



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

# Official Committee Hansard

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

**Land 17 phase 1A infrastructure project**

(Public)

WEDNESDAY, 7 DECEMBER 2011

BRISBANE

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://parlinfo.aph.gov.au>**

**PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS**

**Wednesday, 7 December 2011**

**Members in attendance:** Mr Forrest, Ms Saffin, Senators Boyce and Gallacher

**Terms of reference for the inquiry:**

To inquire into and report on:

Land 17 phase 1A infrastructure project

**WITNESSES**

**GREENAWAY, Mr Martin, Project Director, Gallipoli Barracks, Department of Defence..... 1**

**HARBECK, Mrs Mary, Private capacity ..... 11**

**LEE- STEERE, Mr David, Base Support Manager, DS-BNE, Department of Defence..... 1**

**NAUMANN, Brigadier Darren, Director-General, Infrastructure Asset Development, Department  
of Defence..... 15**

**NAUMANN, Brigadier Darren, Director- General, Infrastructure Asset Development, Department  
of Defence..... 1**

**SMITH, Mr Jamie, Project Manager, Contract Administrator, Department of Defence..... 1**

**TAYLOR, Major Mathew, SO1 LAND 17 Capability Implementation, Department of Defence..... 1**

**TRINDER, Mr Colin, Director, Environmental Impact Management, Department of Defence..... 1**

**GREENAWAY, Mr Martin, Project Director, Gallipoli Barracks, Department of Defence**

**LEE-STEERE, Mr David, Base Support Manager, DS-BNE, Department of Defence**

**NAUMANN, Brigadier Darren, Director-General, Infrastructure Asset Development, Department of Defence**

**SMITH, Mr Jamie, Project Manager, Contract Administrator, Department of Defence**

**TAYLOR, Major Mathew, SO1 LAND 17 Capability Implementation, Department of Defence**

**TRINDER, Mr Colin, Director, Environmental Impact Management, Department of Defence**

**Committee met at 12:53**

**CHAIR (Ms Saffin):** I declare open the public hearing of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works into the proposed LAND 17 Phase 1A Infrastructure Project. I would like to thank Defence through Brigadier Naumann for the briefings and inspections we had this morning. They are always useful in helping the committee with their role. I would like to welcome any members of the public who are here and also other members. I invite the witnesses to state any other details of the capacity in which they appear.

**Brig. Naumann:** I am the lead witness for Defence.

**Major Taylor:** I am in Combat Support Development at Army Headquarters.

**Mr Smith:** I am with Aurecon, consultants to Defence. Aurecon is the project manager.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. Senator Boyce needs to make a comment.

**Senator BOYCE:** Madam Chair, I would like to put on the record a potential conflict of interest. I discovered this morning that the landlord of my electorate office, Leon Trapp and associates, is the design manager for this project.

**CHAIR:** That is noted, Senator Boyce. That is now a matter of public record. Thank you for doing that. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that the hearings of this committee are formal proceedings of the parliament. Consequently they warrant the same respect as the proceedings of the parliament itself. I remind witnesses that the giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as contempt of parliament. Would you care to make some brief introductory remarks, Brigadier Naumann?

**Brig. Naumann:** Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. This proposal seeks approval to provide new and upgraded facilities in support of the introduction into service of the new lightweight towed Howitzer being delivered under the Defence Capability Project known as Project LAND 17 Phase 1A. Under Project LAND 17 Phase 1A, which was approved by government in 2009, Defence will procure 35 M777-A2 lightweight towed guns, a new advanced field artillery tactical data system known as AFATDS and new course-correcting fuses for use with the existing range of artillery ammunition. Under the LAND 17 Phase 1A infrastructure project, Defence proposes to provide new and upgraded facilities to support the introduction of the new M777-A2 guns and provide facilities to suit the organisational changes that have occurred in artillery units in conjunction with the introduction of the new guns into the Australian Defence Force. The facilities proposed include those directly associated with the storage, security and maintenance of the new guns and those that support more broadly the new capability, including training and working accommodation, tow vehicle shelters and hardstands, and some engineering works. Works under this project are proposed to be undertaken at six sites. Improvements to artillery regiment facilities in Gallipoli Barracks, Enoggera, Lavarack Barracks, Townsville, Robertson Barracks, Darwin, and Horseshoe Lines, Edinburgh, are proposed. Training and support facilities works are proposed for the School of Artillery, at Bridges Barracks, Puckapunyal, and for the Army Logistics Training Centre, at Gaza Ridge Barracks, Bandiana. The estimated cost of the proposed works is \$46.5 million, excluding goods and services tax. The cost estimate includes construction costs, professional management and design fees and charges, furniture, fittings and equipment, together with appropriate allowances for escalation and contingencies. Subject to parliamentary clearance of the proposed project, construction is planned to commence in mid-2012 and be completed by mid-2013. Madam Chair, that concludes Defence's opening statement and the Defence witnesses are now ready to take questions from the committee.

**CHAIR:** Thanks, Brigadier Naumann. We have a number of questions. I would like Mr Forrest to lead off the questioning.

**Mr FORREST:** I am not sure whether to address these questions in camera later or to address them now, but they are to do with the different phases of the rollout for this armament. I am still curious to find out what the

army gains without phases B and C—at least B. We are still reliant on the old system of targeting. Can you just run us through what you are going to do without B approved or even C approved? How do you develop this armament up to its full potential?

**Brig. Naumann:** I will get Major Taylor to talk through the detail of that, as he did brief it this morning. I guess the first point I would note, though, is that Land 17 phase 1A does deliver us a capability, albeit not the complete capability which we talked about this morning and which could be delivered if phases 1B and 1C were to be approved by government and rolled out into delivery. I think that the key point, though, is that we do get a capability outcome out of Land 17 phase 1A with the delivery of the M777A2 guns and the AFATADS system, as we discussed this morning. I will ask Major Taylor to go into that detail.

**Major Taylor:** The increase in capability as a result of the advanced field artillery tactical data system is a brain. It allows the computation to be done in a coordinated environment instead of having to rely on old Mac information that is passed by voice. As far as the battle management of those systems is concerned, that is what AFATADS allows us to do. We also get the benefit of increased range, lethality and better mobility and survivability for the gun detachment. It took them some time to bring the gun you saw this morning out of the shed and into the open; the old gun took longer. So, while it took two minutes to move the gun you saw this morning, it is still substantially faster, and that improves the survivability of our troops in contact.

**Mr FORREST:** How much has the range increased?

**Major Taylor:** We have gone from 18 kilometres to 30 kilometres. The Hamel gun—the smaller gun that you saw this morning—has a maximum range of 10 kilometres, and again we have gone up to 30 kilometres. So we have had a significant improvement in capability just through the digitisation of the communication and the new gun system. We also have far higher levels of interoperability with our coalition partners. AFATADS is a US system, and having AFATADS allows us to digitally speak to the US forces.

**Mr FORREST:** Is it possible, in a secure environment, to share target information?

**Major Taylor:** Most definitely—the reason we have gone to that level of system and the classification of the system is that we can share that information between Australian forces and US forces.

**Mr FORREST:** Should a different committee—the security committee—approve B and C, will extra capital which this committee supervises need to be invested?

**Brig. Naumann:** Our understanding at this stage is that under phase 1B there is no additional facilities component which would be required to be brought to this committee; however, under phase 1C there is. We would expect that, if 1C was approved by government, we would be developing a submission which we would bring to this committee for your consideration.

**Mr FORREST:** I am completely satisfied with the operational matters of your submission. I would like to go to the traffic problem, but we will come to that later.

**Senator GALLACHER:** Thank you for the briefing this morning. I think that, as this is a public hearing, it is probably pertinent to put some of the issues you showed to us. If you could briefly summarise the need for this and the shortcomings of the facilities which are to be upgraded so that that could be placed on the public record, I think it would be a useful exercise.

**Brig. Naumann:** I will ask probably Mr Greenaway to add a little bit of detail here, but I guess I could start with just an overview. Within the artillery regiments, as we spoke about this morning, out around Townsville, Darwin and Edinburgh the facilities that are already on the ground there have been constructed recently under other projects that this committee did consider—Enhanced Land Force, Hardened and Networked Army—and then also many years ago when we moved the 1st Brigade up to Darwin and the construction of the Army Presence in the North facilities there. The facilities were built of sufficient size to meet the requirements of this gun. In Darwin it was because we had the M198 in service, which is of a similar size to the M777. So by the very nature of the same size of the guns, the facilities are an appropriate size.

In the case of Townsville and Edinburgh, we knew that this gun was coming and we knew the size of this gun, but what we did not know at that time was the security requirements surrounding the protection of the gun and the equipment that goes with the gun. We were able to design and build those facilities to the appropriate size. However, what we were not able to do was add the necessary security protections to protect that equipment.

In the case of 1 Regiment here in Enoggera, those facilities, as you saw this morning, were built a long time ago for a very different requirement—a much smaller gun. The gun hangar there was built in the eighties and it was for the M2A2 gun, which is two generations previous to this one. It was a much smaller gun, so the facilities are too small to meet the requirements of the M777. That is why we have brought to you the proposal that we

need to build new hangers for the M777 guns to compensate for the fact that we cannot fit them in the existing facilities.

In terms of the facilities for the training at Puckapunyal at the School of Artillery, there the requirement is primarily around security. Again, as we briefed this morning, the facilities that are there are sized appropriately, but we need to upgrade the security so that we can ensure the protection of the asset. The requirement at the Army Logistics Training Centre at Bandiana is for a new facility to allow us to undertake the training that is required in an environment that is conducive to the type of training that needs to be undertaken on this piece of equipment to get it out of the cluttered and noisy environment in which we currently undertake our artillery training.

Across the board on all sides there was also the requirement for us to provide security for the storage of the AFATDS system and also for the training of the soldiers in the use of the AFATDS systems. So there was a requirement there for us to develop training classrooms and classrooms where the soldiers could exercise in the use of those computer systems. They do that on about a weekly basis to ensure that they maintain their currency on that system. We do not have that capability anywhere on the estate, so where we could we have proposed that we will upgrade existing facilities to improve the security requirements, but there is one occasion at Edinburgh where we do need to build a new facility.

**CHAIR:** Senator Gallacher asked you to talk a little bit about the general need.

**Brig. Naumann:** The general need is that we need to secure this equipment. The facilities that we have right now do not allow us to provide the appropriate level of security to the equipment. Also, we cannot undertake the necessary training that we need to undertake with the facilities that we have right now. We are going to deliver this capability into the service, and delivering a capability in the service is more than just delivering a piece of equipment; it is ensuring that our soldiers are trained up such that they can operate it. It is also ensuring that our maintainers are trained up to ensure that they can maintain it.

The need is that we have to ensure that we can actually achieve that capability outcome. We have to be able to train the soldiers, we have to be able to secure the equipment, and we have to be able to provide the appropriate storage for the equipment and ensure that we can meet our obligations with United States in terms of security. There is that element of obligations with United States regarding classified components of the equipment and our obligations to the US to ensure that we do protect that, so we have included that in the design solutions that we are proposing.

**Senator GALLACHER:** The obvious thing this morning was that there are occupational health and safety implications in the existing facilities regarding the size of the weapons you are using. I assume that this is one of the important considerations in this expenditure.

**Brig. Naumann:** That is right, Senator. As I discussed, the facilities at 1 Regiment were built for a much smaller gun. As you saw demonstrated this morning, soldiers trying to manoeuvre that new artillery piece out of that hangar presented a number of OH&S issues. There are some challenges in moving a 4½-tonne piece of equipment like that. Hopefully that was fairly evident to you this morning.

**Senator GALLACHER:** What do you say to someone who says, 'We don't need artillery in today's army, and we are spending \$46 million on what could possibly be described as a great deterrent, but it is obsolete'?

**Brig. Naumann:** Again, I am going to ask my resident gunner, who is sitting beside me, to provide some detail. The key point that I would make is that, in order for us to achieve an effect on a battlefield, we need to ensure that our forces can manoeuvre with freedom around the battlefield. We need to ensure that those forces have the appropriate support—that they have an umbrella of support that can be called in to defeat any opposition that they encounter on the battlefield. The support that they can call in can be in the shape of indirect fire support from artillery or it can be in the shape of aircraft providing support from the air. It is a fundamental principle of undertaking operations that we need to ensure that we have that freedom of manoeuvre, and artillery is just one element to ensure that we have that. I will, however, ask the gunner, who I am sure is going to be able to make it a lot more clear than this poor engineer!

**CHAIR:** Why do we need 35 M777E2 lightweight, towed guns? That is for the public record. We had a briefing and understand it, but it needs to be on the record.

**Major Taylor:** The reason we require artillery in generic forms is that in the land environment we must be able to provide the required support for our organisation. We cannot be reliant on another service, whether that is the RAAF or the Navy, to provide our fire support. We have to have organic, army owned and relied on means to provide our own effective fire support to enable us to provide sufficient weight of fire to allow us to manoeuvre freely. If we do not have artillery, we do not have the ability to provide the rounds to a desired location to shape what we want to be able to do and, also, we cannot necessarily rely on air support or naval fires. So we do need to

have this organic and inside each brigade, so that we have that guarantee of fire support; otherwise we will lose a lot of people in battle.

**Senator GALLACHER:** Fair enough. There must have been other options than a complete rebuild of all of the facilities around the country where you position guns. Could you briefly describe any of those options you did consider?

**Brig. Naumann:** I am going to ask Mr Greenaway to talk through this. I do not know how much detail you want to go to here—whether you want to get into each of the sites or whether you would rather we just talked generically about this.

**Senator GALLACHER:** I think it is very clear from what I have seen that there is a genuine need, in terms of the existing facilities, occupational health and safety, capability and the whole bit. I would like on the public record: did you consider other options to the one you have taken—

**Brig. Naumann:** Yes, we certainly did.

**Senator GALLACHER:** One facility, 35 guns—is this the best scenario?

**Brig. Naumann:** In terms of one facility, 35 guns, I am not sure that we would have ever considered that. As we discussed yesterday, we have a force disposition around the country. The artillery units are disposed around the country and are co-located with their supported brigade. You have 4 Regiment in Townsville supporting the 3rd Brigade, you have 12 Regiment in Darwin and Edinburgh supporting the 1st Brigade, and you have 1 Regiment here in Brisbane supporting the 7th Brigade. They are integral components to those brigades, as Major Taylor indicated previously about the need for that support integral to the manoeuvre element. So we were constrained somewhat in that that is where the units exist—that is where the people are and that is where the equipment needs to go such that we can ensure that we do achieve the capability that I was talking about of equipment, people and training. So, in the broader sense, I do not believe that at any point we would have considered concentrating the 35 guns into one location.

Similarly, to expand on that capability point, the capability that is generated in the field or on the battlefield is only truly effective if it is exercised with the supported force. Again, that comes with the co-location—it comes with being there with those people that they would then deploy with to ensure the supported units know how to deal with the artillery and the artillery knows how to deal with the supported units at each of the sites. Once we had settled that that was where the guns needed to go, we then needed to consider what we were going to do with each of the sites in order to meet the requirement. At that point, we then considered whether we were able to use existing facilities with some upgrade work, whether we were able to get away without doing anything or whether we needed to come up with a complete new build solution. As we have presented to you this morning, what we are proposing is actually a mix of all of those. In some cases we have not had to do anything, but in other cases we have refurbished or we are proposing to refurb existing facilities, and in other cases we have had to go to a complete new build. We can go into it in more detail, if necessary.

**Senator GALLACHER:** No, that is fine. I think it is important to have that on the record. That leads me to my next question: have the existing facilities ever met the standards, or is it simply the case that your requirements now have changed dramatically?

**Brig. Naumann:** If we take Gallipoli Barracks as an example—because we were out there this morning—those facilities would have met the requirements and standards that were required at the time they were built to house the guns that were in service at that time. You will recall we showed you the Hamel gun. As I indicated, the first gun that was in service with the regiment when they moved into those facilities was the M2A2, which was a predecessor to the Hamel. It was about the same size, as the RSM mentioned this morning. You could see from those facilities that they were appropriately sized to meet it. They would have also met the appropriate codes and standards—construction requirements, life safety and all that sort of thing would have been met at the time they were built.

**Senator GALLACHER:** I might be wrong on this, but I think the range capability is generated along a barrel, so that has really rejigged the whole facilities. Is that right?

**Brig. Naumann:** I will ask Major Taylor to explain that.

**Major Taylor:** With increased range, there is a requirement for an increase in barrel length. To provide stability to the platform in firing, you need a wider base. You cannot just take the old gun system and put a longer barrel on it without creating substantial stability issues, and we do not want to modify someone else's design.

**Senator GALLACHER:** And the additional size has created the issue in all of the facilities?

**Major Taylor:** Correct.



**Senator BOYCE:** I want to follow up on options that were looked at. In every one of these facilities, I think, you have a suggested resource area of a minimum of 24 students learning about the tactical data system. Is that right?

**Brig. Naumann:** That is right, but it is not only learning about it; it is practising and exercising it. In order to maintain the capability, they have to be using this regularly. It is a very quickly eroded skill if it is not routinely exercised. You asked this morning about what artillery does when it is not out on the battlefield. Part of that is training—in fact, a substantial proportion of the time in the barracks is training.

**Senator BOYCE:** I was imagining you put them in the garage and left them there, but apparently that is not the case.

**Brig. Naumann:** No, we are not allowed to do that. We actually do need to ensure that we consistently put the soldiers through their paces with the equipment itself—the guns—and also the supporting computer systems. We are introducing that capability, so there will be an immediate increase in training requirement while we get everyone up to a certain level of standard of operating with that equipment, and then we will go into a maintenance phase, where we then maintain that standard through those facilities.

**Senator BOYCE:** I guess my question is: do you need to have that level of facility for training at every base? Or would it be possible for people to do a week every month or something at one central area? Was that an option that you looked at?

**Brig. Naumann:** That is a reasonable question to ask, and I will ask Major Taylor to talk about what the implications would be for a unit if we were to do that.

**Major Taylor:** The main implication for not taking the short-term view of building a facility is that we will spend, over the lifetime of this system, significantly more in travel and lost time due to travel for the guys from five of the locations around Australia in moving to a central point to conduct training. Also, because the software system is such a complex one to set up, the four main operational unit locations need to continually go through those procedures all of the time. So it is just not really effective to have it in a central location and people fall in on it on a one week a month basis.

**Senator BOYCE:** Once you have the system functioning, how much time would be spent in those labs by staff operating the guns?

**Major Taylor:** For the battle management system, it is expected that every week there will be at least four days when they will be operated for at least eight hours. We have operators and alternate operators, so we have lower level people and depending on how we want to exercise V echelons—

**Senator BOYCE:** So the people who use the guns are not necessarily the people who use the data?

**Major Taylor:** They are not using the AFATDS system; they are completely separate. We have specialist operators.

**Brig. Naumann:** Can I just clarify a point there. When Major Taylor talked about the lower level people we are talking about the lower level unit as opposed to higher headquarters. You would have noticed through the designs that we have got that we have individual training rooms within a complex. The idea of that is that we can have subunits of the regiment, so battery elements, in each of those rooms, along with the regimental headquarters in another room. They are separated physically so they are forced to use the system to communicate with each other, and that is how we exercise that communication function. That is the reason why we do not have just one central facility at each site—which is not the question you asked, but I think it goes further to explain what it is that we are proposing to do.

**Senator BOYCE:** Thank you.

**Mr FORREST:** Going back to the operational end of things, these guns are taken out and used somewhere. Where is the nearest artillery range to where most of the guns are, which is here at Enoggera? Where would they go for firing practice?

**Major Taylor:** We can use them at Wide Bay, but the normal location for the Brisbane based elements is Shoalwater Bay training area, near Rockhampton.

**Mr FORREST:** I am just wondering where you are going to get the 30 kilometres.

**Major Taylor:** The gun is capable of firing up to 30 kilometres and can fire to anything between three kilometres out to 30 kilometres, depending on the charge that is used. We do not have to exercise at the maximum range at any point in time; we can exercise at three, five, seven or nine kilometres and we can do that at most of the training areas around the country.

**Mr FORREST:** How will the troops get practice at long-range targeting?

**Major Taylor:** There is Woomera field training area. There are some elements in Shoalwater Bay where we can shoot extended ranges. There are also elements in Townsville field firing area where we can certainly shoot above 22 to 25 kilometres.

**Brig. Naumann:** And we have got Bradshaw Field Training Area up in the Northern Territory and, ultimately, Cultana in South Australia.

**Major Taylor:** So we can do full exercising of the capability at a number of locations, but we do not have to shoot to the maximum range all the time.

**Mr FORREST:** Okay.

**CHAIR:** When I asked before why you needed 35 of these I was not questioning that because that is what Defence has done, but the answer to that demonstrated some of the need for the facilities to support that. I just wanted to make it clear that it was in that context that I was putting that question.

**Brig. Naumann:** Did we provide what you were after there?

**CHAIR:** Yes, you did, thank you. Mr Forrest has some questions now about traffic.

**Mr FORREST:** One of the responsibilities of our committee is to make sure the public are not unhappy with the large expenditure of Commonwealth funding, and we have some unhappy neighbours out here at Enoggera. This has raised its head before at an inquiry—I forget which one it was—and we were ensured as a committee that certain things were going to be done to address the unhappiness of the local community. We have a submission and we will be hearing evidence shortly with regard to that and I am wondering what Defence's defence is for not adopting the Public Works Committee recommendation last time, which was to fix it. I remember at that stage it was something to do with alternative entrances, but when you consider the huge amount of capital investment that has occurred in Enoggera in the last three or four years—and it is phenomenal—I wonder what is happening. Yes, there is going to be some construction traffic and there is not much we can do about that, but we can certainly do something about local traffic and the addressing the reduced amenity that locals experience.

**Brig. Naumann:** We are well aware of our obligation to ensure that we maintain good relationships with our neighbours. That was made very clear to us by this committee during the enhanced Land Force Phase 2 hearing which was in Enoggera back two or three years ago. The recommendation that you refer to required us to consult with local and state government authorities to develop a solution to address a potential entrance to the barracks off Samford Road.

I can report to the committee that we have continued to engage with both state and local government on that issue and we have engaged on numerous occasions with them. We are working closely with the Department of Transport and Main Roads here in Queensland on the entire Samford Road traffic issue. The point that we made at the last hearing—which I would make again, if I could—is that the issue with that road is more than just Defence. That road is a significant arterial road for Brisbane. There is a large amount of traffic utilising that road coming in from the west of the city into the city and we are but one element using that road. We did studies back about 2008-9 in preparation for the stage 2 hearing, which showed that our traffic load on that road was no more than about five per cent at a maximum. I think that my predecessor, Brigadier Grice, might have said potentially up to 10 per cent, but that was the extent of our input onto the road.

**Senator BOYCE:** On Samford Road itself though—it is not Samford Road that is upsetting locals.

**Brig. Naumann:** No, that is right. I understand, but I just wanted to make the point that there is a significant issue on Samford Road that is more than just Defence. We could go out there and unilaterally put an entrance into the barracks off Samford Road. The problem that we have is the impact of doing that on the traffic on Samford Road on the congestion that is already there, and that is why we have not done it unilaterally. We have been working with the Department of Transport and Main Roads to try to come up with a solution that is going to work.

I am going to ask Mr Greenaway to talk a little bit about some of the engagement that we have had recently, because we are meeting regularly with the Department of Transport and Main Roads. They are in agreement, I believe, with what we are proposing to do. As you would have seen this morning as we left the barracks, they are already starting to undertake some works at that intersection in order to try to relieve the congestion which contributes to the concerns that are being raised, we understand, by the residents outside the gate.

**Mr FORREST:** Can you provide the committee with some sort of local traffic map or something that we can consider? It would confirm for me that you are seriously considering a solution.

**Major Taylor:** Are you after just—

**Mr FORREST:** I am a little bit unsure where the alternative entrance is to be relocated. I need a map to get my bearings on that and to see whether it addresses the concerns of the submission we have had complaining about the traffic.

**Brig. Naumann:** Sure. We will see whether we can find a site plan of the barracks and the surrounding roads that we can talk to. But perhaps while we are doing that, Martin, I will get you to talk about engagement with the Department of Transport and Main Roads.

**Mr Greenaway:** Mr Forrest, since we have begun constructing the works at Gallipoli Barracks, we have had reasonably frequent consultation with DTMR. Recently, in 2011, it has been on a fortnightly basis where we are engaging with them to understand the plans they have—

**Senator BOYCE:** How long have you been having those fortnightly meetings?

**Mr Greenaway:** I understand that it is since they have had approval to undertake the Samford Road-Wardell Street intersection upgrade.

**Senator BOYCE:** Is that a month, or six months?

**Mr Greenaway:** The fortnightly meetings have been ongoing for the past three months, and we have had contact prior to that point, but I believe they were unable to meet on that regular basis because they were still subject to their own internal approvals for the construction works of the Samford Road and Wardell Street intersection. In addition to consultation with DTMR, we have also now had two public consultations or open meetings where we have invited residents in the area to come to the guardhouse to learn about what we are doing and understand the works that we are doing, and also to communicate to us any issues they have had concerning the traffic issues around the barracks. We have done two letterbox drops that have preceded that to announce it. I will just try to find out from my colleague, if I may, when DTMR obtained approval to do their stage 2 works—correction, stage 1 works. It was 12 months ago.

**Senator BOYCE:** That is for the Samford Road-Wardell Street intersection?

**Mr Greenaway:** That is for the Samford Road-Wardell Street intersection. Our view has always been to ensure that the Samford Road entrance into Gallipoli Barracks has been part of that design review that they have undertaken and that they are aware of the Samford Road entrance, so we have also been represented to ensure that what they are doing and what we plan to do are in concert with each other in terms of broad intent. What we do not want to do is frustrate their traffic design. We want to make sure that our proposals link in harmoniously, from a traffic design perspective, with theirs.

**Brig. Naumann:** We have a brochure—it is in your pack—that has been produced by the Department of Transport and Main Roads. It talks about the work that they are proposing for that intersection. The point that I would like to make here, just while Martin is pulling that brochure out—we can then table that brochure so that we can talk to it, Mr Forrest—

**Mr FORREST:** I am surprised, Brigadier, that you are not prepared for this. This is in public. I am surprised you are not prepared to brief the committee better than you are doing now.

**Brig. Naumann:** I guess we were prepared to talk to you about the issue. I was not expecting to need to table a diagram. It is just that we are trying to find that diagram. That is what has caused us to look a little bit as if we are not joined up.

**Mr FORREST:** It must be nearly three years. How long does it take? In fact, our recommendation approved that Defence spend the money—whatever capital was needed—to make it easier for the council.

**Brig. Naumann:** That is right.

**Mr FORREST:** I am just a bit annoyed that it has taken this long and there are still unhappy people around.

**Brig. Naumann:** All I can tell you is that it is not something that we are ignoring, but what we need to do is ensure that whatever we do does not exacerbate the issue further. That has been the issue that has held us up from doing anything yet. What we are trying to do is do some initial works that will allow some relief to the local community residents, and we have plans to do some work on the road that runs into the front of our barracks, Lloyd Street. We have some plans to do some work on the Lloyd Street and Wardell Street intersection, which will free up some of the congestion that we have there.

**Senator BOYCE:** What are they, and when are they supposed to start?

**Brig. Naumann:** That is not due to start for about another 12 months, but the reason for that is that we need to link it in with what the Department of Transport and Main Roads are doing at the Wardell-Samford Road

intersection. The thing that is causing the choke point in that area is the Samford-Wardell intersection. So somehow—

**Senator BOYCE:** But there is nothing actually being done there apart from a great big billboard thanking all the Labor members—and even Labor candidates, you will be pleased to hear, Mr Forrest, have a great congratulatory billboard up over the intersection, where no work has actually happened yet.

**Brig. Naumann:** They actually have started doing some work in terms of building a slip lane for left turns out of Wardell Street into Samford Road at the shops there, at the intersection. That will take some of the traffic off the northbound lanes on Wardell Street where it crosses Samford Road. There is work being done there right now to create a slip lane such that traffic will flow that little bit more smoothly. The piece of work that will have the most impact, though, is the next stage of works that the Department of Transport and Main Roads is preparing to undertake: broadening Samford Road and Wardell Street to ensure that it can create turn lanes so that turning traffic is not holding up through traffic. The problem at the moment is that turning traffic is holding up through traffic, so it needs to separate that traffic somehow. Those plans are in place and are underway. We in the barracks have issued directives to our people to ensure that when they leave the base they do not do what is called the rat run through Ardentallen Street, Norman Terrace and another street whose name I have forgotten.

**Senator BOYCE:** Do you police that at all?

**Brig. Naumann:** We cannot police that, because it is outside the barracks. It is not on Defence land.

**Senator BOYCE:** Sorry, perhaps monitor is the word I meant; do you monitor it and speak, perhaps, severely to people who do not observe it?

**Brig. Naumann:** Yes, we do monitor it. There are two elements that are affecting this: the base population and the construction workforce for the large amount of construction that is going on at the barracks right now. In terms of the base population, the brigade commander and the base support manager at Enoggera have issued a directive to staff that they are not to turn left through those streets in exit from the barracks.

**CHAIR:** Then you have a lot of control over that.

**Brig. Naumann:** Unfortunately, we do not have a lot of control over what people do once they leave the barracks. I do not want to sound like I am duck shoving responsibility here, but that is a matter for the Queensland police, it is not something we can police. We can monitor, but we cannot take any punitive action against people. All we can do is issue a direction that that is what they have to do. In terms of the construction workforce, the managing contractor, John Holland, has a construction traffic management plan that requires construction traffic to use certain designated routes when they access and egress the barracks. We do have the ability to take punitive measures against defaulters there and we have in fact done so where it has been brought to our attention that subcontractors or workforce members have acted inappropriately or have not acted in accordance with that traffic management plan. In those cases we have actually taken action to exclude them from the site. Again, those are the measures we have in place. We are doing everything we can. We believe that until the congestion of the Samford Road-Wardell Street intersection is resolved it will not matter what we do; it will not have the impact. We believe there may be an impression that if we just move the barracks entry onto Samford Road it will solve everything. It might address the local issues right outside our gate but it will just push the problem further upstream in the network, because it will disrupt the flow of traffic along Samford Road.

**Mr FORREST:** Can you estimate how long it is going to take to get this resolved? I know that is something of how long is a piece of string.

**Brig. Naumann:** We are very keen to see it resolved, but it is outside our control. We have worked actively with the Department of Transport and Main Roads. It is now fully engaged in this and it has issued a plan, the brochure, which Mr Greenway has now found—we can table that if you like—which talks about what the department is proposing to do. We think that will go a long way to resolving this issue, but will it be a complete solution? We do not know yet. The other thing we are doing is to work with our managing contractor and also with base staff to get a determination of the point of destination of traffic coming in and going out of the barracks to see whether there is anything else we can do to try to fix that problem, such as the utilisation of other gates in the barracks to try to minimise the matter traffic that goes out through the Lloyd Street gate and transfer some of that volume of traffic to the other gates around the barracks.

I would add one more point. In the traffic management plan with the construction contractor we are trying to dislocate the time of arrival and departure of the construction workforce from the base workforce. So what we have done is smoothed out what would otherwise be a significant peak of traffic coming in and out of the barracks. Again, with regard to our ability to control that, yes, we control that for our construction workforce and we can control it for our military and civilian workforces in terms of hours. But ultimately, again, there is a limit

to what we can do. Also, the brigade has instituted staggered unit departure times, so the units have different knock-off times, if you will, to again try and minimise that peak of traffic that goes through the local road network.

**Senator BOYCE:** Brigadier Naumann, you mentioned a couple of community consultations that were held. Would you be able to, on notice, tell us how they were advertised, when they were advertised, when they were held and how many attendees you had, please.

**Brig. Naumann:** We are able to provide you with that information right now, if you would like it.

**Senator BOYCE:** Are we in a hurry, Chair?

**CHAIR:** It might be better if you follow up with that information on notice, Brigadier, in terms of the time.

**Mr FORREST:** I have not finished, yet, Chair.

**CHAIR:** No, I know. Mr Forrest.

**Mr FORREST:** I have just read a media statement that this has been an issue for 13 years. How is Defence going to feel if I can persuade the committee here to not approve the project that this hearing is about until this problem has been fixed? If you fix this problem, then we will tick off on the next project—because that is what happened last time and it did not get fixed. We need to put a bit of pressure on somebody to get this problem fixed.

**Brig. Naumann:** Mr Forrest, the committee can make the recommendations that you feel you need to make, but I would make the claim that there is only so much that I can influence. I can influence what Defence does; I cannot influence what the Queensland state government or the Brisbane council does, and we are beholden to their program in order for us to then do what we need to do.

**Mr FORREST:** Okay. We have approved the submission from the objectors so that you can have a read of it. We will hear evidence from them later, so we will probably ask you to come back after you have had a chance to look through it.

**CHAIR:** Are there any other questions from members of the committee? Senator Gallacher and then Senator Boyce.

**Senator GALLACHER:** It is more out of curiosity than anything else. I have just read that the Canadians and the Americans are the other owners of these guns and they have actually had them in combat. Have there been any shortcomings in those deployments?

**Major Taylor:** No, there have not been any major shortcomings. There has been equipment damage, as will happen, but there have not been any major shortcomings in that equipment.

**Senator GALLACHER:** So the housing that we are approving now is for the best guns available in the world?

**Major Taylor:** This is the most advanced 155-millimetre gun system, in a towed configuration, in the world.

**Senator GALLACHER:** Excellent.

**Mr FORREST:** How do they perform in sandy-desert countries because—

**Major Taylor:** From all reports, extremely well.

**Mr FORREST:** I would want to see them practised out in Afghanistan.

**Major Taylor:** So would I. The weapons system performs extremely well in Afghanistan. The United States have used it over there, significantly. The Canadian armed forces have used that weapons system in Afghanistan. There are additional maintenance requirements as a result of that environment; but, outside of those specific maintenance environments, those gun systems perform extremely well.

**CHAIR:** That is good to hear, thank you. Senator Boyce.

**Senator BOYCE:** I have two brief questions. Firstly, you have noted in your submission that you expect the work to have 'a positive economic impact' on small and medium enterprises near the bases that are being affected, and that was also mentioned yesterday when we were down at HMAS *Albatross*. How do you measure that impact?

**Brig. Naumann:** What we can do, as we undertake our contracting, is record where those contractors and subcontractors are based. We often do do that around our projects because it is information that is of use to us, to understand how much of an impact we are having on local communities. Here in Brisbane we expect that the workforce will be almost entirely local because the Brisbane market is such that it would have available to it pretty much all the skills that we would expect to need to employ. Whether that will be the case at the other sites

will depend on what else is going on in those locations at the time that we are there. Again, though, we would be looking at trying to encourage local employment as much as possible.

**Senator BOYCE:** My question was more general. I am pleased that you are encouraging that, but my question is: how do you know whether or not your encouragement has worked?

**Brig. Naumann:** That is when we get that measure of how many are actually engaged. But, as we said yesterday, we need to run that competitive process, so we cannot show favour.

**Senator BOYCE:** Perhaps on notice—I gather you are giving us a briefing early in the new year—that might be something you could tell us about how it went or how it is going or something. That would be appropriate.

**Brig. Naumann:** I can give you an update.

**Senator BOYCE:** That would be appreciated.

**Brig. Naumann:** But we might not be in procurement at that point.

**Senator BOYCE:** I am not talking about it for this project; it is for every project, really.

**Brig. Naumann:** I guess what I am saying is that we certainly will not be in procurement for this project at that time.

**CHAIR:** You would not be at that stage to report at that time.

**Brig. Naumann:** No, so perhaps a little later.

**Senator BOYCE:** Just for the sake of completeness, are there any environmental issues which arise or arose out of these miniprojects—I suppose that is the way to describe the whole lot of them?

**Brig. Naumann:** Mr Trinder can talk to that.

**Mr Trinder:** We have undertaken environmental impact assessments of the works package that has been brought to the Public Works Committee at this hearing, and we have not been able to identify any significant impacts associated with the works that are being undertaken.

**Senator BOYCE:** They are very disparate sites, aren't they?

**Mr Trinder:** They are very disparate sites. They are mostly either on brownfields sites where we have previously had buildings or modifications to buildings that we already have. The new facilities are on hardened areas, so we have not identified any significant impacts of any of the work that has been proposed.

**Senator BOYCE:** Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. I have no further questions for now. I propose to call another witness, Mary Harbeck. I just ask you not to be excused yet as witnesses but just to stand down.

**HARBECK, Mrs Mary, Private capacity**

[13:47]

**CHAIR:** Welcome. Do you have anything to say about the capacity in which you appear?

**Mrs Harbeck:** I am a local resident living on Ardentallen Road, in close proximity to Gallipoli Barracks. The reason I am here is that I have put in a submission regarding traffic concerns with the new project.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I will just advise you 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 contempt of parliament. Before I ask you to make some introductory remarks, would you like to say who is with you here today? Obviously they told me they were residents as well.

**Mrs Harbeck:** To my right is my husband, Chris Harbeck.

**CHAIR:** Good support!

**Mrs Harbeck:** To my left is Mrs Ruth Ralph. She is one of my neighbours. To my far left is Mrs Glenys Grayson, and she is another one of my neighbours. We all reside on Ardentallen Road.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. We have received your submission, and the committee has accepted your submission. Would you like to speak to what you said to us? Please make some remarks, and then we might have some questions as well.

**Mrs Harbeck:** You already know I live on Ardentallen Road in Enoggera. That is the residential area in close proximity to Gallipoli Barracks. Firstly, I am pleased, Mr Forrest, that you said that Defence have not met recommendation 7 regarding the ELF 2 project.

**CHAIR:** We have a map. I was just showing Mr Forrest your street. It is on our iPad.

**Mrs Harbeck:** I would just like to state too, commenting on Defence's fortnightly meeting with DTMR, that that has occurred only after a considerable amount of lobbying by local residents for Defence to comply with recommendation 7. I lodged a submission with the PWC voicing concern over the LAND 17 phase 1A project because of already existing unresolved traffic issues connected to the current ELF 2 project at Gallipoli Barracks. Prior to the ELF 2 project, traffic was identified as an issue. Defence was to address these issues in two stated ways: one, a new entrance or exit to Gallipoli Barracks on Samford Road and, two, traffic management to minimise disruption to local residents, which would include defence and construction using main roads only to access Gallipoli Barracks, also in compliance with 'local traffic only' signage.

To date, two years later, for whatever reason, there is no new entry or exit on Samford Road, and it should be evident by the information provided in my submission, including the accompanying photographs, that traffic management has been and remains ineffective. Not only are our roads congested but residents also contend with daily unsafe practices on our street in the form of illegal left turns executed by defence, construction and others leaving Gallipoli Barracks. There are some statistics in relation to witnessed and reported illegal left turns into Ardentallen Road from Lloyd Street. I did not actually provide them in my submission, but just bear with me and I will give you some numbers.

On 5 April this year, 38 vehicles turned left illegally between 2:16 pm and 3 pm. That was 38 in 44 minutes. On the next day, 6 April 2011, 122 vehicles turned left illegally between 10:30 am and 3:30 pm. That works out to be 24 per hour. Eight months later, on 2 December 2011, 23 vehicles turned left illegally between 1:56 pm and 3:07 pm. That is twenty-three in over an hour. On 5 December, eight vehicles turned left illegally between 11:52 am and 12:07 pm—eight in just 15 minutes. Later on that same day, 5 December, 17 vehicles turned left illegally between 1:56 pm and 2:29 pm—17 in 33 minutes. Registration numbers were provided to Gallipoli Barracks, John Holland construction and Policelink and therefore can be verified, and we have some video footage. Hundreds of vehicles have been reported over the last eight months or so. Clearly, traffic management by Defence is ineffective.

Defence's submission regarding the LAND 17 1A project does not identify traffic as a problem. Clearly, for local residents the opposite is true. In my submission you would note that on 7 November I contacted by email the relevant person regarding project information concerning traffic. The response received on 24 November read in part: 'Construction traffic will enter and exit the base using Lloyd Street as the main access to Gallipoli Barracks. Construction personnel accessing the base are informed of the concerns of local residents regarding traffic using residential streets. Construction traffic should use Lloyd Street to Wardell Street to access Samford Road.' My reply on the 30th, after acknowledging the response, was as follows: 'Construction workers, defence personnel and others associated with Gallipoli Barracks, especially those connected to the ELF 2 project, routinely ignore

the recommendation to use main roads to enter and exit the barracks. There is already noncompliance to street signage of 'local traffic only' and 'no left turn' into the three side streets that run off Lloyd Street. How do you propose to ensure compliance?' To date, I have not had a reply.

This information and submission provide only a snippet of the traffic problems identified on our suburban street. Clearly, any further projects that do not address this already serious issue would impact further on the safety and wellbeing of local residents. Defence would do well to investigate other options of accessing the barracks.

A few of my neighbours send their apologies for their inability to attend today's public hearing. However, they would still like to voice their concerns regarding this project and have done so in the form of brief letters, of which I have seven to either read or submit to you.

**CHAIR:** We can take receipt of them. You will not have to read them onto the record, Mrs Harbeck. Have you finished your comments?

**Mrs Harbeck:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Do you also liaise with the department? Is it the Department of Transport and Main Roads? I still call them DMR.

**Mrs Harbeck:** We have of late because of the upgrade, and we have certainly voiced concern about the rat-running not just by Defence and construction staff. We get some rat-running from the Ashgrove area as well. So, in part, we have to a certain extent. We have contributed some feedback regarding the upgrade of Samford Road and Wardell Street.

**CHAIR:** Have they responded in a way that shows they are treating the issues that you raise as a problem?

**Mrs Harbeck:** Not as we would like. I did state in my submission that, as a group of residents, we submitted a petition. The feedback was that it was denied. However, I spoke with our state representative, Kate Jones, yesterday and my understanding is that she and Craig Wallace are putting together a submission to assist with some changes to our street. So that may be helpful. It will be great if it goes ahead but it does not address the issues that we have at the moment.

**CHAIR:** Does this take up a lot of your time?

**Mrs Harbeck:** Absolutely.

**CHAIR:** It sounds as though it does, just from what you are saying.

**Senator BOYCE:** It is very thorough research.

**CHAIR:** Yes.

**Mr FORREST:** Good on you, Mary. We will see if we can help you. In your submission you provide a lot of photographs and you have also put on the public record some incidents with dates. You can take this question on notice. Is it possible that you have something comprehensive that you can give to the committee that gives us specific dates—for example, the photographs you have provided of congestion and trucks?

**Mrs Harbeck:** Obviously I can provide some information regarding the dates. Those initial ones were on 6 April 2011. With the congestion on Lloyd Street, that was taken on 6 April from both ends of Lloyd Street, facing the barracks and heading towards Wardell Street. As to the photos of the personnel on our street, I could not tell you what date that was but it was after April and was taken one morning. The last one, once again of Lloyd Street, was taken only about a week or so ago.

**Mr FORREST:** It is possible that some of them have no connection at all with Defence's site there, so we need to be fair about that. I do not even have a decent map to refer to.

**Mrs Harbeck:** Which one in particular are you referring to?

**Senator BOYCE:** We refer to the photos in your submission; perhaps if you could go back and put a date and time and place on each one of them where you can.

**Mrs Harbeck:** Yes. As I say, the initial ones on Lloyd Street were taken on 6 April and that was the traffic heading from the barracks.

**Mr FORREST:** Where the hell is Lloyd Street? I do not even have a map so I cannot get a grasp on how we can help with a solution unless I know where you are.

**Mrs Harbeck:** Lloyd Street is the main entrance into Gallipoli Barracks.



**Mr FORREST:** You have also made reference to frequent police interventions and representations that have been made to what I think are state members of parliament. It would be nice to have a bit of a chronology about that so that we can maximise the benefit we can give to the community.

**Mrs Harbeck:** Had I known that—I have a file at home with correspondence between me and federal member Teresa Gambaro, correspondence with our local member Andrew Wines and certainly correspondence with Kate Jones. There is a lot of correspondence to and fro acknowledging that we have issues. Teresa Gambaro did a letter drop stating that she had spoken to or contacted Brigadier McLachlan. We had been assured that these issues would not continue. I do not know where to start and where to stop. I have volumes of information.

**Mr FORREST:** You have heard Brigadier Naumann's response to my earlier questions. In fairness to him, he is probably as frustrated as you are. What can you recommend we do to get whoever is responsible—the Brisbane City Council or the Queensland government—to take whatever actions are needed for the longer term solution so we can be satisfied that anything we value-add to that does not exacerbate the problem of residents. In fact, you have introduced me to the term 'rat run'. I never knew what 'rat run' was. I finally figured that one out. People are obviously sneaking through, dodging the toll or dodging the blue van or something that you are blaming Defence for.

**Mrs Harbeck:** In those numbers in the statistics that I just read out—and once again I can provide you with reams and reams of registration numbers with a description—

**Senator BOYCE:** Did you say there was a video of that?

**Mrs Harbeck:** There is just recently—

**Senator BOYCE:** Who made that?

**Mrs Harbeck:** My husband. A number of residents on our street have photographs and video recordings of inappropriate behaviour. Some of them are clearly Defence. Some of them, while they are not in uniform—

**Senator BOYCE:** Have haircuts—

**Mrs Harbeck:** And muscles. Certainly some are construction, but there are civilians on the base as well, and certainly their behaviour can be inappropriate too. The disappointing part about this is that the streets are signed 'no left turn' and have been, for over 10 years. It is not rocket science.

**Senator BOYCE:** I suppose the other issue there is that, to be coming from such a direction that you are turning left into Ardentallen Road, there are about 20 houses that might do that, except for the base.

**Mrs Harbeck:** There are no houses that would do that. If you are coming from the top of Lloyd Street and you are wanting to turn left into Ardentallen Road—

**Senator BOYCE:** You have to have come out of the barracks from across the other side of Lloyd?

**Mrs Harbeck:** No. The barracks is the top end. The initial street is Norman Terrace. There is a set of units there. Across the road there is one house, then another house. That is not residential. There is a couple working from there. And then that is our street. While it is possible that some would come down Norman Terrace and turn left into Lloyd Street and turn left into Ardentallen Road, it is not likely that that would be the scenario.

**Senator BOYCE:** But they are about the only people who could, other than the barracks.

**Mrs Harbeck:** Yes. Realistically, while it is possible it is not likely.

**Senator BOYCE:** There are not many that would do that. You mentioned that you provided all these number plates, et cetera, to the police. What did the police do?

**Mrs Harbeck:** The police are great. I have a reference number, and I will happily give that to you so you can check. They then will come out and investigate, and they will police the area for a given time frame. Once that time frame is completed, they are finished.

**Senator BOYCE:** Presumably there should be a lot of incidents where they fine people for turning left.

**Mrs Harbeck:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Mrs Harbeck, I am going to finish now and finish the public part of the hearing. It sounds to me like you are all going around in circles—

**Mrs Harbeck:** Absolutely.

**CHAIR:** with a problem that may be an increasing problem. I do not understand the dimensions of it. I know in your submission you refer to a recommendation that the public works committee gave before, and you said today that it had not been not been complied with. For the record, I need to say that the public works committee does not have enforcement power, and I think you understand that but you want to try every avenue you can. We

can use persuasive power, and obviously this is the second time this issue has come up before the committee, and—

**Senator BOYCE:** And there was an election coming up, Chair.

**CHAIR:** It is not about an election, it is about helping residents. I would like to be in a position to help, so we will turn our mind to it and think about it in our deliberations. I wanted to make sure that you did get a public hearing and an airing about the issues. That is why we have questioned the Defence witnesses through Brigadier Naumann and yourself. As a committee we will give it some more thought. If there is any other information that you want to provide, that would be fine, and we will take receipt of those seven letters you have as well.

**Mrs Harbeck:** My apologies if I have not adhered to any protocol as far as this hearing is concerned.

**CHAIR:** Please do not apologise. It is absolutely fine. The Public Works Committee has a particular role to play and, as the issues arise with people in the community who are concerned about something, we will endeavour to listen to those concerns, hear what you say, and assist where we can. There is only so much that we can do in our role, but we are interested. That is why we are here.

**Mrs Harbeck:** While we have issues with traffic, we appreciate that it is actually quite difficult for those exiting the barracks to get out onto Wardell Street via Lloyd Street. We certainly do have that appreciation. But, having said that, once again it is in Defence's best interest then to provide other ways to exit and access the barracks. There are other gates. I do not know whether that is an option or not, but certainly those sorts of things could be considered to perhaps spread out the traffic and allow easier access for the guys on the base.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Mrs Harbeck, and I thank the neighbours and your husband for being here with you. Brigadier Naumann, as the leading Defence witness, do you want to come back and say anything in terms of traffic?

**NAUMANN, Brigadier Darren, Director-General, Infrastructure Asset Development, Department of Defence**

[14:07]

**Brig. Naumann:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Firstly, just for the record, I would like to say that we appreciate Mrs Harbeck and her colleagues coming to the table and expressing these concerns. As I indicated earlier, we are very conscious of our role in the community and we are very conscious of our impact in the community and we want to do everything we can to ensure that, firstly, we understand community concerns about their relationship with us and then, secondly, do what we can to address those concerns.

We exercise that through regular community consultation meetings. They do not happen too regularly, however there is, I think, the six-monthly engagement where we are talking to the community and there are a number of informal occasions when staff from the barracks approach the community and talk to them about particular concerns and issues. So for the record, I would like to ask you to note that we are certainly well aware of the concerns and we are doing everything we can, we believe, to address those concerns.

I would like to reaffirm just a couple of points that I made earlier, if I may. From our understanding, the issue is created by the congestion in the Samford Road, Wardell Road and Lloyd Street intersection area. We acknowledge that there may well be traffic out of the barracks that does not comply with the traffic regulations outside the barracks, and I have already spoken to you about the measures we have put in place in order to attempt to manage that. Clearly, we need to see what we can do to better influence the behaviour of those people who are offending. However ultimately the enforcement of those road restrictions outside the gate are a matter for the Queensland Police. It is not something that we can directly enforce. We are aware that it is not only barracks personnel that do that rat-running through those streets; it is also traffic coming from the south up the Wardell Road corridor, again, in order to avoid that congestion around Samford Road.

**Senator BOYCE:** That applies, because when we asked about turning left out of Lloyd and not right—

**Brig. Naumann:** We are aware that that is an issue. I am not trying to pass the blame here at all. I acknowledge that Defence is a contributor, but the point I would make is that we are not the only cause of this problem. I acknowledge your point, Mr Forrest. I can understand the committee's frustration that this is something that was addressed three years ago by this committee and there was a recommendation that we work with the state and local government in order to try and come up with a plan to deal with this. All I can do is assure the committee that we have in fact been doing that. Immediately following that hearing, we met with the Department of Transport and Main Roads. We then met on a monthly basis with them and in fact recently those meetings have been on a fortnightly basis. We are at a point now where we believe Transport and Main Roads have approval to go forward with certain works, but I have also been informed that the status of that decision may change pending what happens with the forthcoming Queensland elections. Again, that is something that is well outside of my ability to influence.

**CHAIR:** But it sounds as though they should stay engaged in this issue. Some management of it would be helpful, just from what I have heard—without hearing from them.

**Brig. Naumann:** We would certainly welcome that. We are willing to do what we need to in order to further engage with the community as necessary to understand what their concerns are. We are more than happy to talk with community members about what we might do to better understand their concerns.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. Being conscious of the time, I would like to thank all the witnesses today—yourselves and Mrs Harbeck—for being here and providing evidence.

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

That this committee authorises publication of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

*Evidence was then taken in camera—*

**Committee adjourned at 14:32**