

Issues and Conclusions

Amendments to Statement of Evidence

3.1 The following amendments to CSIRO's Statement of Evidence were tabled during the Public Hearing held on 23 July 2007:

- Paragraph 1: delete "Mathematical Information Systems"; substitute "Mathematical and Information Sciences";
- Paragraph 19: delete "19"; substitute "17";
- Paragraph 80: delete "1300"; substitute "13,000";
- Paragraph 125: delete "Heritage"; substitute "Water Resources";
- Paragraph 144: delete "2006"; substitute "2007";
- Paragraph 174: eighth dot point: delete "distributed Central"; and
- Annexure B – Associated Drawings: general changes to scale and legend.¹

¹ Exhibit No. 1, *Amendments to Statement of Evidence*, CSIRO.

Relationship between Commonwealth and State

- 3.2 As the proposed project represents a collaboration between CSIRO and the Queensland State Government, the Committee enquired as to whether there was a form of agreement established, and which bodies were signatories to the agreement.
- 3.3 CSIRO responded that the signatories to the agreement are CSIRO and the State of Queensland represented by the Department of State Development and the Department of Public Works. The role of the Department of State Development is to coordinate the project, with the Department of Public Works being responsible for the construction works and ownership of the land.²
- 3.4 CSIRO assured the Committee that it is confident that there is a process in place whereby all bodies involved with the proposed project will be able to resolve any outstanding differences. CSIRO added that the current arrangements ensure the Commonwealth's interests are preserved and that there is a longstanding history of cooperation between CSIRO and the state, supported by appropriate committees and government mechanisms.³

Project Management

Managing Contractor

- 3.5 CSIRO stated in its main submission that the Queensland Department of Public Works would manage the Managing Contractor (MC) who would be responsible for, and carries the risk of, delivering the project at an agreed sum.⁴ CSIRO continued that an MC had not yet been appointed, however it anticipated going to tender in August, with an MC entering into a contract in February 2008.⁵
- 3.6 CSIRO further explained that a two-stage Expression of Interest (EOI) process had been undertaken. The first stage was a briefing to industry

2 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 5.

3 loc.cit.

4 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraph 148.

5 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 18.

and general registration of interest, with companies pre-qualified for government work the only companies eligible for consideration. The second stage was a formal EOI against a set of criteria and assessed by the Queensland Department of Public Works.⁶

Project Delivery

- 3.7 According to CSIRO, and subject to the project receiving parliamentary approval, construction would begin for both sites in 2008 with completion scheduled for 2009 for the Health and Food Sciences Precinct, and 2010 for the Ecosciences Precinct.⁷ Further to the scheduled project delivery timeline, the Committee sought further information on when CSIRO proposed to move staff.
- 3.8 As regards the transition of staff to the new precinct, CSIRO informed the Committee that staff would move immediately after construction is completed. Staff from Cannon Hill will relocate to the Coopers Plain site from mid 2009; and staff from Indooroopilly, Cleveland and the Queensland Bioscience Precinct, from August 2010.⁸ Both the CSIRO and the Queensland Government are confident that the forecasted timeline and estimated budget for the project will be met.⁹

Memorandum of Understanding

- 3.9 During the public hearing CSIRO provided the Committee with a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Queensland and CSIRO.¹⁰ The Committee sought clarification on the MOU and the arrangements that it covers.
- 3.10 CSIRO explained that the MOU, as it stands, is primarily for the planning and design of the facility, with a more formal project agreement currently being finalised.

6 loc. cit.

7 Appendix C, paragraph 152.

8 Appendix D, page 18.

9 *ibid.*, page 19.

10 See *Memorandum of Understanding between the State of Queensland and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) – To establish a collaborative planning framework for joint building projects between CSIRO and Queensland State agencies at the Boggo Road Ecosciences Precinct and the Coopers Plains Health and Food Sciences Precinct.*

The project agreement also makes reference to two other agreements, one being a building management agreement and the other being a lease agreement. Both of those will be in place prior to completion of the facility, and that will govern the ongoing operations and leasing arrangements for the facility.¹¹

- 3.11 CSIRO confirmed that the project agreement, as stated within the MOU, was to be completed by 2006 and admitted that the project is behind the original schedule.

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that CSIRO provide the Committee with the details of the finalised project and lease agreements.

Lease Arrangements

- 3.12 One of the issues highlighted by CSIRO's proposal to collocate and collaborate with the State of Queensland related to the lease arrangements between the State and the Commonwealth. The Committee sought clarification on what would occur, for example, should the Commonwealth leave before the end of the lease term of 99 years. CSIRO responded that the project agreement will have clauses in it covering the relationship between the State and the Commonwealth if CSIRO were to withdraw.¹²

- 3.13 Further, the Committee sought clarification on the section of the MOU that indicated that the State could, after a 30 year lease, provide five years notification of withdrawal. In response CSIRO stated that:

...if the state ceases its ownership of the Boggo Road ecoscience precinct or ceases to use that precinct principally for ecoscience research, CSIRO may surrender the Boggo Road ecoscience precinct lease and, if it does so, the state will be liable to pay CSIRO reasonable compensation interest for the surrendered component part. That might give a bit of comfort that we will be dealing effectively, efficiently and also equitably with the partner.¹³

11 Appendix D, page 6.

12 *ibid.*, page 7.

13 *ibid.*, page 8.

Options Considered

- 3.14 In its main submission, CSIRO listed the four main options considered for the proposed project.¹⁴ In the interest of best use of available resources and not duplicating existing facilities, the Committee asked if CSIRO had considered other locations within Australia.
- 3.15 CSIRO explained that an important part of conducting successful research and development is to have scientists as close as possible to the research being undertaken. According to CSIRO, most of this work is geographically located within the Queensland region ruling out alternative sites elsewhere in Australia. CSIRO believe that the preferred project option represents the most efficient deployment of its staff.
- 3.16 It is not unusual that staff from other CSIRO laboratories in other Australian locations work in Queensland as a project may require specific scientific knowledge or skill set. CSIRO proposed that it is endeavouring to combine the scientific capacity of both the Queensland government and CSIRO staff to address national issues in the Queensland context.¹⁵

Facility Design

Greenhouse Location

- 3.17 Annexure B of CSIRO's main submission displays the building plans for the proposed works.¹⁶ Upon further examination of the building plans and a concern for safety, the Committee sought further information regarding the decision to locate the facility's greenhouses on the roof of the Boggo Road building.
- 3.18 In responding, CSIRO informed the Committee that the ground level greenhouses that the Committee saw during the site inspection of the Indooroopilly site are experiencing problems with eucalyptus trees overshadowing these facilities. The agency also added that:

The key characteristic of a greenhouse for research purposes is that it needs 100 per cent solar exposure, so they need to be able to get full solar exposure from the first thing in the morning until late

14 Appendix C, paragraphs 31 – 43.

15 Appendix D, page 9.

16 Appendix C, Annexure B – Associated Drawings.

afternoon. That should not be impeded by trees or other buildings... To get consistency in your research results, you need that constant and regular sunshade input.¹⁷

- 3.19 CSIRO acknowledged that the greenhouses will need to take into account issues such as wind loads and weather damage, however it maintained that the roof was the preferred location for the greenhouses.

Fire Safety

- 3.20 In addition to what was outlined in CSIRO's main submission¹⁸, the Committee sought further information on the fire safety and evacuation procedures for the facilities. CSIRO assured the Committee that the flammable chemicals that are held on site fall within the guidelines for laboratory projects. Also:

We are following part 10 of the Australian Standard 2243 in terms of how those flammable goods are managed and distributed across laboratory floors. The loadings are relatively low compared to what the capacity could be under those guidelines for a building of this type.¹⁹

- 3.21 CSIRO have consulted with the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service and with CSIRO's building certifier in respect to the Building Code of Australia. Consultation is also being undertaken with OH&S representatives to ensure that buildings comply with safety and egress procedures.²⁰

Access Equity

- 3.22 During the hearing CSIRO commented that all buildings will be designed to meet the requirements of the relevant Australian standards and the BCA and which will ensure access equity for employees and visitors to the facility.²¹

17 Appendix D, page 14.

18 Appendix C, paragraphs 180-181.

19 Appendix D, page 12.

20 *ibid.*

21 *ibid.*, page 13.

Maintenance of Facilities

- 3.23 During the site inspections the Committee was able to inspect existing facilities at various sites. The Committee noted, though was unable to inspect, that the Coopers Plains site had existing state government infrastructure on-site. In this regard, the Committee enquired as to the condition of the existing state infrastructure and the program incorporated for the maintenance of the facility.
- 3.24 The representative from the Queensland Department of Public Works responded that the Queensland Health Scientific Services (QHSS) facility was in 'reasonably good condition'. The facility comes under the Department of Public Works maintenance arrangements and is fully maintained as a government asset. Furthermore, the representative assured the Committee that there would be no cost to the Commonwealth in the undertaking of 'additional work' or 'capital improvement' to the existing state facility in the proposed development.²²

Environmental Considerations

Ecologically Sustainable Design

- 3.25 In its main submission CSIRO listed Ecologically Sustainable Design (ESD) initiatives that have been incorporated into the project design and added that the project took into consideration the principles of the *Energy Efficiency in Government Operations* (EEGO) Policy.²³ In reviewing the list of ESD initiatives, the Committee sought further information on the benefits of 'direct digital building management'.
- 3.26 CSIRO explained that 'direct digital control' is a computerised building management system that enables direct control of all service systems within the building. The ability to fully program and monitor energy consumption provides the capacity to tailor and manage optimal energy usage. CSIRO provided the example of fume cupboards where an alarm can be set to alert users in the event that a fume cupboard sash is inadvertently left open.²⁴

22 Appendix D, page 7.

23 Appendix C, paragraphs 124-134.

24 Appendix D, page 10.

- 3.27 The Committee also requested CSIRO to further explain the 'daylight compensation lighting control system'²⁵ as listed in its main submission. CSIRO responded that part of the lighting control system are lights that will be motion detection activated ensuring that areas where there is no activity for a period of time are not unnecessarily lit. In addition, some lighting will be programmed to turn off in areas where there is an acceptable natural lighting level. There would be a range of energy saving lighting measures that could be implemented depending on the operation requirements of the specific work areas.²⁶
- 3.28 CSIRO reported that after installing building management systems on more recent developments, it achieved energy savings in the order of 15 to 20 per cent.²⁷
- 3.29 The Committee highlighted the importance it places on the reduction of energy consumption and the emphasis for Commonwealth government buildings to lead in this respect. Further, the Committee commended CSIRO on the attention paid to ESD and working towards designing environmentally friendly buildings.²⁸

Water Sustainability

- 3.30 In CSIRO's main submission it makes mention of water saving initiatives such as the collection of rainwater and the use of water saving devices.²⁹ With the issue of water conservation being of major concern to the Committee, it asked for further detail on the water saving initiatives being employed at the sites.
- 3.31 CSIRO informed the Committee that it is proposing significant volumes of water storage at Boggo Road and Coopers Plains, approximately 420,000 and 300,000 litres of water storage respectively. CSIRO explained that:

Not only will we be collecting rainwater but also we are collecting the water that is required for testing the fire apparatus in the building – which, on its own, constitutes 250,000 litres a year – as well as our recycling of the RO waterways. We are looking at, wherever possible, focusing on water consumption in terms of not only savings but also capture of whatever sources we can on site.³⁰

25 Appendix C, paragraph 132.

26 Appendix D, page 11.

27 *ibid.*, page 10.

28 *loc.cit.*

29 Appendix C paragraph 134.

30 Appendix D, page 14.

Building Materials

3.32 With regard to building materials used in the project, CSIRO proposes to incorporate a 'selection of materials with low volatile organic compound emissions and those of a proven sustainable manufacture'³¹ about which the Committee sought further information.

3.33 CSIRO responded that:

There is quite a body of evidence that indoor air quality has a significant effect on the wellbeing of the occupants of buildings. So we are increasingly focussed on trying to make sure that the materials that are used have minimal off-gassing in relation to compounds that might affect health.³²

Hazardous Materials

3.34 During the site inspection of CSIRO facilities the Committee observed different types of work environments which later raised the issue of CSIRO operations that may be of a hazardous nature or use hazardous materials. Specifically the Committee sought details as to what hazardous works are likely to be undertaken at the proposed facilities, and what measures have been taken by CSIRO to protect employees and the environment.

3.35 CSIRO stated that whilst hazardous materials may be used, it assured the Committee that:

All contaminated waste and normal routine waste that is generated from laboratory buildings will be contained in a secure facilities on site that will meet all regulatory requirements. That waste will be disposed of by approved contractors. Any airborne contaminants...will also be contained using filter systems and such which...will meet regulatory requirements to ensure that any hazardous substances will not be discharged.³³

3.36 During the hearing CSIRO explained the use of fume stacks that are planned for both precincts, with the exact specifications being developed and the study of the impacts of the fume stacks are yet to be finalised. The

31 Appendix C, paragraph 134.

32 Appendix D, page 11.

33 *ibid.*, page 12.

Committee requested to be kept informed with regard to the proposed fume stacks.³⁴

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that CSIRO provide the Committee with the final plans for the proposed fume stacks.

Site Contamination and Remediation

- 3.37 Given that there may be hazardous materials used in, or derived from, activities at the proposed facilities, the Committee asked whether there was any likelihood of soil or water contamination that would need to be removed.
- 3.38 CSIRO admitted that while there may be 'soil and water materials on-site' it will put in place necessary measures to ensure materials are contained on-site, or removed following appropriate protocols.
- 3.39 CSIRO assured the Committee that in the event that it disposes of any of its sites, all necessary steps will be taken to ensure that the sites are properly remediated. As part of the collocation proposal, CSIRO stated that it intended to sell three of its existing sites, where two stage environmental audits would be undertaken at each site. Results from the first stage of the environmental assessments indicated that there was minimal contamination on the sites, and the second stage of assessment will determine what remedial action is required.³⁵

Consultation

- 3.40 At Annexure C of its main submission, CSIRO listed the authorities and departments consulted in the preparation of its statement of evidence.³⁶ CSIRO also stated that the proposal had been publicly supported by the Premier of Queensland.³⁷ The Committee sought further information as to whether there had been any particular issues raised in opposition to the proposed facility.

34 Appendix D, page 11.

35 *ibid*, page 12.

36 Appendix C, Annexure C - Consultations.

37 *ibid.*, paragraph 140.

3.41 CSIRO indicated that the main concern, of which it was aware, was raised by the parents and citizens of the Dutton Park School. The Queensland Department of State Development added that as the school located close to the Boggo Road development, there was a concern of disturbance during the construction period and the affect on the Dutton Park School. The Department assured the Committee that it has kept the school and other such community groups fully informed through its public consultative process and associated mechanisms such as letter drops, newsletters and public meetings.³⁸

3.42 Some of the concerns are centred on the urban renewal of the Boggo Road area, or the Boggo Road Urban Village project. The Department explained that:

Generally there has been excellent support for what has been identified today as parts of that village, which includes not only the science precinct but also a residential component and a commercial precinct.

A major bus-rail interchange and connectivity through to the University of Queensland is proposed as part of the urban renewal of the area.

3.43 The Department believes that, via its consultative processes it has allayed community concerns and also understands that:

There is a requirement that the public look to that development as it occurs to ensure that commitments given today are maintained.³⁹

Recommendation 3

The Committee recommends that CSIRO continues its consultation with the local community and relevant stakeholders.

Staff Consultation

3.44 The Committee sought further information regarding the extent of staff consultation undertaken by CSIRO and how it had addressed any feedback regarding the proposed works. CSIRO responded that it: distributes a staff newsletter that provides project updates; and also conducted personal briefings. There is also a CSIRO project control group which has staff

38 Appendix D, page 9.

39 loc. cit.

and union representation. CSIRO continued that there had been a lot of staff input in the design of laboratories and office spaces.⁴⁰

- 3.45 One concern for CSIRO is the possible impact on travel times and staff movements and, in this regard, CSIRO has undertaken a transport study to gauge the impact on staff so as to minimise staff disruption. CSIRO has recognised that the proposed project may have a material impact on staff with longer travel times to get to work, and are working closely with affected staff to address this issue. CSIRO assured the Committee that it is treating all staff concerns seriously and is working with staff to achieve the best outcome for all involved.⁴¹

Childcare Provisions

- 3.46 In its main submission CSIRO states that the Queensland Government supports the establishment of a private sector childcare centre within the Boggo Road Urban Village, since none are currently available on the QHSS precinct.⁴² As there was no further reference to childcare facilities in CSIRO's main submission, the Committee sought further information on the provision of childcare on-site or in the area.
- 3.47 According to CSIRO, it would be permissible to have a childcare facility on the proposed site but the provision and operation of this would be the responsibility of the private sector. Whilst CSIRO would support the provision of onsite childcare, a social amenity and impact assessment identified that there were:

...approximately 12 facilities offering childcare services including before and after school care, vacation care and long day care in the suburbs immediately surrounding the ecosciences precinct... and our view is that there will be ample opportunity for staff members who have children requiring care to take advantage of local facilities.⁴³

40 Appendix D, page 16.

41 *ibid.*, page 18.

42 Appendix C, paragraph 138.

43 Appendix D, page 16.

University Involvement

- 3.48 Given the nature and significance of the research to be carried out at the proposed facilities, the Committee enquired as to whether any Queensland universities had a financial interest in the proposed collocation project. CSIRO responded that whilst there is a strong interest from universities from a research perspective, there are no universities with a financial interest in the project.⁴⁴
- 3.49 However CSIRO added that:
- ...it is within CSIRO's broader strategic interest to collaborate with the universities, and in particular we have an important role in the national innovation system in the training and development of scientists through joint supervision of students.⁴⁵
- 3.50 Students enrolled at universities, such as the University of Queensland and Griffith University, would be physically located at both precincts, but have no 'material interest' in the facilities.

Traffic Management

- 3.51 Given the increase in the number of people on both of the sites, the Committee enquired how CSIRO proposed to manage the possible increase in traffic. CSIRO responded that the design philosophy for the project was to minimise the number of vehicles entering and exiting the site, estimating that there will be 174 vehicles on site which will all be related to work (such as for the transport of field equipment). In line with ESD, and conscious that one site will be an ecoscience precinct, CSIRO stated that it will not provide staff parking on-site.⁴⁶
- 3.52 CSIRO further supported its traffic management proposal by informing the Committee that one of the sites is adjacent to major bus and rail interchanges which, combined with no on-site staff parking, would hopefully encourage staff to utilise public transport. CSIRO indicated that there will be a small number of parking spaces for individuals who, in particular circumstances, may require private vehicle access, and there will also be some visitor parking spaces provided. There are also two hour parking areas near the Boggo Road site. Through CSIRO's traffic

44 *ibid.*, page 8.

45 *loc.cit.*

46 *ibid.*, page 13.

management plan, it hopes to minimise impact on the respective local areas and encourage the use of public transport.⁴⁷

Future Works

- 3.53 CSIRO stated in its main submission that at the Boggo Road site there is 'space for a future block at the southern end of the site' and as such the Committee asked CSIRO of the plan for future development of the site that has not been highlighted in the current proposal.
- 3.54 In clarifying the statement, CSIRO stated that there is flexibility on-site should CSIRO work necessitate additional staffing levels that are beyond the current building capacity. There is no planned expansion in the foreseeable future.⁴⁸

Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the proposed CSIRO collocation with Queensland Government on the Ecosciences and Health and Food Sciences Precincts, Brisbane, Queensland, proceed at the estimated cost of \$85 million.

Hon Judi Moylan MP

Chair

13 September 2007

⁴⁷ loc.cit.

⁴⁸ ibid., page 15.