



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
WORKS

Reference: Warehousing facilities at Wadsworth Barracks, East Bandiana, Victoria

THURSDAY, 7 AUGUST 2008

WODONGA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE PARLIAMENT

INTERNET

Hansard transcripts of public hearings are made available on the internet when authorised by the committee.

The internet address is:

<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>

To search the parliamentary database, go to:

<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>

**PARLIAMENTARY STANDING
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS**

Thursday, 7 August 2008

Members: Mr Butler (*Chair*), Senator Troeth (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Mark Bishop and Forshaw and Mr Champion, Mr Forrest, Mr Hale, Mr Lindsay and Mr Slipper

Members in attendance: Senator Troeth, Mr Butler and Mr Hale

Terms of reference for the inquiry:

To inquire into and report on:

Warehousing facilities at Wadsworth Barracks, East Bandiana, Victoria

WITNESSES

BESTEK, Mrs Jacqueline, Project Director, Infrastructure Division, Infrastructure Asset Development Branch, Department of Defence 2

CLEGGETT, Mr Wayne, Regional Estate Development Manager, Defence Support - Riverina Murray Valley, Department of Defence 2

GRICE, Brigadier William, Director General, Infrastructure Asset Development Branch, Infrastructure Division, Department of Defence 2

ROSS, Mr Michael James, Project Manager/Contract Manager (Senior Associate), ARUP Pty Ltd 2

TEMPANY, Mr Warwick David, Design Consultant (Director), GHD Pty Ltd 2

TUCKERMAN, Colonel Simon John, Commander, Joint Logistics Unit (Victoria), Department of Defence 2

ZENTELIS, Mr Rick, Director Heritage and Biodiversity, Estate Planning, Infrastructure Division, Department of Defence 2

Subcommittee met at 11.32 am

CHAIR—Welcome, everybody. I declare open this public hearing of the parliamentary standing committee inquiry into the proposed construction of new warehousing facilities at the Wadsworth Barracks, East Bandiana, Victoria. Before we move to the proceedings of the public hearing, I might just make a couple of statements. First of all, thank you to members of the public and community who have come to our hearing today to hear about this project. We also have, as I understand it, some representatives of the local media.

The way in which we conduct these hearings is that witnesses who have pre-notified us of an intention to give evidence are given that opportunity. The only witnesses so far who have done that are from the Department of Defence and they will be the first witnesses called to give evidence to this public hearing. In the event that any member of the public would like to make a statement to the committee about the proposal, we also have a way in which members of the public can do that, which I will come to perhaps after we have dealt with the listed witnesses for the Department of Defence. Also, it is proper that witnesses be given an opportunity to object to the broadcast of proceedings by the media. At some stage I will formally ask the department whether it has an objection to that being done.

With those preliminary statements, can I ask whether there are any witnesses who object to the broadcasting of the proceedings of the hearing today? As there is no objection, I would ask Senator Troeth whether she is willing to move that the committee authorise the broadcasting of the proceedings.

Senator TROETH—Yes, I so move.

CHAIR—As there is no objection, I declare that motion carried.

[11.34 am]

BESTEK, Mrs Jacqueline, Project Director, Infrastructure Division, Infrastructure Asset Development Branch, Department of Defence

CLEGGETT, Mr Wayne, Regional Estate Development Manager, Defence Support - Riverina Murray Valley, Department of Defence

GRICE, Brigadier William, Director General, Infrastructure Asset Development Branch, Infrastructure Division, Department of Defence

ROSS, Mr Michael James, Project Manager/Contract Manager (Senior Associate), ARUP Pty Ltd

TEMPANY, Mr Warwick David, Design Consultant (Director), GHD Pty Ltd

TUCKERMAN, Colonel Simon John, Commander, Joint Logistics Unit (Victoria), Department of Defence

ZENTELIS, Mr Rick, Director Heritage and Biodiversity, Estate Planning, Infrastructure Division, Department of Defence

CHAIR—Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise that these hearings are formal proceedings of the parliament and, consequently, they warrant the same respect as proceedings of the parliament itself. I remind witnesses that giving false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of parliament. Before I ask you to make some introductory remarks, Brigadier, I will just point out for other people present at the hearing today that the written submission by the department is on the committee's website and has been accepted by the committee. Before you make some introductory remarks, you might like to indicate to the committee any variations you might like want to make to that submission.

Brig. Grice—Yes, we would like to make a few small changes to our written submission of evidence. They are due to the progression of design developments since this submission was referred to the committee. The first is on page 3 of our statement of evidence, in subparagraph 11(a)(iii), which is towards the bottom of page 3. It should read a 'new receipts and issues area (2,378 square metres) for the existing freight distribution centre'. That is, it just changes the size of that.

On page 8 of the submission, subparagraph 25(c) should read 'construction of a new awning (2,378 square metres) for the existing freight distribution centre; and'. At the top of page 9, in subparagraph (c), it should read 'upgrading works to address high priority occupational health and safety issues identified in the 11 remaining warehouses at North Bandiana'. That just corrects the incorrect number of warehouses.

On page 13 of the submission, the second sentence of subparagraph (c) should read 'existing stormwater and sewer services will be upgraded and modified'. Engineering investigations have noted that the existing sewer pumping station does not need upgrading.

On page 16, the final sentences of paragraph 48 should read '160,000-litre rainwater storage tank will be provided at the building. Gas hot water will be used for hot water requirements'. That just updates the final engineering design solution for a single 160,000-litre tank and the final design solution for the provision of the gas hot water service in that building, which is the most efficient method. They are all of the amendments we would like to the statement of our evidence.

CHAIR—Thank you. You have provided us with a letter dated 31 July 2008, which is an update on community information sessions that the department has held in relation to this project. That submission has been accepted as a formal submission of this inquiry, but we only did that yesterday and have not had an opportunity yet to put that document on the website. If there are any members of the public at the hearing who would like a copy of that submission, Narelle, sitting over there on her lonesome, has copies for people. It is only 1½ pages. I just indicate that that has been formally accepted and is on the record as well. Over to you.

Brig. Grice—The Department of Defence proposes to construct warehousing facilities at the Wadsworth Barracks, East Bandiana. Joint Logistics Unit Victoria supports the Australian Defence Force both in Australia and on operational deployments by providing maintenance, storage and distribution of defence items, including combat clothing, personnel equipment and repair parts for armoured vehicles, weapons systems, artillery pieces and wheeled vehicles. The objective of this proposal is to provide Joint Logistics Unit Victoria with a modern warehouse at Wadsworth Barracks, East Bandiana, to address current deficiencies in the existing warehousing facilities at Gaza Ridge Barracks, North Bandiana. The relocation and centralisation of all fast-moving stock and inventory items into the new warehouse and the subsequent rationalisation of stock remaining at North Bandiana will enhance capability, reduce warehousing requirements and result in efficient support to Defence.

The scope of works at East Bandiana consists of the construction of a new 18,000 square metre soldier support warehouse, including the provision of materiel handling equipment, construction of a new awning of 2,378 square metres for the existing freight distribution centre, engineering services upgrade works to support the new facilities and the relocation of defence stock into the new warehouse. The works at North Bandiana include the rationalisation of the stock that remains at North Bandiana, the demolition of eight redundant warehouses and minor occupational, health and safety upgrade works for the remaining 11 warehouses at North Bandiana.

The total estimated out-turn cost of the proposal is \$36.369 million. This includes construction costs, professional fees, furniture, fittings, materiel handling equipment, stock relocation and rationalisation works, and demolition and minor upgrades works to warehouses at North Bandiana. Subject to parliamentary clearance, construction is scheduled to commence in early 2009 and be completed in 2010. Defence witnesses are available to take any questions that the committee may have.

Senator TROETH—Could you tell us what, if any, further consultations have been undertaken since you gave us your submission and what the outcome of those consultations was?

Brig. Grice—I can provide a separate document which summarises all of the consultations that Defence has undertaken with respect to this project. However, of interest to the committee would be the community consultations that we have undertaken here in the last few months. We have had two community information sessions, one on 8 May and a second on 29 July. The first session was attended by approximately 30 personnel, and Defence outlined its proposal. The community raised some concerns which Defence undertook to go away and investigate. The second community information session was held in these offices on 29 July. At that meeting Defence provided the attendees—and there were approximately four personnel that attended the second consultation meeting—with the outcome of our investigations.

Residents' concerns covered several areas, one being that the proposed warehouse may overshadow their houses, which would lead to increased heating costs. We believe, after investigations and shadowing studies, that that would not be the case. The new warehouse is located to the south of Killara, and the overshadowing from Mount Huon in the late afternoon would precede any shadowing which may occur from the new warehouse.

The second issue is that television and mobile phone reception may deteriorate due to the new warehouse, and I may pass to Mr Tempany to give the results of surveys. We had engineering consultants undertake studies of both the mobile telephone service within this area and the television service. Our studies indicate that we do not believe there will be any impact on the residents of Killara. That being said, and having a television set in my own home and using a telephone, I understand their concerns and we are sympathetic to their concerns.

What Defence would undertake to do is, prior to the commence the of construction, commission a survey of signal strength throughout the community of Killara, to document the existing condition and the existing services that are available there. We would provide that information to the residents for their records. As a result of that, we may be able to provide them with some advice on how they could better improve their television reception. Following completion of construction of the project, we would undertake an identical study to document the signal strength of both television and mobile phone service. We are confident that that will show that there has been no degradation in either service. Mr Tempany might want to give us a little more information about the engineering studies.

Mr Tempany—The initial study was based on towers, carriers, signal strength and the like, and the response to that study was that we do not expect any problems. But we have inquired further in terms of locking in a baseline reading preconstruction and using that as a baseline to then assess post-construction signal strength. Post-construction signal strength then becomes an issue, largely and normally, between the resident and the carrier, whereby signal strength can be boosted off towers or off antennas. However, it also becomes an issue of in-house performance of equipment. I guess that Defence is saying that at that point, if there has been degradation, that could be investigated further.

Brig. Grice—A couple of other issues were raised. One was seeking confirmation that water run-off from East Bandiana would comply with environmental standards. There has been an issue there in the past, but there is a parallel project which is being undertaken. Construction is

due to commence of a stormwater detention system and downstream defender units to provide additional treatment to run-off from the roads within East Bandiana. That project is valued at about half a million dollars. Its tenders have closed and I believe that it is due to commence construction sometime in the next four to six weeks, with completion around October.

The new project, clean rainwater off the roof of the new warehouse, would bypass that and go direct into the billabong, providing clean run-off into the billabong. All run-off from the road surfaces and the surrounding countryside would be passed through the stormwater treatment detention system and only in compliance would clean water be discharged into the billabong. So we believe that we have that under control and there will not be an issue there.

One final point was raised, which was that in summer perhaps the building might act as a heat sink, which would radiate heat in the evening. We have had a look at that. Perhaps Mr Zentelis and Mr Tempany might be able to give us an update on that.

Mr Zentelis—In essence, the building itself will not have any thermal mass associated with it, so it will not act as a heat sink to radiate out during the night. In fact, it is designed to try to keep the conditions inside the building relatively constant. The engineers have advised us that there will not be any radiation issues associated with heat with the facility.

Mr Tempany—I concur. It is not a building with any great thermal mass; it is a lightweight clad building. We have gone to great lengths to ensure that the internal environment is suitable for working conditions, so we do not expect it to get warm. The advice from our engineering team is that a building of this type in that location will not have any radiant heat strength to generate strength across to other locations.

Senator TROETH—When we looked at the plan for the concrete wall around the building, I think you indicated that there is opportunity for cross-ventilation in that, so that would emit and take in heat, as it were.

Mr Tempany—Yes. It is a naturally ventilated building.

Brig. Grice—It has not really been raised as a concern, but noise can always be an issue. The design of the new facilities has placed all of the areas of the building where there might be an external operation to the southern end of the facility, which is the furthest away from Killara.

Senator TROETH—Yes, facing away.

Brig. Grice—There is no need for any vehicles to go behind the new facility for the conduct of operations. There is a small road which goes around the perimeter of the building for firefighting and maintenance purposes. Our noise studies indicate that it might be prudent during the early stages of construction to erect a temporary noise barrier to the northern side of the site. Defence has opted to put in the permanent noise attenuation barrier there, which would remain in perpetuity. That consists of about a 2.4-metre-high wall along the northern boundary adjacent to the building. In addition, all of the trees along the northern boundary at present remain as part of this project, and the tree line on Murray Valley Highway and on Military Street is further enhanced by about nine plantings of an additional approximately 9,000 trees and shrubs.

So Defence is taking every effort to assure the residents of Killara that we respect their rights and we want to be seen as a good neighbour. Defence has also offset the building between 26 and 42 metres from the boundary at Military Street, and the roofline of the new building at that point will be lower than the existing tree line. We want to be seen as good neighbours and we are taking all prudent actions to ensure that our development does not unnecessarily interfere with the right of others.

Senator TROETH—Thank you. I know that the work is still to go to tender, but have you had any engagement with the local construction industry to advise them of what is coming up?

Brig. Grice—Yes. Several local companies attended the first community consultation meeting. We have written to several organisations within the Albury-Wodonga area and advised them of the project—organisations that have a mantra to assist people in the construction industry and related industries in finding work, so they are aware of the project. We expect that local companies will be very competitive for this work. There have been several smaller warehouse projects recently undertaken in Albury-Wodonga, and we are certain that the capability to execute this work is available locally. We look forward to those people tendering.

Following parliamentary clearance, we will further engage with the construction industry and hold industry briefings to brief people. The tender process for these works will be a two-stage open tender process. In the first stage, we will invite qualified companies to register their interest in the project. We would start that process in the next four to six weeks—we will hold an industry brief—and we would expect to see in the order of 10 to 15 companies registering an interest to execute the works. Following receipt of those registrations of interest, a registration evaluation board would be convened to review the qualifications, capabilities and past performance of all of those companies. A short-list of three to five tenders would be selected to proceed to the second stage of the tender, which would occur probably in the October time frame, subject to the gaining of parliamentary clearance.

Mr HALE—I have a further question regarding consultation. At the May meeting, what was the feeling of the local residents? Was that the same meeting that the construction industry attended? Were its representatives included in those numbers?

Brig. Grice—I will pass to Mr Tempany, who attended that meeting, and maybe to Mr Cleggett. The rationale for that first meeting was to advise the local community, in particular Killara residents, about the project. Obviously, it was advertised in the local newspaper, we did a letter drop of residents on the Murray Valley Highway, Military Street and Killara, and a doorknock was undertaken as well to garner participation and attendance from that audience. Of course, when it is advertised in the newspaper, everyone sees it, and several local construction companies took the opportunity to learn more about the project. Warwick, would you like to add anything?

Mr Tempany—The only comment I would make is that, as we saw it, the second session was an opportunity to return with some research done on shadowing, TV and mobile phone signal strength and downstream water quality. So the second session was an opportunity for us to return with some technical engineering advice, which we would hope would address to a degree those concerns.

Brig. Grice—I might add that both information sessions were chaired by the deputy mayor of the City of Wodonga, and we thank him for his assistance.

Mr HALE—So the feeling at the first meeting was just one of information gathering; the residents were not coming in opposed totally to the construction of the warehouse, were they?

Brig. Grice—I will ask Mr Tempany to comment on that, as I was not at the meeting. But, clearly, at the first meeting the residents raised their concerns. Defence took them away and investigated them. At the second meeting, we came back and gave them our position and the results of our investigations. Warwick, would you like to characterise the tone of the meetings?

Mr Tempany—I will do my best. There was some anxiousness about a facility of this size in that location, at the first meeting. It was a terrific opportunity for the design team and the stakeholders from the Defence end to understand those concerns and then to go away and do the due diligence and the research a bit further than had been done already and to return with further information. My feeling with respect to the second consultation meeting is that, to a degree, matters such as overshadowing were somewhat satisfied and that the mobile phone and TV signal strength had been well researched and investigated. You will have picked up from the briefing on site and also the dialogue today, that there have been a series of injections into the project to try to make sure that the interface between the residents, the Defence site and the new facility is appropriate.

Mr HALE—So only four people attended the second meeting. Has any of the information that was gathered in regard to the concerns from the first meeting been conveyed to the residents in that area?

Mr Tempany—My understanding is that the research undertaken was delivered through Defence to the deputy mayor for a degree of circulation. But all of that material was shared at the second consultation community meeting.

Brig. Grice—I may pass to Mr Wayne Cleggett to provide some additional information. He attended those sessions as well.

Mr Cleggett—I attended the last meeting. We had a particular project which was an issue at the time of the first meeting, which was the First Flush project. My manager presented to the Killara residents the operation of how this First Flush system would work. I think, after that, the local community was satisfied with the outcome that Defence had presented at the time.

CHAIR—I am not sure whether I should address this question to you, Brigadier, or to the Colonel. What is the expected life of these proposed constructions, firstly, in terms of the structure itself and, secondly, in terms of the technology around transport and distribution?

Brig. Grice—The facilities' design life is 25 to 30 years, as per normal.

CHAIR—So only half of the warehouses were constructed during World War II.

Brig. Grice—If we could resurrect the planning documents for the construction of the original warehouses, you would probably find that they were temporary structures with a life of 10 years.

So, while we say that the design life is 25 to 30 years, that does not mean that they are going to fall down. With continued maintenance, they will continue to operate. But the whole-of-life calculations are based on that period. They are not going to go poof at 25 years.

I will pass to Mr Tuckerman and possibly to Warwick or Michael to speak about the installations within the warehouse. We have designed the logistics work within the warehouse to cater for additional advances in warehouse technology. You have probably seen on *Beyond 2000* and those types of things the fully automated warehouse, where someone presses a button and then they go and get whatever it is that you want. A machine does it. We are not building the warehouse to that standard, but we are building it so that in the future it could be installed with such technology. So we are future proofing the warehouse, should Defence and industry in the future choose that that is a more efficient way to go. Simon, is there anything else you would like to add?

Col. Tuckerman—The warehouse has been designed to take a range of technologies, leveraging off what is known as the standard defence supply system, which is our overall warehousing architecture. There is an ability for it to be upgraded. The warehouse will be fitted for barcode scan type technology. As technology grows and develops, we can evolve with that within the limitations of the actual structure itself. So I am reasonably confident that there is sufficient cabling in it and sufficient smarts in the building to do us for at least the next 30 years, which is the design life of the building at this point in time.

Mr Tempany—I would comment that there has been a fairly diligent whole-of-life process, where we have looked at the materials and the systems. The design processes to date have had a couple of value management sessions, where we have tested different things and chewed over things. From a design services consultant's point of view, there has been a diligent whole-of-life process to make sure that there is inherent flexibility to allow for improvements in technology; but there has also been a careful assessment of materials to last the day.

CHAIR—From your written submission, Brigadier, I understand—and correct me if I am wrong—that there has not been a significant change upwards or downwards in personnel numbers at the barracks from this proposal.

Brig. Grice—That is correct. There may have been an increase of around 15 people at East Bandiana, with a reduction of those in North Bandiana.

CHAIR—Out of some hundreds?

Brig. Grice—Yes.

CHAIR—Thank you, Brigadier and all those from Defence. I now ask whether any member of the community is interested in making a short, three-minute statement to the committee. You will have heard the statement I made at the beginning of the public hearing about the nature of statements made to committee proceedings such as this. They should be taken as being statements made to the parliament, with the appropriate respect and the avoidance of any contempt. In order to give everyone who wants to make a statement a fair chance, it is our practice in these proceedings to limit such statements to three minutes. Would anyone like to make such a statement?

Colin—I represent a number of the residents, particularly in Military Street, regarding a number of issues that were raised at these community meetings. I am still trying to digest some of the information that we have only just found out about from the Defence Force today. We still feel that a number of the issues that we raised have not been addressed by the Defence Force.

The issue of the shadowing was more to do with the changing of the temperature in the area. It is a well-known fact—it is even noted in the government's own guidelines in relation to these sorts of constructions—that there would be a change in the ambient temperature around such a structure. The distance away from the houses is not very great. It is approximately three times the length of this room. There are only seven of us in this street, but it affects our lifestyles. We would like these issues addressed probably to a greater extent than they are being addressed.

A couple have not been addressed. One is the wildlife that gets over into that particular area. We are not even complaining about the fact that the building will be a substantial eyesore, in that basically it will run the full length of Military Street. We just feel that the Defence Force still has to come up with a lot more answers in relation to how it will affect the temperatures in the area. A one- or two-degree change does not sound much, but it has a huge affect on us in our homes and around our homes. I do not know whether Daniel has any comment to make.

Daniel—My name is Daniel and I also live in Military Street, next to Colin. I attended both previous meetings. At the second meeting, they did come back with some resolutions and some nice diagrams addressing the issues brought up at the first meeting, but they did not address all the issues that had been brought up. Basically, we will be looking at a 50-odd-metre-long and 10-metre-high wall of steel. Maybe the temperature conditions inside the warehouse are suitable for those inside the warehouse, but it probably means that all the heat will be reflected back on the occupants in Military Street in particular and on the residents of Killara in general.

The issue of shadow was brought up. The diagrams that were presented at the meeting on 29 July indicated that, in the middle of summer, there would be no shadow at five o'clock in the afternoon. I do not know where they got those diagrams from. I suspect that their mathematics is totally wrong. In any case, they were drawn up for five o'clock standard time, which is four o'clock in the afternoon daylight saving time, which means that we should have another four hours of sunlight, but we will miss out on some of that.

Then there is also the issue of twilight. Following sunset you have twilight. We will be getting twilight in the middle of the afternoon, so we will be missing out on that. It might be handy for young mums and dad trying to put kids to bed, but for the rest of the residents it is a case of 'too bad'. That is all I would like to say at the moment, thanks.

CHAIR—Thank you. Would anyone else like to make a statement? Brigadier, do you have anything else that you wish to say? You do not need to, but you have the opportunity. While you are collecting your thoughts, I will make one point. I think it would be useful for the committee if you were able to provide us with a copy of the shadowing study.

Brig. Grice—We can do that, as well as provide details on the mobile phone and television reception. We will continue to do some more investigations on shading and on the heat sink issue, both of which I do not believe are issues to the detriment of local residents. But we will do some more work there and undertake to come back to the residents, via another community

consultation period—we will get the deputy mayor to arrange that for us—and provide additional information on that. We will see whether those residents are satisfied with the additional information that we can provide. We can expand our studies and come back. But Defence is confident that the thrust of the positions that we put forward on 29 July are correct. We will provide additional information to convince those half-a-dozen residents of Military Street of that at a future consultation meeting.

Mr HALE—Finally, Brigadier, is there scope to move the project further away? Currently, I think it is 25 metres, plus the width of Military Street and the residents' houses, so we could be talking, roughly, 40 metres from the front door. Is there scope to move it on that block of land?

Brig. Grice—No. The remainder of the site is master planned for additional facilities in the future. If we were to do that, we might be unable to relocate all of the functions that we would like to do on that base. Warwick, you may want to speak about setback distances and standards. But, by providing a 26- to 42-metre setback, we have more than complied with local government regulations. With the forest that is currently there, the additional plantings and the sound attenuation wall, I believe that there will be glimpses of the warehouse as we go forward, not a 50-metre long eyesore.

Mr Tempany—The dialogue we have had with the planning department of the City of Wodonga has been that the proposed setbacks are very generous, compared to the minimums required in their local planning scheme. We have also used, as a benchmark for the shadowing diagrams and other things, ResCode, which is the Victorian standard for these things. We have tried to be diligent about those components. If we look at the planning scheme—and I think it is sections 22.13 and 22.16 of the local planning scheme—they talk about a 7.5-metre setback in that situation. They talk about a landscape buffer in that situation, which we have exceeded with what we have provided. They talk about streetscape, which is also one of the reasons, I think, why the acoustic wall is to remain in the longer term. That is why we have seriously escalated the planting down that side. The setbacks are generous, at least, by those standards. I agree with the brigadier that there is an overall master plan for that site that sees an alignment of roadways and infrastructure done in a diligent and reasoned way.

CHAIR—I will make a couple of closing comments. Brigadier, thank you. We take notice of your indication that the department is willing to have further discussions, particularly with residents of Military Street. That seems to be the locus of the issue. We welcome and encourage that. The involvement of the local council—and the deputy mayor has obviously played an important role here—would also be welcomed as would, as soon as possible, from all of our perspectives, some clarity around some of these issues. Again, I repeat my request that the department provide the committee with copies of those studies for us to look at, as soon as it possibly can, so that we can be timely in our deliberations on this important project.

I thank a number of members of the community for their attendance. Thank you particularly to those two members who were willing to make verbal statements to the committee today. It is very important that we hear from members of the community their views about the impact of public works such as this, as well as those of the proponent agencies from the Commonwealth government.

We will be deliberating on this project over the coming weeks. There is the capacity for members of the public to make a written submission to the committee. There are pamphlets that the secretary here can provide to you to guide you in the way in which you can do that. They do not need to be long or technical; they really just need to reflect your views about the project and the things that we should take into account in our deliberations. These things do have a level of timeliness about them, though, without understating the importance of issues raised and getting this right. Our job is to deliberate on these proposals in a timely fashion that reflects the operational needs of our defence forces and other agencies of government. So I would ask that, if any member of the public is keen on making a written submission, they do that within a week of today's hearing.

Resolved (on motion by **Senator Troeth**):

That, pursuant to the power conferred by section 2(2) of the Parliamentary Papers Act 1908, this committee authorises publication of the evidence given before it and submissions presented at public hearing this day.

CHAIR—I thank everyone for their attendance today and declare this public hearing closed.

Subcommittee adjourned at 12.14 pm