



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Reference: Redevelopment of Kokoda Barracks, Canungra, Queensland

WEDNESDAY, 20 JULY 2005

CANUNGRA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE PARLIAMENT

INTERNET

The Proof and Official Hansard transcripts of Senate committee hearings, some House of Representatives committee hearings and some joint committee hearings are available on the Internet. Some House of Representatives committees and some joint committees make available only Official Hansard transcripts.

The Internet address is: **<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>**

To search the parliamentary database, go to:
<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>

**JOINT STATUTORY COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC WORKS**

Wednesday, 20 July 2005

Members: Mrs Moylan (*Chair*), Mr Brendan O'Connor (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Ferguson, Troeth and Wortley and Mr Forrest, Mr Jenkins, Mr Ripoll and Mr Wakelin

Members in attendance: Mr Forrest, Mr Jenkins, Mrs Moylan, Mr Brendan O'Connor, Mr Wakelin

Terms of reference for the inquiry:

To inquire into and report on:

Redevelopment of Kokoda Barracks, Canungra, Queensland.

WITNESSES

COOPER, Lieutenant Colonel Mark Hilton, Chief of Staff, Headquarters of the Regional Training Centres, Kokoda Barracks Canungra, Australian Army, Department of Defence..... 2

HUTCHINSON, Brigadier Peter John, Director-General Infrastructure Asset Development, Infrastructure Asset Development Branch, Department of Defence..... 2

SHEPPARD, Mr Robert Sherman, Project Director South Queensland, Infrastructure Asset Development Branch, Department of Defence 2

STANLEY, Mr Christopher Robert, Business Development Manager, Special Projects, John Holland Pty Ltd 2

Committee met at 12.03 pm

CHAIR (Mrs Moylan)—I declare open this public hearing into the redevelopment of Kokoda Barracks, Canungra, Queensland. The project was referred to the Public Works Committee on 11 May 2005 for consideration and report to parliament. In accordance with section 17(3) of the Public Works Committee Act 1969:

- (3) In considering and reporting on a public work, the Committee shall have regard to -
- (a) the stated purpose of the work and its suitability for that purpose;
 - (b) the necessity for, or the advisability of, carrying out the work;
 - (c) the most effective use that can be made, in the carrying out of the work, of the moneys to be expended on the work;
 - (d) where the work purports to be of a revenue-producing character, the amount of revenue that it may reasonably be expected to produce; and
 - (e) the present and prospective public value of the work.

Earlier this morning, the committee received a tour of the base. We thank you for facilitating that inspection. We have now received a confidential briefing on the costings. The committee will now take further evidence from the Department of Defence on the public record.

[12.05 pm]

COOPER, Lieutenant Colonel Mark Hilton, Chief of Staff, Headquarters of the Regional Training Centres, Kokoda Barracks Canungra, Australian Army, Department of Defence

HUTCHINSON, Brigadier Peter John, Director-General Infrastructure Asset Development, Infrastructure Asset Development Branch, Department of Defence

SHEPPARD, Mr Robert Sherman, Project Director South Queensland, Infrastructure Asset Development Branch, Department of Defence

STANLEY, Mr Christopher Robert, Business Development Manager, Special Projects, John Holland Pty Ltd

CHAIR—Welcome. Do you have any comments to make on the capacity in which you appear?

Mr Stanley—I am the project director for John Holland Pty Ltd, which is the managing contractor for the project.

CHAIR—The committee has received a statement of evidence from the Department of Defence. This will be made available in a volume of submissions for the inquiry, and it is also available on the committee's web site. Does the department wish to propose any amendments to the submission that it has made to the committee?

Brig. Hutchinson—I would like to make the following changes to the statement of evidence. In paragraph 12, the annual training output of 4,850 refers to the number of students trained by regional training centres throughout Australia. The final sentence should read:

The annual training output at Canungra in the regional training centre is 1,550, with a maximum of approximately 230 trainees on course at any one time.

The final sentence of paragraph 11, as a result of that correction to paragraph 12, should read:

The annual training throughput at Canungra is approximately 5,400.

Finally, in paragraph 51, delete the second and third sentences and insert:

Government has recently approved two accommodation blocks under the Single Living Environment Accommodation Precinct (Single LEAP) project initiative for Canungra as a separate medium project. The two accommodation blocks will address the requirement for permanent, that is staff living-in, accommodation at Canungra that is not met by this redevelopment. The Single LEAP project at Canungra is approved at \$5.8 million including a defence contingency. The Single LEAP buildings will be delivered concurrently with the redevelopment to take advantage of existing project management and contractual arrangements.

CHAIR—Thank you very much. I now invite you, Brigadier Hutchinson, to make a short opening statement in support of the submission.

Brig. Hutchinson—This proposal seeks approval for the redevelopment of Kokoda Barracks Canungra for the Department of Defence. Defence long-term planning provides for the retention of Kokoda Barracks and the Canungra military area as an eastern Australian base for Army career development training, defence intelligence training and subunit battle training. A government decision in 2002 to construct a new defence intelligence training centre at Canungra confirmed the long-term future of the base.

As the all corps training facility for Army, every senior non-commissioned officer has undertaken training at Canungra at some point in their career. The base also holds special significance for veterans of World War II as well as those involved in subsequent conflicts. For these reasons, many consider Canungra to be the spiritual home of the Army. Planning for this redevelopment has therefore been sensitive to the built and living heritage values of Canungra.

The redevelopment of Kokoda Barracks is necessary to address dysfunctional and substandard office and training facilities, inadequate and outdated messing and living-in accommodation arrangements, and seriously degraded infrastructure. Many of the facilities at Kokoda Barracks have been in use for more than 30 years, with some being close to 50 years old. The reinvestment will ensure Canungra can operate effectively as a defence training base over the next 30 years.

The program of works includes: rationalising messing, constructing and refurbishing trainee living-in accommodation, improving working accommodation and training facilities and improving the engineering services at Kokoda Barracks. The budget for the project is \$86.7 million. This includes professional design and management fees and charges, construction, furniture fittings and equipment together with appropriate allowances for contingency and escalation. The project was foreshadowed as part of the 2005-06 defence budget. Subject to parliamentary clearance, it is intended to commence work in late 2005 with the works being completed by late 2007.

Mr FORREST—I only have two questions. One is in regard to the medical centre and the other is in regard to sewage treatment. Firstly, on the medical centre, paragraph 30 indicates that the centre does not provide inpatient care. It leads me to wonder what happens if there is a major acute occurrence on-site and what arrangements will be put in place.

Brig. Hutchinson—I will start with that and then perhaps pass to Lieutenant Colonel Cooper. Our assessments of the requirements for medical care throughout Australia have undergone changes over the last decade or two. We now place much greater reliance on either the civil infrastructure or centralised defence facilities. It all depends on the time of access to those facilities. We do not, as perhaps we did 20 years ago, look to have distributed facilities in many of the bases. We would look to concentrate that sort of care. Perhaps Lieutenant Colonel Cooper could expand on that.

Lt Col. Cooper—The medical facility is for daytime hours. There is a medical officer there at any one time. They are all civilian staff, bar several uniform medics. It is the same for the dentist. In the evacuation plan normally that is the first port of call for stabilisation—and this

year we have seen heart attacks and snakebites. From there they go either by our military ambulance, which we maintain here, or by the local ambulance down to Allamanda hospital on the coast. If it is not an emergency they are then transferred to the military hospital at Enoggera 2nd Health Support Battalion.

The other issue too with the medical facility is that we do not have uniformed medical officers up here. They are all contracted staff. Currently we are having serious issues with occupational health and safety in contracts with civilian doctors and indemnity because of the current state of the building up there, so part of the refurbishment will ensure that the new medical facility meets current practices.

Mr FORREST—Are live arms used in training here?

Lt Col. Cooper—Yes, in some of the courses that we do. The visiting units here will bring their own medics—basic-trained medics for stabilisation. The onus is on them for initial treatment. Generally speaking, they will come here to the aid post—the medical centre—during daylight hours. If it is after hours we then use the CareFlight system or the local ambulance.

Mr FORREST—How would a person be treated for a major broken leg from climbing the obstacles down there?

Lt Col. Cooper—There would be casualty evacuation from that point there straight to the medical centre during daylight hours. If it is after hours, he will be moved up to the range control office near what is currently the front gate, where he will be met by the ambulance. There are local ambulances from Mount Tamborine and Canungra itself that will then transfer him to Allamanda.

Mr FORREST—The next question was in regard to paragraph 42—and members will groan because I want to talk about the sewage. The option to integrate Kokoda Barracks sewage treatment with Beaudesert Shire Council has been investigated but not adopted because of the loss of opportunity for defence to have a reuse system at the source of the problem. Could you just lead me through why that opportunity to provide a valuable resource to the surrounding community has not been utilised? Sewage is a resource and it ought to be treated that way.

Brig. Hutchinson—I will start on that answer and then hand over to Mr Stanley to talk about it a bit more. The basic principle of economically sustainable development is that we should handle our own problems—

Mr FORREST—It is not a problem; it is an asset.

Brig. Hutchinson—Sorry, we should handle our own opportunities as well. The sewage treatment plant here was built under a previous regime and it does not meet the current standards, so we are looking to upgrade it to meet the current standards. The principle we are using is that it would be much more economical and would also meet our ESD principles of looking after our own problems and opportunities on our own turf. If we were to connect it in, I understand there would be significant increases in the cost. Given our location, that is not an easy thing to do. You have seen the topography around here. It would lead to some engineering

problems as well. So we want to fix what we currently do, and we think we should be doing that in our own space. Perhaps Mr Stanley can talk bit more about the detail of some of those issues.

Mr Stanley—I think you have covered it.

Mr FORREST—I can already see major investment going into the sewerage infrastructure—the pipes that leak and so forth—but I am talking about where it is collected. I imagine we are going to collect it in an evaporation basin somewhere and not do anything with it. Is that what is envisaged?

Brig. Hutchinson—No, we are looking to rebuild our treatment plant to meet current standards. We will be doing our component of the good citizen thing by looking after the risks and opportunities here rather than handing it to somebody else.

Mr FORREST—That is good. Is the effluent that comes out of the treatment plant being reused around the site?

Brig. Hutchinson—We looked into the ability to reuse the treated outcome of the process. One option was to pipe it for reuse elsewhere on the base. We did not take up that option because of the cost of doing it, and because it will meet environmental standards it is permissible to put it back into the natural stream.

Mr Stanley—There is an existing sewage treatment plant which treats sewage from the base and discharges it into the Coomera River. Our redevelopment project will upgrade the quality of treatment to contemporary tertiary discharge standard and discharge the effluent at the same point.

CHAIR—I would like to pursue some issues around climate and soil conditions. This morning we saw one of the end buildings that will be demolished because it is in such bad shape. There is reference in the report, at paragraph 72, to highly reactive soils and high rainfall, which provide some challenges for making sure that buildings do not deteriorate and crack, have appropriate footings and are built of appropriate materials. For the public record, could you tell us a bit more about the particular climatic conditions and the highly reactive soils, and how this is going to be accounted for in the future development of the base's main buildings.

Brig. Hutchinson—I will ask Mr Stanley to address the technical nature of that.

CHAIR—I think the committee and the public would want to be assured that measures are being taken to make sure that in future the buildings do not deteriorate to the degree that we have seen the existing building deteriorate.

Mr Stanley—There are two key ingredients to solving that problem. First, we have to do whatever is possible to exclude water from getting into the soil under the buildings, because it is the effect of water on the clays that causes the movement, and the differential movement is what causes the cracking in the buildings. There are measures in our designs to keep, for example, garden beds away from the edge of buildings—to exclude them by putting a path around buildings. The second important ingredient is to design the foundation system to be stiff enough to manage what movement would otherwise tend to occur. The structural form of the

foundations is to modern design standards for this type of soil, which is not what was done last time.

CHAIR—Don't the footings have to allow for expansion and contraction in these kinds of soils that are very wet at times and then very dry at others?

Mr Stanley—The design objective is to have the building move as a whole on effectively a stiff foundation rather than let it articulate and cause differential movement through the building. That is the design principle.

CHAIR—At the same paragraph the submission also talks about roofing material, again in light of the environment and, I presume, the high rainfall. Could you explain to us the environmental benefits of using appropriate metal roofing? What sort of metal roofing are we talking about as being appropriate?

Brig. Hutchinson—Again, I will ask Mr Stanley to talk about that. Part of the approach here is to do with consistency with previous approaches as well. In keeping with the heritage of the base and the approaches that have been used here in the past, corrugated iron has been a well used and well proven approach in this particular area. I will ask Mr Stanley to talk more on the issue from a structural point of view.

Mr Stanley—The type of sheeting profile we would use these days is one that allows for flatter pitches to take the water away without getting leaks through the roof. Some of the other initiatives in the project are to get rid of some box gutter areas, which are always prone to leaking and which occur in some of the buildings. Metal roofing is common here and we will continue to use it. We are just choosing different profiles and putting them at an appropriate angle to make sure the water clears away properly.

CHAIR—What is the life of metal roofing in the climatic conditions such as are experienced here?

Mr Stanley—Something like 30 years.

Brig. Hutchinson—We are going for a 30-year design life, allowing for a mid-life upgrade of 15 years. Clearly, we would be looking to assess any issues and to address them to extend the life out to the 30 years.

CHAIR—The other question that relates to climatic conditions is airconditioning. In your submission, at paragraph 67, you talk about the use of air-cooled airconditioning systems, which avoid the problems of legionella bacillus in the systems. Could you explain to us what kind of airconditioning systems and heating and cooling systems will be used to maximise the benefit here?

Brig. Hutchinson—Across the base we have looked at a solution specifically for the type of use of the building and the hours of use of the building. For example, a lot of the living accommodation is not occupied during the day, because the trainees are in the working accommodation or out in the field. So we have considered those sorts of factors and then looked to address the heating and cooling solution for each of the facilities depending on its use. For

example, for the working accommodation where the syndicate rooms are we clearly need to provide an environment during the day when people are there in which they can operate effectively. I will ask Mr Stanley to talk about the solutions that we are adopting.

CHAIR—There are two issues that I would like to have some reassurance on. One is the suitability of the kinds of systems you are proposing to put in. We have had quite a lot of problems over the years with public buildings and airconditioning systems that have not worked efficiently and effectively. The other issue is the energy saving aspect of heating and cooling.

Brig. Hutchinson—I will ask Mr Stanley to talk about the specifics but on the ESD side of the buildings we have done a lot of work. I spoke about fitting the solution to the type of use of the building, but we have also fitted the solution to the ecologically sustainable development side of things and looked at reducing our energy use and greenhouse emissions. All of those sorts of factors have been considered. Perhaps Mr Stanley can address some of them.

Mr Stanley—In coming up with that balance for the trainee accommodation we have selected bar heaters, fans and natural ventilation. Only the staff accommodation units have chilled airconditioning, and they are what are called ‘split units’. The bulk of the airconditioning and the systems that are referred to in the comments about legionella are in the training facilities and the office buildings. In those buildings the systems are ducted central airconditioning systems and the cooling plants, which are external to the building, are air-cooled systems rather than cooling tower systems—hence the comment about avoiding the legionella problem. In one of the buildings, the new A1 training building up on Battle Ridge, our engineering team has developed an ESD solution that enables the building to breathe. During some climatic conditions the building will be cooled and heated by breathing rather than by simply chilling or heating the air. That is an ESD initiative that we see as lowering energy use and providing a better environment for working in.

Brig. Hutchinson—Just to expand on that, as I have said, Defence are very serious about our ecologically sustainable development. It is a requirement that we now build into our contracting and our approach. We embrace a wide range of initiatives. We think we have done some pretty good work here at Canungra. We are a founding member of the Green Building Council. Its green star rating tool has been implemented on this project to assist in achieving our ecologically sustainable design solutions and minimising the whole-of-life costs. Some of our significant ecologically sustainable development initiatives include orienting the new facilities to maximise cross-flow ventilation and larger overhanging eaves. I think one of the committee members mentioned designs from the south of Australia being used in the housing market here which are inappropriate—

CHAIR—I am sorry, but due to time constraints we need to just with what is happening on the base at the moment. As you know, we usually ask a lot of questions about the environment and sustainable buildings and systems but we are running very close to time this morning. We will now move on to the deputy chair’s questions.

Mr BRENDAN O’CONNOR—In paragraph 54 of its main submission, Defence explains the number of facilities to be removed or demolished. In fact, it mentions ‘the removal and disposal of about 26 redundant facilities’. Earlier in the submission it also says:

All removals/demolition will comply with cultural heritage requirements and ecologically sustainable development criteria.

What I am interested in knowing is whether there is any hazardous material that makes up part of the buildings that need to be removed or demolished. If I could firstly get an answer as to whether there is hazardous material involved.

Brig. Hutchinson—The short answer is yes, and perhaps if I can—

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—I was going to ask: what are you doing then? What types of hazardous material are there and how are you approaching their removal and demolition?

Brig. Hutchinson—I will ask Mr Sheppard to start on that one.

Mr Sheppard—Asbestos is the hazardous material. It is most common in a lot of the old Defence buildings. Mr Stanley can talk about how it is going to be safely removed.

Mr Stanley—The asbestos product is mostly in the form of sheeting in roofs and walls and there is some insulation. The removal will involve using contractors who have the proper licences and use the proper precautionary processes to remove, bag and store it and take it to appropriate locations. That is well-established technology now that we are able to contract out.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—The contractors that would undertake this work would be specialists or would have experience in removing asbestos on a regular basis?

Mr Stanley—Yes.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—Whilst you say it is clad or encased, could there be situations in which asbestos would be airborne as a result of the demolition and removal of certain parts of the facilities?

Mr Stanley—The procedures are designed to avoid that, but monitoring is done to ensure that if that does not happen it is detected.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—There is no concern about the way in which you have to phase the project? There are logistical matters to consider, I understand, when you are looking to have people continue to live, work and train in the area. Whilst the demolitions are occurring, you are not concerned that there will be any potential danger to any of the personnel who might be in the vicinity?

Mr Stanley—Generally, the removal of asbestos activity will be organised to happen within a confined building site well separated from the other operations of the base. With that sort of site designation, yes, I am quite confident about that.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—How many buildings that need to be removed or demolished have asbestos? Can you give us a rough proportion, if not a figure?

Mr Sheppard—Almost 100 per cent.

Brig. Hutchinson—No, I do not think I can give you that figure at the moment. I have an extensive list of the buildings to be removed, and since we presented the evidence we have done some more studies which have shown that more buildings will be removed.

CHAIR—Would you like to take that question on notice and provide us with that information at a later date?

Brig. Hutchinson—I can certainly provide you with the list with the details of all the buildings to be removed. Whether I can provide an asbestos survey before the committee wishes to consider its report, I am not sure. I could provide that subsequent to the consideration, perhaps.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—That would be helpful.

CHAIR—It is probably hard to know until they start demolition just what the extent of it is anyway.

Brig. Hutchinson—We do have asbestos surveys.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—You have to identify asbestos before you can start demolition anyway, obviously.

Brig. Hutchinson—That is right.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—I understand that is the assessment you would make. I am certainly happy for you to provide the information before we consider agreeing upon a report, because that evidence may determine recommendations the committee makes to the department.

Mr Sheppard—The removal of all the asbestos is in line with the Queensland legislation.

Brig. Hutchinson—I have been advised that we can table that information today. I have the list here, and it is a bit more extensive than the original list, as I said. We will give you the information about which buildings on that list contain asbestos.

CHAIR—Members agree to that additional material being tabled.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—We noticed that there were some heritage interests in the area. There are some Indigenous interests and there would certainly be some heritage interests attached to some of the older buildings that are present. Has there been any requirement to register any interest in protecting any particular buildings as a result of this effort to add and refurbish buildings? Are there any identifiable existing dwellings that need to be considered for heritage protection? Has that been a part of the process?

Brig. Hutchinson—That has been a part of the process. As we have said previously, Canungra is considered by many to be the spiritual home of the Army, so we are very keen to look at preserving the site's heritage values. The project has embraced the Defence heritage strategy of opening the doors by providing improved public access for visitors and veterans. As

the committee has been briefed, we have the visitors precinct as part of the project with the new entry.

In terms of how we have done the categorisation of the buildings, and addressing the concerns that you have raised, a heritage consultant has been contracted and they have given us a methodology to use for the identification and recording of all of the buildings. We have an agreed process regarding what we need to do to record any of the buildings that are being demolished. We have classified all of the buildings in terms of their heritage value. Of the buildings being demolished, nine have been identified as having a moderate heritage value. Three are identified as of little heritage significance, and the remaining buildings are below those assessments. Our consultants in this study were Environmental Resource Management. The heritage impact assessment was conducted this year and it lists the processes required.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—Have you felt the need to consult with the Australian Heritage Council at all? Or did the consultants consult with the council on your behalf?

Brig. Hutchinson—The project was discussed at officer level over several informal meetings between Defence and the Australian Heritage Commission during 2003. The Australian Heritage Commission formally wrote to Defence on 9 September 2003 advising that a draft heritage assessment and concept plan for the museum and visitors centre was supported. This concept plan has since been revised, and Defence recently had a heritage impact statement prepared by Environmental Resource Management, as I just mentioned, in June 2005. This statement addresses the changes to ensure that the heritage values of the site are not compromised. The current project planning has not changed the heritage outcome previously supported by the Australian Heritage Commission. The changes to Commonwealth legislation in 2004 mean that the Department of Environment and Heritage has now taken the lead in that area.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—We noticed the child-care facilities when we inspected the site. I am assuming that those facilities are for the children of personnel or staff that might be undertaking training. Is that correct?

Brig. Hutchinson—I will ask Lieutenant Colonel Cooper to talk about that.

Lt Col. Cooper—There are two components. There is a two-day kindergarten, which is pre-preschool in Queensland, for three- to four-year-olds, and three-day limited hours care which runs from Wednesday to Friday that is primarily for staff here—in fact it is all for staff. We also have some families off base who deliver their children here for that care.

Mr BRENDAN O'CONNOR—Thanks. I will stop there.

CHAIR—I invite Mr Wakelin to ask his questions. Due to time constraints, Mr Jenkins has agreed to put his questions on notice.

Mr WAKELIN—Thank you. We understand the facility is prepared for up to the year 2035—effectively for 30 years—under current demands. Do you think what has been done with the power supply is sufficient to meet the demands? Obviously you are satisfied it is. I just want to reassure myself, considering that you did have some issues, that it will meet the demands.

Brig. Hutchinson—There are two issues with the power. The first is what we can do on the base itself and the second is the quality and quantity of supply that we get from the local supplier. We think that some of the problems we have had here fall into each court, so we will definitely address the issues on our side of that in this project and our regional office has been negotiating with the power supplier to address the other, longer-term issues. We are confident that that will meet requirements into the future.

Mr WAKELIN—You mentioned visiting lecturers. There is not a great demand, but do you have somewhere you can accommodate them to meet future demands?

Brig. Hutchinson—Yes. They would generally stay in the officers' mess or the senior NCOs' mess as required.

Mr WAKELIN—They are an important part of your barracks?

Brig. Hutchinson—Yes.

Mr WAKELIN—Lieutenant Colonel Cooper, do you have anything to add to that?

Lt Col. Cooper—We maintain some VIP rooms—they are VIP by name; they are not that VIP. That is where they are accommodated.

CHAIR—Mr Jenkins, would you like to state your questions, to which we will receive answers on notice.

Mr JENKINS—I am satisfied so far with the story about asbestos, but in our inspection I noticed there is an orange label on every building around here asking contractors to make contact. It implies that there is some sort of inventory being done. I want to check whether or not that has been done and whether, in refurbishment of the buildings, there would be asbestos related situations.

The other matter, which has been pretty well covered, concerns the heritage ratings of buildings. For instance, but not actually pushing the case for it, it occurred to me when we were up at the gate that that N2 building would perhaps rate somewhere in the life of this place. But I take it, from the tour we had and from the answers to our questions, that there has been some cognisance taken of heritage stock. My gratuitous remark would be that some of those which you rated zero should be kept so you can explain to the younger generations how good they are getting it.

With regard to the numbers of rooms—and I appreciate that some information has been given to us about the numbers which will be provided in the new buildings and in the refurbished buildings—would we be able to be supplied with the numbers of the new stock plus those that are going to be removed because they are buildings that you are getting rid of? Just on an environment and heritage matter, I take it from what we have been told that there will be very few trees actually removed because of this. In any case, I would like to place of record that I do not think you really have a problem with the way you have catered for keeping a representation of what is around here; added to that is the standard of the gardens.

The next questions are about consultation. You have listed those you have consulted with. Directly arising from Mr Forrest's series of questions about the consultation with Queensland Environment and the flows from the sewerage works into whichever river was mentioned, I am interested that we start to develop an understanding that by adding to environmental flows we are in fact recycling water. Having said that, I would have liked a longer discussion about why it was that we were not using some of that water for additional piping through to toilets and things like that. I would hope that at some stage we are going to develop our ESD principles to that degree.

The other consultation question is with regard to Beaudesert Shire or main roads about the works that have been done at the main entrance and the extent of consultation that has gone on so far so that all the works that are associated with bringing the security boom gate further into the property have been considered. Also, what effect has the fencing around that area had? I asked a question in the confidential part about savings. You placed that answer on notice on the record. People who have followed my interest will not be surprised by this question. In Attachment B2 I notice that there are some workstations dotted out and some rooms. I feel obliged to ask about the size of the workstations and the size of the office spaces and whether everybody actually gets a desk in these situations—what type of office organisation there is.

Because there is just a few more minutes, I would place on notice my self-indulgent general knowledge type question. I take it that the base's symbol is a Kokoda lizard or something but it is multiheaded. If anybody can explain to me why it has so many heads, I would be pleased. That is the end of the questions.

CHAIR—Thank you very much. If we could have answers to those questions in writing it would be appreciated. Is everyone happy with that arrangement? I am sorry that we have these time constraints which do not allow further discussion on those points. Thank you to all the witnesses who have appeared here today. To those who have assisted us with our inspections this morning, we appreciate your cooperation. I would like to thank Hansard and our secretariat.

Resolved (on motion by **Mr O'Connor**):

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.

Committee adjourned at 12.48 pm