department is developing a regulatory strategy that will ensure that environmental assessments focus on setting outcomes, not prescribing how outcomes are achieved; and where companies do not meet environmental standards the community expects from them, the full force of the law will be used as a strong deterrent. In addition, re-focusing the priorities of existing programs—such as introduction of targeted approaches to auditing and compliance activities under the Nature Refuges program—will allow for better outcomes.

This Government will continue to protect the environment in tight fiscal times by delivering environmental services that are more efficient through the merging of related functions, realignment of the priorities of existing programs, and reduction of administrative burden. This will ensure that finite resources support those front-line services where the Government can deliver the most environmental benefit.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 2

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister provide details on the number of staff that have been made redundant, what work units have been reduced and the department's savings?

ANSWER:

In April 2012 the government made decisions to close a number of climate related programs in the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection. This resulted in 34 voluntary redundancies being offered to Office of Climate Change employees. 16 employees accepted the offer and exited the department and 18 were placed into other positions.

Since then, the Service Delivery Statement (SDS) identifies that 220 Full Time Equivalents (FTE) positions will be made redundant. This process will occur during the 2012-13 financial year.

Offers of voluntary redundancy are being made in a staged process and there is always a time lag between when an employee accepted a voluntary redundancy and when they exit the department. Obviously, savings are not realised until after an employee exits the public service.

By 5 October 2012, 201 letters offering voluntary redundancy had been given to employees. This count of 201 includes offers made to Office of Climate Change employees. 157 employees who have received an offer have accepted the offer. 21 employees were yet to respond to their offer and 23 employees had rejected their offer and elected to become an Employee Requiring Placement (ERP). Of the 23 employees who elected to become an ERP, 19 have been placed into permanent positions. 4 remained unplaced.

The offers of voluntary redundancies (VR) have been made across the department. As at 5 October 2012, the breakdown of VR offers by division is as follows:

- 29 in Environmental Policy and Planning;
- 36 in Conservation and Sustainability Services;
- 34 in Office of Climate Change (a former division)
- 64 in Environmental Services and Regulation; and
- 38 in Corporate Services.

The offers have been spread across business units within each of these divisions as detailed in the following table.

Table 1: Offers made per business unit

Division	Business Unit	No. of offers
Environmental Policy and Planning	Ecosystem Outcomes	2
	Environmental Planning	6
	Heritage	2
	Policy Projects	1
	Waste Avoidance & Resource Efficiency	11
	Water Information & Quality	1
	NRM Programs & Policy	6
	TOTAL	29
Conservation and Sustainability Services	Ecosystem Outcomes	4
	Environment Strategy & Policy	3
	Policy & Programs	12
	Employees who transitioned from Queensland Parks and Wildlife Services (mostly sustainable landscapes employees)	16
	Land Management and Use	1
	TOTAL	36
Office of Climate Change (former division)	Office of Climate Change	34
	TOTAL	34
Environmental Services and Regulation	Environment & Natural Resource Regulation	20
	Environment Performance & Co-ordination	1
	Implementation & Support	1
	Regional Service Delivery	38
	South East Region	4
	TOTAL	64
Corporate Services	Corporate Communications	15
	Executive & Administrative Services	2
	Governance & Strategy	2
	Human Resources	5
	Business Services	13
	Directorate	1
	TOTAL	38

A projected reduction of 220 FTEs is anticipated to deliver budget savings of \$9.7M in employee expenses in 2012-13. \$9.7M represents the part year savings only. In out years, 220 FTEs will deliver around \$18.5M in savings.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 3

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister explain how this government is assisting farmers to take greater control over flying foxes that are affecting crops?

ANSWER:

Crop growers are now able to apply for permits to shoot limited numbers of flying-foxes under new laws introduced by the Queensland Government.

These new laws are about giving greater control to farmers over managing their crops while striking a balance with animal welfare and conservation considerations.

The new laws have been developed with input from growers, conservationists and animal welfare advocates.

The legislative framework includes amendments to regulations and a new code of practice which identifies how flying-foxes can be controlled to make sure that good ecological sustainability and welfare standards are met.

The code of practice sets out a range of things that growers must do when shooting flying-foxes to make sure the animals are killed with minimal pain or suffering.

It sets strict requirements that growers must meet to be eligible for a permit, including that they have previously tried, and will continue to use, non-harmful methods of deterring flying-foxes.

A limited quota has also been agreed with the Commonwealth Government to ensure there will be no impact on the long term survival of the four flying-fox species that can damage crops.

The new code of practice is available on the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection's website along with the necessary permit application forms and a fact sheet providing further information for growers.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 4

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister explain how his department is working with communities like Charters Towers and Mount Isa to address flying fox roosts?

ANSWER:

The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is continuing to work closely and collaboratively with local government on flying-fox roost management.

Mt Isa provides an excellent example of the progress that is being made in this area. Departmental officers met with Mount Isa's Mayor on 14 September 2012 to discuss solutions to the annual visitation of large numbers of little red flying-foxes to the town area. A positive outcome of this meeting was that local mining entity Xstrata has agreed to make an area of land on their mine lease available for development of an alternative roost site.

With the capacity for such an area to be irrigated, fast growing trees can be planted to establish an alternative roost site in the medium term. Council is working with Xstrata to progress this option. Once this alternative roost is established, flying-foxes can be encouraged to the site while being discouraged from returning to the town under a damage mitigation permit. During the meeting, departmental officers also approved the trimming of certain limbs from the roost trees in the cemetery to address public safety concerns. This work has now been completed.

The department frequently liaises with Charters Towers Regional Council to assist in the management of the flying-fox roost in Lissner Park. Council currently holds two damage mitigation permits. One to disperse flying-foxes if they begin roosting in the vicinity of the swimming pool or the children's playground and the other to trim trees for both public safety and for the health of the trees in other areas of the park. Council is also reviewing proposals from consultants to develop alternative roost habitat along Gladstone Creek. This would form part of a longer term strategy to relocate the roost.

Since this government came to power the department has approved eight damage mitigation permits to manage flying-fox roosts. These permits vary from giving approval to completely disperse the roost to allowing strategic vegetation trimming.

Trimming vegetation near residents or facilities is an obvious way to reduce the impact of roosting animals.

The department is also reviewing the approvals process for managing flying-fox roosts to reduce green tape and to allow a rapid response in the event of flying-foxes commencing to roost in a new area which is unsuitable in respect to community impacts.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 5

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister explain how the Newman Government has taken action to enhance public safety by improving crocodile management in North Queensland?

ANSWER:

The Queensland Government is committed to improving crocodile management to enhance community safety. To this end, the government has dedicated over \$1.5 million over the next four years to implement this commitment through the development of a crocodile management policy consistent with the successful Northern Territory's three-tiered approach that strikes a balance between community safety and crocodile conservation.

Implementation of the crocodile management policy has been initiated through the commencement of a pilot program for the Cairns, Townsville, Hinchinbrook and Cassowary Coast areas. Critical local knowledge provided by the four involved local government authorities involved will be used to guide the application of the new policy to these areas before rolling it out across the accepted range of the estuarine crocodile in Queensland.

While no natural waterway can be entirely risk free, under the pilot program areas will be managed for either:

- Exclusion — where the aim is to prevent crocodiles from entering an area so that the level of risk is low enough to recommend safe swimming and water activities:
- Zero tolerance — where efforts to significantly reduce the risk of attack will be made by removing any crocodiles that enter the area, such as boat ramps and marinas in risk areas: and
- Removal of crocodiles anywhere if the animals exhibits unprovoked aggressive behaviour towards humans.

Under this policy, the Queensland Government will also engage crocodile farmers or zoos to remove animals identified as crocodiles of concern where it is practical to do so.

Local crocodile management plans will be developed for the four areas within the pilot area for the coming summer period. Councils' local knowledge of the issues in

their areas is critical to getting the balance right, and the department is collaborating with these councils right now to ensure that the crocodile management plans can be practically implemented out there on the ground and can be resourced in the long term.

A new scientific baseline for the abundance and distribution of estuarine crocodile populations in Queensland will also be established to inform future crocodile management. In order to ensure the government is operating with the best possible science, an independent scientific review of the current Queensland estuarine crocodile survey data and methodology will initially be undertaken.

In the meantime, our wildlife rangers remain vigilant in responding to circumstances where crocodiles may present a threat to public safety.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 6

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister explain the steps the Newman Government is taking to protect koalas particularly in South East Queensland?

ANSWER:

The Queensland Government is taking real and practical action to conserve our koala populations by adopting a range of measures to ensure the long-term protection of koalas and their habitat.

Queensland's koalas are under significant pressure, particularly in the south-east corner. Koala populations have declined by over fifty per cent in some areas since 2006, primarily as a result of habitat loss and fragmentation, disease, dog attacks and vehicle strikes.

To address the causes of koala population decline, the *Investing to protect our koalas* policy will invest \$26.5 million to acquire koala habitat, support research into koala disease and preventable causes of death, injury and illness and enhance koala rescue and rehabilitation services.

The first initiative under this policy, the Koala Habitat Program, is now open. This program is investing up to \$22.5 million over the next three years for the purchase of suitable properties in south east Queensland to be rehabilitated for koala habitat.

Properties will need to meet a range of criteria to ensure purchased sites can provide a high level of koala conservation outcomes, such as contributing to connectivity or consolidating koala habitat. Purchased properties will undergo rehabilitation and may be gazetted as national parks, nature refuges or reserves for community use and there will be recreational opportunities wherever possible.

The Queensland Government recognises, however, that threats to koala's wellbeing are far broader than habitat loss and \$4 million will also be provided for research and koala rescue and rehabilitation services.

The Koala Research Grants will fund high quality research into koala diseases and other preventable causes of death, injury and illness. Funding of \$3.2 million will be

available over the next four years for research projects that can provide tangible outcomes to better inform koala management

The Koala Rescue and Rehabilitation Grants will soon be available to organisations that provide a valuable service to the community through their work with sick, injured and orphaned koalas in Queensland. Funding of \$800,000 over the next four years will be available to support the important work of koala rescue and rehabilitation services.

These initiatives will ensure the long-term future of Queensland's koala population, while achieving a balance between the protection of koalas, economic development and the social wellbeing of Queensland communities.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 7

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister explain how the Newman Government will deliver strong environmental management that supports sustainable economic development on Cape York?

ANSWER:

Cape York is home to iconic environmental values and the Queensland Government is focused on protecting these values while supporting economic development that can deliver jobs and business opportunities for the region.

To this end, the government has begun to prepare a statutory regional plan as the primary planning instrument, accompanied by economic, infrastructure and bioregion management planning frameworks for Cape York. This planning approach recognises the special values in the Cape, including the environmental values represented in the region's extensive national park estate.

The Cape York Plan will include actions for the improved management of the national parks on the Cape, respecting and supporting the role of Traditional Owners in developing management plans for parks under joint management arrangements.

It will also include a strategic framework for coordination of Natural Resource Management activities across Cape York Peninsula, including priorities for fire and pest management in the region.

The plans will be informed by submissions received on the Cape York Bioregion Management Plan scoping paper and by consultation with Traditional Owner and other groups across the Cape. Importantly, the statutory regional plan will be informed by the advice of the Regional Planning Committee, established by the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, which includes representation of bodies with a key interest in protecting the environment and land management.

The Queensland Government is providing practical, on-the-ground support for better management of the Cape's environment through the Indigenous Land and Sea Ranger Program. The government has boosted funding for the program, providing

and additional \$8 million in Cape York Peninsula over the next three years to support the employment of an additional 30 rangers. Rangers care for the area's pristine waterways and protected species, support national parks management and assist local communities in developing businesses based on environmental services.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 8

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister outline the ways in which cane and beef farmers can adopt sustainable land management practices and help to protect the reef and rebuild our four-pillar economy?

ANSWER:

The Great Barrier Reef is an important part of Queensland's extraordinary natural heritage. This is why the Queensland Government is committed to ensuring the Reef continues to be one of the best managed marine protected areas in the world. It is an international tourism icon supporting over 60,000 jobs and worth approximately \$6 billion yearly to our economy.

The Queensland Government is committed to the targets and outcomes of the Reef Water Quality Protection Plan signed originally by Prime Minister Howard and Premier Beattie in 2003. This commitment maintains the \$35 million per year investment in reef water quality and related initiatives.

With the election of the Newman Government earlier this year, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection has commenced work with the beef and sugar industries to accelerate the transition from broad regulatory coverage to a best management practice (BMP) program. This approach is similar to that in the cotton and grains industries.

The industry-led BMP program will be supported by strong science and extension programs. The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection and the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry will be ably assisting industry in the development and implementation of the BMP program.

Efforts to improve water quality to the Great Barrier Reef lagoon by industry uptake of best practice fertiliser calculation methods for sugarcane farmers and pasture condition improvement for cattle graziers will ultimately result in better water quality for the reef and increased profitability for many sugarcane farmers and cattle graziers.

The Queensland Government is committed to ensuring that agriculture is a key economic priority, and to doubling food production by 2040. Industry-led BMP systems will facilitate a highly efficient, innovative, productive and world-leading cane-growing sector, and in doing so achieve long-term objectives for reef water quality protection.

The Queensland Government is supporting the grazing industry to become world leaders in sustainable agricultural production and land stewardship, and to achieve the long-term objectives for reef water quality protection. Many current aspects of regulated farm management, including monitoring, record-keeping and reporting, are considered to be key elements of industry best practice.

The department has commenced negotiations with industry groups, including CANEGROWERS, AgForce and the Fitzroy Basin Association about the development and implementation of BMP programs for the sugarcane and cattle grazing industries and it is expected a BMP framework will be in place by December 2012.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 9

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister explain how this Government is working to develop a sustainable CSG industry in Queensland?

ANSWER:

The Queensland Government and the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection are committed to a sustainable Coal Seam Gas (CSG) industry.

An important part of achieving this is the department's administration of the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* to regulate the potential impacts of this industry. This provides the basis for requiring high environmental standards of CSG operators. Some examples include the general prohibition on evaporation dams in all but exceptional circumstances and requirements on operators to proactively manage and monitor risks associated with hydraulic fracturing. The department also undertakes proactive monitoring of the environmental performance and impact of this industry.

Another element in developing a sustainable CSG industry is via the department's administration of the aspects of the *Water Act 2000* that require CSG producers to complete ongoing assessments, monitor their impacts on groundwater, and 'make good' any impacts of groundwater extraction on existing water users.

In the broader picture, the department will continue to work closely with other State agencies to ensure a comprehensive regulatory approach to groundwater management, land access and drinking water quality standards.

In managing for a sustainable CSG industry, the government also understands the importance of recognising the legitimate interests of landholders and local communities. One of the means for implementing this approach is via the current review of the CSG Water Management Policy. This policy, which provides guidance to industry and the community about how the CSG industry should sustainably manage the water that is produced through CSG extraction, is being reviewed to ensure it is consistent with the Government's policy priorities. A draft of this policy will be provided for public comment in mid October.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 10

asked on Friday, 28 September 2012

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister outline the practical measures the Newman Government has taken to cut green tape and deliver boost the resources industry while maintaining high environmental standards?

ANSWER:

The resources industry, which includes the mining and petroleum sectors has benefited from a number of initiatives to cut green tape while maintaining high environmental standards.

Firstly, the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection has been working collaboratively with the resources sector on major reforms to the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* since 2010, with the legislative side of these reforms recently passed by Parliament in the *Environmental Protection (Greentape Reduction) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2012*. This Act provides major benefits to the resources sector, including significant simplification of the legislation with removal of duplicate environmental management plan requirements, formal recognition of EIS documents as part of the application, and the ability to include all Environmental Protection Act approvals on the one environmental authority.

To support the legislative change, the department is working on standardising conditions and improving guidance material to help applicants to provide the necessary information in the application without additional information requests. This will speed up the approval process, increase certainty and consistency for mine operators, and reduce unnecessary regulatory burden by developing conditions that industry supports as being reasonable.

To further reduce the regulatory burden for the small scale miners, the department is partnering on a reform project with the Department of Natural Resources and Mines. This project is anticipated to see significant removal of green tape for the small scale opal and gem miners.

The department is also conducting an operational review of financial assurances. The project, which is strongly supported by industry groups, aims to ensure better

and more efficient administration through the provision of better information about when financial assurance is to be provided and a simpler method of calculation.

Other key initiatives include reviewing the CSG Water Management Policy, finalising the Manual for Regulated Dams for mines, developing standard conditions for small to medium exploration activities, preparing a guideline for the approved method of calculating residual risk payments, and streamlining and harmonising the generic terms of reference for environmental impact statements. Each one of these projects adds up to a benefit to the resources sector, simplifying their dealings with the department and helping them to meet environmental outcomes as easily as possible.

To be clear, none of these initiatives has resulted in a reduction of environmental standards. Instead, we have focussed on process improvements and administrative simplification to make sure that the efforts of the industry and the department are focussed on what matters – allowing the industry to grow while still meeting environmental standards that protect Queensland's environment.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 1

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MS TRAD ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

I refer to page 43 of Budget Paper 4 and the \$15 million for the Industry Driven Waste Strategy. Can the Minister please provide a detailed breakdown of this funding including, (a) staffing costs, (b) capital expenditure and (c) any funds committed to outside agencies?

ANSWER:

The \$15 million for the Industry Driven Waste Strategy will support three core objectives: the waste policy and regulatory simplification program; the waste data and collection program; and the litter and illegal dumping program.

The waste policy and regulatory simplification program includes the development of an industry driven waste strategy, legislative amendments to finalise the levy repeal and front-line support for levy payment in the lead-up to final payment. The program will also complement the Greentape Reduction project in reviewing and streamlining regulation for the waste industry.

The waste data collection program includes the collection of statewide data on waste generation, disposal, and recycling; private sector intelligence for future investment in waste infrastructure; comparative statistics for local and state government recycling performance and will fulfil national reporting requirements.

The litter and illegal dumping program includes education and engagement with land managers; reactive compliance and enforcement; a proactive regional illegal dumping hot-spots project and development of litter and illegal dumping data and mapping.

The funding breakdown is as follows:

	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Allocation	\$4.51M	\$3.51M	\$3.51M	\$3.51M
Staffing costs	\$1.9M	\$1.7M	\$1.7M	\$1.7M
Operational	\$1.21M	\$1.21M	\$1.21M	\$1.21M
Capital	\$0.8M	Nil	Nil	Nil
Depreciation	\$0.6M	\$0.6M	\$0.6M	\$0.6M
Funds for outside agencies	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

- (a) The following table indicates the ongoing staff profile for the Industry Driven Waste strategy across the three core deliverables.

Classification	FTE	Expenditure
SES2	0.4	\$66,986
AO8	3	\$386,037
AO7	4	\$468,992
AO6	3	\$313,899
AO5	3	\$276,513
PO3	1	\$90,626
AO3	1.5	\$106,344
TOTAL	15.9	\$1,709,397

The 2012-13 allocation also includes additional staff costs for three months to wind up the levy.

- (b) There is an allocation of \$800,000 in 2012-13 to provide enhancements to the Queensland Waste On-line Levy IT system to collect and report on data both, from and for, the waste sector.
- (c) No funds are committed to outside agencies.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 2

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MS TRAD ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

I refer to Schedule 2 in the *Appropriation Bill 2012*, outlining the 2012-13 funding allocation for the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection. Will the Minister list every work unit, branch and/or division that has been abolished within his department and the number of staff positions contained within each abolished work area, as part of the process of developing the 2012-13 State Budget?

ANSWER:

The Office of Climate Change is the only work unit within the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection to be abolished as part of the process of developing the 2012 – 2013 State Budget.

The Office of Climate Change is currently in the process of being disbanded. A total of 60 positions from the Office of Climate Change have been made redundant.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 3

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MS TRAD ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

I refer to page 84 of Budget Paper 2 of the 2012-13 Budget. Will the Minister advise how many positions (broken down by permanent, temporary, casual and contract) have been abolished since 26 March 2012 in the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, listed by job title, salary level, unit or section, and location and/or departmental region?

ANSWER:

Page 84 of Budget Paper 2 of the 2012-13 Budget indicates 220 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Redundancies for this financial year. The figure in the budget paper does not include FTE redundancies between 26 March 2012 and the start of the current financial year.

This question has been answered in terms of FTE Redundancies offered to employees since 26 March 2012. Therefore it will not equate to the figure of 220 in the budget paper.

By 5 October 2012, 201 letters offering voluntary redundancy had been given to employees. 157 employees who have received an offer have accepted the offer. 21 employees were yet to respond to their offer and 23 employees elected to become an Employee Requiring Replacement (ERP). Of the 23 employees who elected to become an ERP, 19 have been placed in permanent positions. 4 employees remain unplaced.

The attached table indicates the position titles, classification and work locations broken down by permanent, temporary, casual and contract of the 157 voluntary redundancy offers that have been accepted as at 5 October 2012. Positions are abolished once employees exit the department.

Permanent or Temporary	Position Title	Position Level	Work Location	Division Title
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	AO7	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Director	SO	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Director Sustainable Reconstruction	SO	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	AO7	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	AO8	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	AO7	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Communication Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	AO8	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Business Manager	AO5	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Director	SO	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Policy Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Communication Officer	AO8	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Manager Sustainable Reconstruction	AO8	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Business Manager	AO4	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Policy Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Conservation Officer	PO3	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Director	SO	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Coordinator (Wild Rivers)	AO6	Cairns	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Team Leader	PO4	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Nature Refuge Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Program Coordinator	AO6	Gold Coast	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Ranger	AO5	Rockhampton	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Extension Officer	AO4	Daisy Hill	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Technical Officer	TO5	Atherton	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Nature Refuge Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Project Officer	AO4	Cairns	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Nature Refuge Officer	AO5	Moggill	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Team Leader	AO7	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Project Officer	PO5	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Project Officer	PO4	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Manager	SO	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Project Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Project Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Team Leader	AO7	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Team Leader	AO7	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Project Officer	PO5	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Senior Project Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Planning Officer	AO7	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	AO8	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Director	SO	Brisbane	Conservation and Sustainability Services
Permanent	Library Technican	TO3	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Human Resources Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Human Resources Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	IT Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Administration Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Project Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Executive Assistant	AO3	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Human Resources Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Photographer	TO3	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Principial Communications Officer	AO7	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Procurement Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Project Officer (Fire Safety)	AO4	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Web Developer	AO5	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	IT Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Graphic Designer	AO5	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Manager Business Servcies	AO8	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Project Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Corporate Services

Permanent	Administration Officer	AO2	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Human Resources Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Media Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Principal Media Officer	AO7	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Graphic Designer	TO3	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Not on HRM	AO6	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Team Leader Bsnness Services	AO6	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Information Management Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Human Resources Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Research Librarian	PO2	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Senior Client Services Librarian	PO4	Brisbane	Corporate Services
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Principal Project Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Project Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Policy Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Director	SO	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Principal Project Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	PO5	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Senior Planning Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	PO4	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Project Manager	AO7	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Principal Project Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Project Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Senior Project Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Senior District Advisor	AO4	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Adminstration Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Executive Assistant	AO3	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Principal Heritage Office	PO4	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Senior Project Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Project Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Policy Officer	PO2	Cairns	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Project Director	SO	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Manager	AO8	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Project Support Officer	AO2	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Senior Administration Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Principal Policy Officer	AO7	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Director	SO	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Senior Policy Officer	AO6	Brisbane	Environmental Policy & Planning
Permanent	Senior Planning Officer	PO3	Rockhampton	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Administration Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO2	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Lawyer	PO3	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO3	Rockhampton	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Environmental Officer	PO2	Mackay	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Biodiversity Planning Officer	PO5	Townsville	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Advisor	AO7	Mackay	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Environmental Officer	PO4	Mackay	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Project Officer	AO5	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Customer Service Officer	AO3	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Environmental Support Officer	AO3	Mackay	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Environmental Officer	PO2	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Engineer	PO4	Woolloongabba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Manager	AO7	Rockhampton	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Scientist (Biodiversity)	PO4	Longreach	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Director	SO	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Detached Senior Environmental Officer	PO3	Whitsunday	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administrative Officer	AO2	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Environmental Officer	PO4	Townsville	Environmental Services & Regulation

Permanent	Project Manager	AO6	Townsville	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Advisor	AO6	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Technical Officer	TO3	Mackay	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Environmental Support Officer	AO3	Emerald	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Manager	AO6	Rockhampton	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO2	Charleville	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Technical Officer	TO4	Cairns	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Inspector	TO4	Toowoomba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administrative Officer	AO2	Cairns	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Technical Officer	TO3	Townsville	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Environmental Officer	AO6	Townsville	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Project Officer	AO4	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Environmental Officer	AO6	Woolloongabba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Environmental Officer	PO3	Toowoomba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Environmental Officer	AO6	Woolloongabba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Manager	AO7	Woolloongabba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Environmental Officer	PO3	Woolloongabba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administrative Officer	AO2	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Environmental Officer	AO5	Caboolture	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Team Leader	AO7	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Executive Assistant	AO3	Brisbane	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Principal Environmental Officer	AO6	Woolloongabba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Administration Officer	AO3	Woolloongabba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Environmental Officer	AO5	Caboolture	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Environmental Officer	AO4	Toowoomba	Environmental Services & Regulation
Permanent	Senior Inspector	TO4	Townsville	Environmental Services & Regulation

AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE

No. 4

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MS TRAD ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

I refer to page 5 of the SDS and ask how many waste reduction projects, planned by local governments and notified to the Department of Environment and Heritage, have had funding cut or not provided? Has the Minister received legal advice on whether any compensation may be required for any works already undertaken?

ANSWER:

The Waste (Recycling) Infrastructure Grant Program was a program to support the increase in recycling capacity within Queensland through supporting investment in additional recycling infrastructure. This program was open to local government, industry and the community sector and was a competitive grant process. Applications closed on 5 April 2012. The grant program had 19 applications from local governments across south east and regional Queensland. At the time of the announcement of the repeal of the levy on 10 April 2012 and the cessation of the grant programs, no grant applications had been assessed or approved. As a competitive grant process, there was no guarantee that any or all of these applications would have been successful.

Other programs such the Local Government Weighbridge and Ancillary Equipment Grant program were targeted directly at local government and were to support the implementation of weighbridges, landfill fencing and signage, which would have provided broader support for waste management and reduction activities by local government. Under phase 2 of this program 33 local governments and two Aboriginal Shire Councils were supported with funding. All executed grant agreements at the time of the cessation of the programs have been honoured.

The legal advice sought has confirmed that the State is not liable to pay compensation for costs incurred in meeting legislative obligations. The *Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011* does not provide for compensation to operators in the event of the levy and certain obligations being repealed, irrespective of whether or not any works had been undertaken.

Grant funding was competitive, applying for a grant did not guarantee that a local government or any other applicant would have received funding. Therefore, the issue of compensation does not arise.

Where the department had executed grant agreements in place, the department has continued to honour these grant agreements.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 5

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MS TRAD ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

I refer to table 5.4 on page 88 of Budget Paper 2, which shows a decrease in current grants funding by the Queensland Government in 2012-13. Will the Minister list all grant funding allocations that have been cut by the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection for non-government and community organisations and projects (including businesses and local government) in the 2012-13 State Budget, listed in the same format as used by the Health Minister in response to Question on Notice 445?

ANSWER:

A number of specific savings measures were applied by the Department of Environment and Heritage in the 2012-13 Budget and the impact on grant funding for each program as a result of those savings measures are outlined in the attached table.

Funding under these programs are not generally provided as ongoing annual contributions to specific non-government organisations, community organisations, local governments or businesses, but are provided to successful applicants based on their meeting the relevant grant criteria. Grant recipients are liable to change during each funding round depending on the nature of the program.

It should be noted that ongoing annual contributions are provided to non-Government Conservation organisations managed through a grant payment to the Queensland Conservation Council. The grant funding available for this purpose remains unchanged in 2012-13 at \$415,000. In addition, the department provides \$75,000 annually for Queensland Conservation Council core funding.

In addition, the government has provided \$3 million for a new grants program titled Everyone's Environment Grants in 2012-13 with a \$12 million funding commitment over three years.

Project / Program	Recipient Organisation	2012-13 Savings (\$ Excl GST)	End Date
Waste Avoidance and Efficiency Fund	Various, including business, local government and community organisations.	34,181,000	Was being funded through the industry waste levy which was repealed from 1 July 2012
Local Government Sustainable Futures Fund	Local Government Association of Queensland	10,000,000	Was being funded through the industry waste levy which was repealed from 1 July 2012
Queensland Sustainable Energy Innovation Fund	Various (4 recipients in 2011-12)	440,000	This program ceased from 30 June 2012 and no new applications are being taken. In some cases, funding of existing contractual commitments to recipients is being negotiated to ensure optimum value for investment.
EcoBiz Program	Various, industry associations (7 recipients in 2011-12); Business leaders through business efficiency clusters (32 recipients in 2011-12)	76,000	This program is scaled back from 30 June 2012 with no new applications being taken. All existing contractual commitments to recipients will be funded.
Miscellaneous Grant Funding	Nil. Funds allocated for one off grants and sponsorships but not allocated to any recipient	1,082,000	Funding availability ceased from 30 June 2012

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 6

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MS TRAD ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

I refer to page 60 of the Capital Statement and ask which regions of Queensland, reported by locality, are currently being identified and prioritised for acquisition by the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, advise of their environmental and/or biodiversity significance and a breakdown of projected cost?

ANSWER:

Acquisition priorities are set using a number of criteria. The primary objectives are to improve the comprehensiveness, adequacy and representativeness of the reserve system and ensure it delivers appropriate economic and social benefits for the public.

Broadscale adequacy of the protected area system will ensure large enough areas of a range of habitats are conserved to allow for ecological viability and resilience and preservation of plant and animal species. At the level of individual parks, reducing the management cost of protected areas is a particularly important consideration. The consolidation of fragmented areas and improving management boundaries are important priorities. This is for both conservation reasons and improving the capacity to manage areas efficiently, for example to manage wildfire and feral animals.

The Queensland Government is committed to ensuring that its' acquisition program supports sound and efficient management of the overall estate as well as maximising opportunities for public use of these public lands.

Other considerations that dictate where acquisitions will occur include landholder willingness to sell, conflicting interests such as mining, timber and quarry interests, quantum of funding available and relative value able to be obtained with the available funding. Opportunities to leverage state funding using commonwealth government and other external funding sources to get better value for Queenslanders are also assessed.

Due to these criteria it is not possible to say that any particular area is being targeted and as such properties available for purchase are assessed on a case by case basis. Any current acquisitions would be 'commercial in confidence'.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 7

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MS TRAD ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

I refer to page 5 of the SDS and ask the Minister to list performance targets for the acquisition, assessment and registration of assets on the Queensland Heritage Register?

ANSWER:

The Department of Environment and Resource Management does not have a program for the acquisition of heritage assets.

Under the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992* (the Act) the department has a role in the assessment and registration of heritage places in the Queensland Heritage register. The department assesses register applications for places to be entered in or removed from the Queensland Heritage register. The Chief Executive makes a recommendation about the application to the Queensland Heritage Council who decide the application. The department's performance target for the assessment and registration of heritage places is to process all applications within the statutory timeframes set out in the Act.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 8

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MR KNUTH ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

The Minister has expressed his willingness to work with local governments to get rid of the bats in Charters Towers. Can the Minister advise what funds have been allocated in the 2012 budget for the removal and eradication of flying fox roosts in residential areas?

ANSWER:

The Queensland Government recognises community concerns about flying-foxes roosting in residential areas and is taking the necessary action to minimise the impacts that can result.

In addressing this issue we need to acknowledge that as a broader community we have an influence on flying-fox behaviour. Long term changes to the natural landscape and the creation of food resources and habitat attractive to flying-foxes in urban areas through plantings in backyard gardens and parks is likely to have influenced the movement of these animals closer to residential development.

While it would appear that there are many alternative places away from people where flying-foxes could choose to roost, a range of ideal settings have been created within towns and cities that the animals clearly prefer given the benefits that are available to them. The impact of vegetation clearing and development over time on locations that flying-foxes may have previously used could also be an influencing factor to their current behaviour.

Experience has shown that if flying-foxes are dispersed from a residential location there is every chance that they will either spread out more generally into trees in the local neighbourhood or fly to another nearby roost site which results in equal or greater community conflict. Either of these scenarios only adds to community distress. It is therefore essential that a planned approach is taken to flying-fox roost management.

The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is currently working closely with a number of local governments, including Charters Towers Regional Council, to manage flying-fox roosts. This includes assisting them in the development of flying-fox management plans which may contain strategies for the dispersal of roosts

where the presence of flying-foxes is causing economic loss or affecting human health and wellbeing.

An excellent example of a joint planning approach is the recent decision by Mt Isa City Council to work with Xstrata and the department to establish an alternative flying-foxes roost outside of the town limits. Once a suitable roost site has been established, the flying-foxes would be encouraged to the new site and discouraged from settling in town.

It is not a given that all roosts which may have some level of impact on the local community will be automatically dispersed. A key consideration for deciding whether dispersal should be approved is the possibility of the animals moving to another place or equal or greater community conflict.

Therefore a damage mitigation permit (DMP) may be granted to manage or disperse a flying-fox roost after the proposal has been properly assessed by the department. This is a key area that is currently being reviewed by the department with the intent of providing more rapid and longer term decisions wherever possible. For example, where flying-foxes gather in a new roost location close to urban development, the approval process should allow for the animals to be moved on promptly before they enter into a breeding cycle and build affinity with the site.

For existing roosts, management strategies that may be permitted under a DMP include vegetation clearing, trimming or lopping trees to create a buffer between flying-foxes and affected community members, through to active dispersal of flying-foxes from a roost in combination with vegetation modification to discourage them from returning.

The government is confident the approach being taken for flying-fox roost management is a balanced and responsible way to provide relief to both affected parts of communities and their local council.

There is no specific funding allocation for flying fox management as this is included within the budget for management of a range of native wildlife species. However, there has been no reduction in the budget for this important function.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 9

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MR KNUTH ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister advise how many positions and services terminated from his department since March 2012 will be outsourced to private enterprise?

ANSWER:

At this time, the only service from the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection that is being outsourced to private enterprise is the ecoBiz program.

The ecoBiz program was established in 1999 at a time when sustainable industries were in their infancy and needed high levels of government assistance.

Subsequent growth of this market indicates these programs have matured, with a range of service providers addressing the sustainability needs of small to medium businesses across the State.

While the Queensland Government is still committed to this successful program, we have decided to do so in collaboration with industry.

Previously, there were 27 permanent positions and two temporary positions based in the Sustainable Industries Directorate for the delivery of the ecoBiz program and the related Queensland Sustainable Energy Innovation Fund.

This number will reduce to one permanent full-time position for the management of the industry collaboration between now and the end of February 2013.

During this time the government will be calling for expressions of interest to establish a collaborative service delivery model with private enterprise to continue the successful work of ecoBiz.

**AGRICULTURE, RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**ESTIMATES PRE-HEARING
NON-GOVERNMENT QUESTION ON NOTICE**

No. 10

asked on Thursday, 27 September 2012

MR KNUTH ASKED THE MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE PROTECTION (MR POWELL)—

QUESTION:

Can the Minister advise of the portion of QPWS 2012 operational budget allocated to the eradication of feral pests in National Parks compared with the cost and possible income generated by allowing controlled recreational hunting in National Parks?

ANSWER:

The issues raised in the question are the portfolio responsibility of the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing. I refer the member to the relevant Minister.