CHAIR (Mr Wing) - I declare the meeting open and welcome everybody in attendance. I would like to take the opportunity of confirming our appreciation as a committee to Commissioner McCreadie and to everybody involved with the helpful inspection that we made and, for the record, to confirm our appreciation for the hospitality that we have received, which we appreciate very much. Thank you.

Mr McCreadie - Could I thank the committee - through you, Mr Chair - for taking the time to come and to be part of the facilitated tour of the academy. As I mentioned, the academy has served us brilliantly for 26 or 27 years but the time has arrived that if there's not some expenditure to bring it back up to a satisfactory standard then things can only get worse.

So having said that, that is as much as I want to say from my perspective and the department's perspective may I introduce Mr Ian Latham, who really has had the management and running of the project internally for the department. I'll ask Ian to brief you on the need and the justification for the expenditure.

Mr Latham - The academy first opened in 1976 and the major function at that point in time was to undertake the recruit training for police cadets who were coming through the system at that point in time. As the academy progressed the facility became involved more and more in the development and delivery of in-service training courses for our own police staff. That involved courses for promotion and specialist courses such as search and rescue, CIB investigation et cetera. A bonus for us was that community groups commenced to use the facilities here, especially the gymnasium side of it. The Police, Citizens and Youth Club was developed; groups from the outlying areas used it as well. There's a child care-centre which operates in the gymnasium now four days a week. The auditorium has become popular with school groups and through these activities this has allowed the police department to develop community relationships and that has been very beneficial to the department in being able to gain the confidence of people out in the community.

The building is some 26 years old now and during that period of time the only maintenance carried out on the building has basically been statutory maintenance and
emergency maintenance on the building. We have not been in a position to spend significant funds to upgrade the building through those years.

We have now come to a situation where the building itself is starting to show its age. Many of the furnishings, the carpet, curtains, drapes et cetera are the original ones which were installed back in 1976. It has lasted very well but as you can see through your walk around it is now starting to show the signs of age in all areas - the accommodation block, classroom block et cetera.

Also, the profile of the recruiting within the department has changed significantly. In 1976 when the academy was first opened the profile of cadets coming into the academy was basically young male adults and the academy was basically built for that purpose, as you've seen with the communal showers, toilets and small bedrooms.

The profile has now changed. We have people applying to join the police force from the age of 18 through into the mid-forties. We have mothers applying to come into the police force, single parents and a diverse range of ethnic backgrounds also apply to join the police service.

It's felt that the standard and type of accommodation which we offer is not really suitable for today's environment. People expect a little more in the way of home comforts when they come to live here. The course is some 32 weeks that they're on site for and we consider that there is a need to upgrade facilities, especially in the accommodation area to provide for en suite accommodation to make the 32-week stay more accommodating for those students on site. As I said, the age of the building has lead to many of the surfaces becoming degradated; carpets, curtain finishes, paintwork et cetera is all starting to show its age.

In addition, with the advent of legislation in respect to disability, occupational health and safety, many of the features through the academy do not comply these days with those regulations. We do not have appropriate disability access through the various floors. To gain access into this accommodation block, for example, to come down here we don't have any access for disabled persons to gain access to this floor. Similarly with the accommodation area, we don't have suitable disability access.

The building code standards, as Mr Catherall pointed out earlier in the day, fire hose reels in particular do not comply with current standards. So the building is also becoming outdated in complying with various standards.

Also, the community groups are becoming more prevalent. Over the years the department has developed relationships with Neighbourhood Watch, Bush Watch and a series of other community groups. These people often use the academy for seminars, conferences et cetera and we need a facility which reflects the degree of professionalism that is within the Police Department. They are the main reasons and the need as to why we have applied to government for an upgrade of the academy.

Mr McCREADIE - Could I just emphasise the importance and the need for training itself. There was a thought at one stage that perhaps the academy could go and that all police training could be university based. Well, I mentioned over lunchtime that we now have a very strong partnership with the university but a big percentage of the training is
vocational training - and that's firearms training, self-defence, all those sorts of things - for it to be carried at the university as opposed to this academy it would simply require a huge shift of police staff because the expertise isn't within the university within the academic sphere.

If you reflect on our history, I say unashamedly that this is the service that is most free of corruption right around Australia and it is the best performed service. If you look back, I think that you could say very comfortably that the very wise decision to build 25 years ahead of most other services a purpose-built academy to facilitate and to underpin police activities was a very wise decision.

I mentioned before - and Port Arthur has been and gone - the response to Port Arthur was second to none and if ever I had a fear it was that this was like a training exercise and then I thought, 'Relax, that's what you've trained for'. I think the response that was mounted for that would be a justification for any money that's ever been spent on training and over the years we've resisted in tough times. Of course it's always very tempting to downsize your training and so forth and we've resisted that at all costs.

So I simply say that there are two aspects to this. One, the time has well and truly arrived that as a utility it needs to be picked up but the need for training in all its aspects - and there will be even more detailed training to come, particularly in cyber crime and computer fraud and so forth - that it just becomes absolutely more important that this facility is of a standard to facilitate that over the period.

That's from a service point of view and I thought that perhaps I ought to make that point, Mr Chairman.

CHAIR - Thanks very, Mr Commissioner. I haven't consulted with my colleagues but I'm sure we would all endorse the view that we are very fortunate to have the high standard police force that we have in Tasmania. And I think that's the view of the community as well.

Mr LATHAM - If I may add one comment on that training perspective. Many of our courses now are not only directed at police officers themselves but we undertake training in domestic violence, crime prevention, drug education prevention, which not only offers training to our own people but people in a range of other government departments such as Education, Community Services - so the training aspect is more than just our own agency these days.

Mr McCREADIE - And for the record, importantly, we are now training Corrective Services as well to bring their command of control up because it was better for us to build that side of it than to chase them round when things weren't right. So at the moment within the last sergeants' course there were three members from Corrective Services. In our officers' course we invariably have two or three. I think that will serve the community. I think that's indicative of the sort of community benefit that flows: in addition to having a very professional police service that there are a whole range of people who've enjoyed the benefit of this academy and the training that it offers within the professional environment.

Mr CATHERALL - What's on the agenda?
CHAIR - Well, there is no particular - so just a list of names of people who would be giving evidence, but it's for you all to work out in what order.

Mr CATHERALL - Do we want to quickly describe the work?

Mr McCREADIE - I think you ought to. Leading off with perhaps the point that whilst you've had a look around and we've seen that there are some significant problems and this will go a long way to rectifying, we've taken the minimalist approach in terms of only really doing what's necessary to bring it back up to a satisfactory speed. There's no opulence in this everything that's going to be done is utilising anything that's still got some utility and then moving on to newer things within that context. I think that it is a very thoughtful and considerate program within that context but maybe you ought to take it on from there about how you've approached it and where we've arrived at this situation.

Mrs NAPIER - Through you, Mr Chairman - I'd be interested in the priority that have been established. You have four category priorities and I note that some of that which was listed in category four is actually being brought forward - $71,000 for the roof of the gym - and I just wondered has there also been a business case established that might look at increasing the utilisation of the centre or what capacity is there for increased utilisation of the centre by outside groups that might otherwise also bring in some money to argue for being able to get the extra $281,000 that's budgeted for stage four, or even to argue for better providing for maintenance into the future. I guess they're a couple of things that are on my mind.

Mr McCREADIE - Okay, I made the point, I think, on the way through - and I'll take the first running - that we have at all times encouraged and on an average year there are about 1,500 members of the community come through the academy and are exposed to some sort of visitation and/or training - most of them training. We even in the time that I was here as superintendent - which is some 12 years ago - we made the active decision to solicit and encourage the spending of government moneys here on training because we basically have the facility and we developed the top room on the accommodation block - that conference room up there - because we were commonly told that the hard-backed chairs and the classroom-type things were not the sort of facility that people within government wanted for training, so we developed that as an interim step. But we've long had a desire to extend our capacity. There are tens of thousands of dollars spent on a monthly basis, I suggest, with various forms of training. Here they've got all of the facilities they need, it's convenient to town, they don't need to travel distances but indeed in the absence of being able to offer en-suite accommodation people simply wouldn't come.

So we really believe that if we have upgrade of the classroom facilities and an upgrade of the accommodation that there will be a fairly strong ability to build on a significant base of people who are exposed to training and to capture and recycle some of the government money within the training environment so that they don't need to be all over the State spending much more.

We have to be careful of the competition policy because we, like everybody else, are not to be undercutting and so forth but I'm very confident, based on our experience just with
that room up there and the people who were prepared to use that and the other people who come in for training, that with those added facilities we will do a whole lot better in encouraging government training and realising some financial benefits to offset that.

CHAIR - I think at this stage it would be helpful if we could just have for the record an explanation of what is being done, then we can raise these other matters by question.

Mr CATHERRALL - The process really began with SEMF as a facilities maintenance contract to Police. One of the buildings in that portfolio are the academy buildings, so amongst all the information that we have on the place of various condition audit reports that go back four years, the first one has come through and looked at services issues where things are no longer working or need repair or statutory maintenance requirements as well. In walking around, people would have also been listing down major detrimental problems with the building fabric - for example, the roof leaks that we've spoken about.

Building on that, nearly 12 months ago we were asked the question what works need to be done to the academy to bring them up to modern day standard. That has then been the commencing point for this study, including management of this facility as well, as Ian's input reviewed what options there were and the direction that the police training is taking as well, so that we could respond to the needs perceived for the next 15 years or so.

Mr CATHERRALL - Out of those investigations we produced an earlier report which we'd not really had sufficient involvement perhaps with the Commissioner and that level to be able to prioritise the projects that in our mind we thought should be taken forward. So we took the approach that we put the whole lot forward for the Commissioner's review on the basis that we've walked around listing ideas more than anything that we could do this, we could do that. But it then required that we actually sit down together as a group and prioritise those works that we felt were going to have the greatest impact upon being able to train police.

In all our decisions most of the things that you'd have heard today already - an example would be the toilet facilities in the gymnasium where we've actually thought how much benefit is that in training the police recruits and so we've shied away. That's how the priorities have been established, in terms of what has the most benefit for teaching purposes. That gets difficult when you then sort of start weighing up the access disability discrimination-type issues as well have come into that.

The other issue is compliance with the building codes. That's an easier issue in that if you do nothing to the building there's no obligation to bring them up to standard in some cases but, as soon as we start doing work in some areas, we have to start considering where that line kind of lays in terms of getting the building of your fire hose reels, fire doors, other fire separation issues and things brought up to standard as well. They go back and this year one, two, three, four has allowed us to move those budgets around.

The last one, I think, there's a couple down in the very bottom list where the numbers have been changed. They've been changed in response to budget considerations and having a budget of $1.6 million in the first year; $536 000 in the subsequent year - like that issue we were talking about with the accommodation block and being able to progress. Cash flow-wise we couldn't get all of the work done in the accommodation block in the first year so we've been able to plan a way of getting the majority of that
done; wait for the third year to complete that work but then bring forward some of the other things that do fit within the financial plan.

CHAIR - So would you care to outline the plan - you don't need to go into it in precise detail but just an overall description.

Mr CATHERRALL - Really, year one involves bringing up to date the accommodation block. We've brought in and introduced the computer classroom to the top level of the classroom block. I think I overheard comments earlier on a consideration in doing that has been so that the recruits feel that there's a level of equity being spread around as well; that it's all not just being put into one area but that there are various areas of benefit. So there's been decision-making taken along those lines.

Mr GRIMSDALE - Some of the things in that classroom that we're looking at doing, as Peter alluded to before, is upgrading facilities like the light fittings. There are no low bright light fittings in there and there's people working at the computer so you have OH&S issues with glare off the computer screen. So part of his proposal for the classrooms is to bring all that up to a lot better standard and a contemporary classroom standard. So the ceilings will have acoustic panels in them so that you can cut down the reverberation time in the rooms and make them a lot easier to teach in without having teachers having problems hearing themselves because of their voice bouncing off the back wall. It is also for the students sitting on the machines, they can actually then not have the problem of eye strain that they probably get a lot more now with the level of light fittings in there.

Mr CATHERRALL - That's an approach that's been taken across the board in terms of the place is 25–26 years old and to bring it up to speed. That's been a consideration in all of the work that we've looked at, like the discussion at the very start about the kitchen equipment. That's another example of bringing it back up to modern-day standard without - we'll be here all day if we start talking about individual things that we want to do to bring it up to standard.

CHAIR - No, no we've already read them through twice in the submission.

Mr CATHERRALL - Year 2, the work is to then concentrate firstly on the classroom block, doing those sorts of things that Andrew was talking about, coming through these removing the dark finishes and brightening of those sorts of spaces up. With some things on the end of year 2, remembering that year 2 is only $530 000 worth, to extend that work program across into the administration block as well. Year 3 is the completion of the work that we'd be starting up in the administration area with the new offices for the admin staff and that conference room beside it.

Slotted into those yearly budgets we've actually made allowance for general maintenance. This is a minor small item but if you read down through these lists you'll pick up small items coming in. If we're in that building we're going to do the maintenance while we're over there. We're not going to get through to the end of it and then go back and do the maintenance. We'll document those sorts of things as we progress through - and not all of those issues have been identified. We're aware that you walk through this building and there's door handles that need work. That detail will get picked up at a later date rather than - we've just provided a contingency amount to try to
take into account that no money has really been spent down here on maintenance. I think you had a groundsman who did some work for some years but it wasn't a planned maintenance schedule.

Mr LATHAM - You'd have to be sure, if we're going to approach government as part of the next CIP program, to see if we can have the cash flows amended for the project.

Year 1 the funding is $1.6 million of which $1.1 million comes out of the department's asset management funds, so it's $500 000 from the capital works program. Year 2 is $536 000 from the capital works program and year 3 is $1.3 million to $1.4 million. So we're going to put a submission in to see if we can have some of that $1.4 million moved backwards into year 2, which would allow us to do the accommodation block in one swoop rather than have to go back and revisit it in year 3.

Mr CATHERALL - Looking at the spreadsheets, on the third page I've got two sets of totals here: value of work for years 1, 2 and 3 and then combined estimate of works and fees. I was just conscious then that we've been suggesting amounts that $1.6 million, $530 000 or whatever as the budgets for those respective years and, of course, you'll immediately pick that the totals don't tally.

CHAIR - Yes, very close but about $14 000, $15 000 out.

Mr CATHERALL - Yes, they're very close. The point is that these are all estimates and that what we're trying to put together here is a document that describes the nature of the work that we want to achieve. There's obviously some scope to drop off that line of project if we have to for budget purposes. It's very difficult three years out and variance of tendering projects and all the rest of those sorts of considerations to come up with a firm fixed price for the works. Our approach to that problem is that these are estimates and that there's a degree of scope in the way that we document the projects and how we control those costs and what we put in as the final detail to finetune those figures back to the appropriate moneys that are available at the time.

Mr LATHAM - We'll have a process in place so that as we go down the track, as you can see, a lot of the work is project orientated so within the department there will be a structure whereby the decision-making process will go back through our corporate management group, which consists of the four commissioners of police and the director of Corporate Services. As we go out to tender and get some firm prices on this schedule of work to be done we will then be able to undertake a process within the department that goes through and prioritises the work in the final order as we go down into years 3 and 4 to balance it out to the CIP funding.

CHAIR - You've done that to some extent between version 1 and version 2 already, haven't to?

Mr LATHAM - We have, yes.

CHAIR - So there will be a refinement of that.

Mr LATHAM - One issue which is not mentioned in here specifically is that our understanding at the moment is that the work done in the accommodation block would
be subject to GST because it's residential accommodation. We are going to obtain a ruling to see if that is the case or whether there is a way around it. As I say, GST on that building will be a $200,000 impost on us that we'd have to pay and not be able to recover. So, there are some issues like that which we need to resolve as the project goes along the road.

CHAIR - And it wouldn't be subject to any roll-back in the event of a change of government.

Mr LATHAM - Well, fingers crossed.

Mr McCREADIE - Mr Chairman, just to clarify one point.

The mention of $1.1 million, that's money that we've got in trust. We developed, as all department's were required to do, a strategic asset management plan and that plan identified a range of buildings and land that we owned across the State that were no longer needed with the service that we were delivering. So we have worked with Treasury to sell those off and we earmarked this money - with some frustration, I might say, because we've really had the academy firmly in our sights and CIP bids in that for the last five or six years - and we thought that we would start the journey alone with the $1.1 million and do what was absolutely necessary. So there is a considerable amount of money from asset sales from within the department to kick this off as well. So that's just for the record.

CHAIR - Good, thank you.

Mrs NAPIER - I was going to ask a question in relation to that part of the budget. You said that there were some budget issues and you'd decided to delay part of the project to the third year. Are there any cost savings if you do it in two years rather than three years?

Mr LATHAM - No. We would imagine there would be an additional cost in delaying the accommodation block by being done in two stages. Our estimate of the accommodation block is about $2.3 million in total. The available funding in year 1 from the funds within the department and government is $1.6 million. So we need to be able to balance those funds with the work undertaken. As we described this morning, if we are not able to have the funding changed we would look at doing two parts of the wing, converting to en suite accommodation and then leave one block in single rooms.

Mrs NAPIER - I understand that. I suppose I was asking whether you had done some estimates on whether you would get a better tender price if you suggested that you could do all of that accommodation work within two years rather than spreading it across a longer time period?

Mr LATHAM - I would estimate that we would.

Mr CATHERALL - What I think you're saying is that if that's the change of financial year and we've got some funding availability up to June 2002 and then in July we get some more we could actually structure our budgets to run over those two periods. Yes, it would be cheaper to do it.
You're going to lose on the builder's preliminaries. That's the biggest area - the costs for the builder to set-up. He's got to come here, set-up, go away, come back, set-up again, go away. Yes, it will probably cost more but unless there's a magic wand that gives us a bigger budget then there's not really a solution to it.

Mr LATHAM - And that is the catalyst behind going back to government this year as part of the CIP process to see if we can have the funding altered.

Mrs NAPIER - I just thought if there's a strong argument, say, 'we would save $150 000 by bringing it forward or $200 000' whatever it might be, then it seems to me a pretty strong argument to find some kind of finance mechanism for enabling that to happen.

Mr KONS - Is that using that .3 .6 budget analysis of short listed options - net present value calculations. I think that's what Sue might be talking about, that if the job was done straight away it would cost just over $3 million but if it was taken over three years it would be $3.6 million.

Mr LATHAM - Well, that's part of it. At net present value if the work is done quicker obviously the cost will be cheaper than in later years.

Mr KONS - So that's a potential saving there of almost 20 per cent?

Mr LATHAM - Yes.

Mr KONS - Just a query on the time frames for the first year, if it's done according to plans, how long would the first year is there -

Mr CATHERALL - Indications are about 20 to 22 weeks. A lot of this is going to be news to the gentleman up that end of the table because we haven't discussed this yet. Year 1 is about 20 weeks. Year 2 -

CHAIR - There's a project timetable on page 10 of the project brief.

Mr CATHERALL - That's Ian's document.

Mr LATHAM - Mr Catherall's actually been speaking to some builders to get some idea of estimates and those are the figures he's referring to.

Mr CATHERALL - Year 2 is in this building and the classroom block perhaps six weeks. This is a difficult one to judge. It depends on the opportunity to be given the whole block. If we have to stage the works it could take 12 weeks if we start at one end and come through a classroom at a time, but if we can get a timing when we've got the whole building we might be able to compress that into six weeks. The final stage, year 3, is about the 18-week period again.

Years 1 and 2, the time consuming part of that each time is going to be the accommodation block. There'll be little projects throughout that occurring in other areas that would only run for two or three weeks. For example, the computer classroom up in the top corner would only take about three weeks worth of work and that will occur somewhere in that 20 to 22 week period for the accommodation wing.
Mr KONS - So the project management would be those weeks combined?

Mr CATHERALL - Yes.

Mr KONS - The only other difficult question is: can you reconcile to me $385 000 for that amount of time for renovation?

Mr CATHERALL - Fees?

Mr KONS - Yes, there's a 12 per cent -

Mr CATHERALL - Have you got - our fee scales which were part of the submission to police -

Mrs NAPIER - It says 210 on 3.1.

Mr KONS - Builders' fees?

Mr CATHERALL - Well, hang on. Which area are you looking at?

Mr KONS - Project management.

Mr CATHERALL - That's in Ian's. I don't have that in front of me.

CHAIR - Unfortunately the pages weren't numbered in your submission.

Mr CATHERALL - In mine they are.

CHAIR - Are they? I'm not sure which is which. You say they are in yours but the one dated 15 August is signed by Mr McCreadie and they are numbered but the first document, which I understood was your company's, is not numbered.

Mr LATHAM - The first document is the submission to government - the CIP process.

CHAIR - By whom?

Mr LATHAM - By the department to the government for the capital investment process.

CHAIR - So the one signed by Mr McCreadie is not -

Mr LATHAM - The one signed by Mr McCreadie is the one that was prepared and given to SEMF.

CHAIR - Who prepared that?

Mr LATHAM - I prepared that document.

CHAIR - I see. Because there are whole pages duplicated. So they're all your department's submission then?
Mr LATHAM - Basically the second document has taken information from the CIP program and placed in there to be forwarded on to SEMF.

CHAIR - I see. So they're both yours? I wasn't sure.

Mr LATHAM - They're both our documents.

CHAIR - All right. Well, the first one's not numbered, the second one is. Mr Catherall, you said your submission is numbered. Which is yours? This one here?

Mr CATHERALL - Yes.

Mr LATHAM - The third document in there is the original detail which we gave to SEMF to go away and prepare version 2 with the costings.

CHAIR - So, there's a whole mass of duplication throughout.

Mr LATHAM - Version 1 is basically replaced by the last one you've got there.

CHAIR - I understood that but not until after I'd finished this and then I started reading that one and I found that it was variation but largely similar.

CHAIR - I understand. What page is that you're looking at, Mr Catherall?

Mr CATHERALL - This estimate sheet -

CHAIR - What page of which submission?

Mr CATHERALL - The estimate sheet in volume 2 is three pages of building estimates.

CHAIR - Is there a page number?

Mr CATHERALL - Page 15. What I have done in there, under budget estimates I've got a column 'SEMF Managed', 'DPPS Managed'. Fees are calculated across the range and, to get to your question, the management fees shown there as project management include all of the consultant engineer's fees, the architect's fees plus the project management fees, quantity surveyor's fees and building surveyor's fees.

In my total the fee schedules - which I've not photocopied but I've got them here if you want to have a look at them and you're more than welcome to it - they transfer the costs from here as a building cost and our fee proposal to Police is that sheet there which gave a percentage fee basis on how we would manage the project. At that time we didn't know what the final cost of the job was going to be or how we were going to break it down into parts, whether we were going to do in the first year five little jobs or one big job. For us there's a difference in the way that we would fee those five little jobs because they often involve a lot more preparation of documents, more time spent with the preliminaries and those sorts of things.
So our fee proposal was presented as a table of percentages depending on the project total cost. For example, what we've done here is when we get down to the third page of that estimate sheet we have 'Value of works for year -1 $1.3 million'. So we've gone to this fee schedule -

Mr KONS - Can we have that tabled?

Mr CATHERALL - Yes - looked up that percentage and then calculated it and added it back into to where the bold number is showing, but that bold number also includes the total of works that DPPS are managing, to give us a total budget. So if you took the value of works for year, $1.3 million, and subtract that from combined estimate works and fees, $1.5 million, the fees are not that figure because you've not added yet the moneys that go into the project cost that I'm not managing - for example, the parade ground. Police are going to manage that cost themselves and there's a hundred and something thousand dollars worth of furniture in the place that the police are going to go out and secure for themselves without me being involved.

Mr KONS - I've noticed, say, carpet.

Mr CATHERALL - Carpet falls in underneath my management, if you like. I'll run that as a separate contract rather than putting it through the builder, which would attract his margin on it.

Mr KONS - What about putting it through DPPS?

Mr CATHERALL - Well, they can if they like. It needs coordination with the builder's work - to stage it with the builder's work and to - I had a little job, the Devonport Police Station - you'd think $20,000 worth of carpet. But I've actually had to get involved and kick a few heads to get the work done when it's meant to happen and to smooth out all the problems. Now, come the time that we start building, it will be our office that has the contact with the builders, not Police. So that is why I would suggest it's better to keep the carpet under SEMF control, which is only picking up a 3 per cent management fee on that. I've structured it that way so that - for example, we could've put it in as part of the works of the architect but then it'd get my 3 per cent and it would also get the architect's 5.6 per cent.

Mr KONS - So in that $385,000, can you detail that?

Mr CATHERALL - I believe - I've done a quick calculation and I believe that there's only about $287,000 worth of fees in the job.

Mrs NAPIER - So the $385,000 was the original estimate and the subsequent breakdown -

Mr CATHERALL - I'm not sure how that figure was prepared.

Mr LATHAM - My understanding of the $385,000, unless I made a mistake in calculating something off the sheet, picked up project management, architects, all the various building-type consultants' fees within that which equated roughly to around about 10 per cent of the project total when we were playing around with the figures in the early days while trying to put the documents together.
Mr CATHERALL - The point I make is that we're looking at the estimate sheet, page 17, and four lines up from the bottom underneath 'Description' there's a bold type that says 'Combined Estimate Works and Fees'. Just be aware that the works described there now include the totals from 'DPPS Managed' - which is the next column across.

Mr LATHAM - Would it be preferable for us to prepare a separate document to be tabled to the committee just on straight fees.

Mr KONS - I'd like that.

CHAIR - That is already prepared? All right, we'll take that into evidence, thank you very much.

Mr KONS - That breaks down the architect's fees, the engineer's -

Mr CATHERALL - I could show it to you later.

Mr KONS - Okay. What about the builder's fees, what do they involve?

Mr CATHERALL - Our quantity surveyor has prepared from the sketch plans that were presented to you - and the group of us have walked around the buildings on a similar sort of look to what we've done this morning - he has given there the complete total cost breakdown trying to define the detail of the work.

There will be wins and losses in this because it's been prepared on fairly inaccurate information at this stage. A lot of assumptions have been made about the nature of the work until we take the time to document it but this document will be used as a guide to control the cost of all future work. It identifies your builder's preliminaries and mark-ups and margins. About 8 per cent as a builder's margin has been included in the estimate values. A figure for the margin isn't shown as a separate amount; it's all rolled into the estimates of the architectural, electrical comms work. Again, you are welcome to a copy of that too, if you like.

CHAIR - Would you like a copy of that, Mr Kons?

Mr KONS - I'll just have a look at it.

Mr CATHERALL - The front page there, the allowance for contractors preliminary costs versus the cost of the work that this particular page is looking at it, is relating to the lobby in the accommodation wing. When you flick through, I'm sure you'll be able to follow it and if you've got questions come back to me after.

Mr GRIMSDALE - You can't avoid those figures. Any project you do has builder's preliminaries in it and that's the site establishment costs, payment of council fees, payment of any workloadings that unions may impose upon the site, a degree of profit and overheads, maintaining a site phone, maintaining site faxes, maintaining their vehicles - its just dumped under this figure called 'preliminaries'. Any project that you do building-wise will have those in them and they range from 7 to 10 per cent.
Mr GREEN - What was the original cost of the establishment of the academy?

Mr McCREADIE - About $8 million to $9 million including land. I think your building works rate.

Mr GREEN - Could anybody give an estimate of what sort of money you'd be looking at to establish something like this right now?

Mr McCREADIE - Western Australia's is a little bigger but it's in the $400 million. It's probably twice the size if it's about $400 million, and land acquisition.

Mr GREEN - In terms of the cost benefit analysis in terms of the lifespan of the premises, what would you suggest to the committee that that is? We're talking about spending about $4 million here. What sort of life will that give the -

Mr McCREADIE - I think it would give us another 20 years. I think 15 in what we've played around with but this probably should've had a major workover after 10 and we've squeezed it out to 25. So I think 15 is the predictable and probably 20 years is the best estimate.

Mr GREEN - I'm interested in this interface with the university. You were talking about students going off site and if this didn't exist then there would be an on-campus-type arrangement at the University of Tasmania. Is there a reciprocal arrangement in terms of the use of this facility?

Mr McCREADIE - Yes, this is now a designated campus because, for example, in your recruit training you get 50 per cent accreditation for first year if you BA in police studies. But the reality is the university hasn't got this facility and can't make it. It would have to be built down there. They haven't got the space, for example. We've just upgraded outside of this from an OH&S point of view, the academy range underneath, because it had lead pollution problems. I don't know what we spent in the end - $291 000. If you wanted to abolish this and say it can all be under university training you can't pick that up and take it.

So the value was, heads or tails, I think it was a Labor Government when they came to power that said to do up a proposal to sell it. They didn't say they wanted to sell it, but they didn't say do up one telling them why you can't sell it or why we shouldn't sell it; it was why you should sell it. So we did up a proposal to sell it. But then we looked at how the university would provide the vocational training - that is, defensive driver training, firearms training, self defence, baton training - all those sorts of things that are not part of academia. It's just a nonsense. So the economy of scale is not there. You couldn't bring it all in under. We are very keen and pleased with our partnership programs saying that on this side we've got all this tertiary study, you'll find that there'll probably be a centre for excellence for police studies in cyber crime and so forth and also you've seen that the university are very interesting in becoming the centre for terrorism training and research - mainly research - and so forth. They all sit quite separately to the sorts of things that are done down here.
What we do do in our officers' course is we actually pay the university a faculty fee to come in a deliver the training for administration and all those sorts of things here at the academy. So, there is no space at the university and it can't happen.

Mr GREEN - In terms of the partnership you mentioned about Corrective Services - and we heard a little bit about the Fire Service and the arrangements that used to participate there - is there an ability to utilise this facility with other emergency services?

Mr McCREADIE - Yes. I think there is for a whole range of things. There is a large component of vocational training and then tertiary-based training for ambulance. They are heavily into both. The firies sat quite happily until we had a dispute about proper behaviour and they said well because there is only about 2 per cent funding of government money they basically packed and stacked and went and said, 'We'll go and do what we want to do'.

This was to become the combined emergency services academy under the old Department of Police and Emergency Services so that then the training would've been mandated. But there's absolutely no reason why the fire department shouldn't be doing their training here; there is no reason why the ambulance department couldn't do a lot of their training here; the same as there is no reason why the SES ought not to train here.

So at some time in the future I would be surprised if an insightful government didn't think about the benefits that might've flowed from the Department of Police and Emergency Services. It was brought in and probably abandoned because of fear of an electoral backlash from the police. But when we run three radio dispatch areas within a block of each other, when we do similar sorts of training, when we're into uniform acquisition, when we're into a lot of vocational training that could be offered here and not paid for at hotel rates then, of course, there would be some benefits in that.

That's what I'm saying, that if we bring it up to speed, there is no argument for those people to be spending their dollars at The Pines and some other training institutions. So, with the right facilities it would increase and I think the cash flow and the opportunity and the net benefits to the State would improve quite markedly.

Mr GREEN - In terms of the occupation health and safety requirements of the site, I notice that there are, by any standard, a number of pitfalls and issues in relation to occupational health and safety. What sort of pressure is on you to actually complete that? I know there's legislation in place, disabled access and a whole range of other things -

Mr McCREADIE - I think you can probably answer it better than me but it will be a sleeper until such time as we start some major works and then everything has to be picked up within that. You noticed that we did the wheelchair facility at the front of the thing. By the time we built it the railing on the sides didn't conform to the Australian Standards because things had moved on.

So, two issues. One, there would be a workplace accident that would be investigated and we would be ordered to remedy all the things that might contribute to that or might lead to additional accidents in the future but, obviously, once you make a commitment to spend x amount of dollars then there's an expectation that each and every part of the OH&S is brought up.
Mr GREEN - Does the money we're about to expend fix the majority of the issues?

Mr GRIMSDALE - In the areas that we're putting money into, yes. Say, like the accommodation wing, there's a number of issues ranging from the stair that we walked up the fact that there's dangerous edges to it, a single step going in right through to access suites in the building. So that'll be brought up to compliance. But if we're not doing anything back in another part of the building that won't happen until we start work into that part of the building.

The way the building surveyors view a facility like this is it's deemed to comply at present day because it was built okay when it was built, it complied with the regulations. But you have duty of care obviously and so once you start doing work, yes, it triggers off a reason for fixing up as much as you can in that particular area. If all these buildings were conjoined and against each other, it becomes a greyer argument about where you stop. But if we only do work in the accommodation wing wall the management plan would say that the work in this wing would get upgraded next and it would go sequentially through.

Mr OGLE - Can I just give you an indication on that? We have a duty of care even before the work starts.

Mr GREEN - But you've done the audit as well. Somebody's done the audit.

Mr OGLE - As you've walked around you would have seen the carpet and the carpet has in some places been put together by tape. I can point to one workers' comp claim that cost this department close on $300 000 where someone slipped on a wet floor.

Mr GREEN - I was thinking about the ramp as we walked into the kitchen. You know, that narrow corridor with a terracotta - your feet could go out from under you.

Mr OGLE - Same situation. The first claim we get will be -

Mr OGLE - Much more than it costs us to remedy. I was just trying to illustrate that one claim on a wet floor, that by today's standards isn't sufficient, cost us $300 000 in pay out.

Mr GREEN - I just wanted to make sure, Mr Chairman, that an audit had been done to make sure that all of those issues have been taken care of.

Mr McCREADIE - Disability access and all those sorts of things will be pretty well attended to, whichever way we go through this. Some other aspects of bits and pieces won't. The main at-risk areas I think are picked up within this.

Mr GREEN - The only other thing I might ask, Mr Chairman, had it been considered, they are very extensive grounds that you've got here. Do you need them all?

Mr McCREADIE - Well, of course.

Laughter.
Mr McCREADIE - When you say they're extensive, let me say that the houses we occupy - we've thought about selling those but some instructors and so forth live in them. Going through the process of subdivision - as you go along there's a strategic radio area that would take a lot of dismantling and then the driver training. If you bulldozed the houses you'd get a row of probably 15 waterfront blocks. That's something that might be considered into the future. On the top side there's a fair bit of land, but when the new highway comes through it carves into it fairly heavily. To sell off probably the blocks down there you would need to re-establish and relocate the skid pan and the driver-training area and it would probably negate any benefit from the waterfront land. So in tough times we looked at every aspect and we looked at subdivision and we looked at cutting off the waterfront blocks all that sort of issue -

Mr GREEN - I noticed one house has been built around here on the point.

Mr McCREADIE - They offered us the land next door and you'll be pleased to know we said, 'No, we've got enough. We won't buy that' and it was probably a bargain at the time.

But in terms of the internal stuff, because of the community exposure it would be a sacrilege to let the football ground go. We hire out our driver-training facility to all the professional driver trainers, plus ambulance, plus fire. The radio aerial can be relocated around that we lease it out for agistment to old Clarrie for his horses and so forth. So what you've got left is - and we've let that out for nothing - the national and State cross-country course happens right around the academy grounds and so forth. There is a fair bit of land and at some time in the future if things got really bloody-minded there might be a fence right across up by the little thing and the rest of it's sold off and it's a possibility at some time in the future.

The $1 million - we've sold off everything that wasn't painted, nailed down or screwed over the period and we've realised from asset sales $5 million or $6 million and most of that has been put in. The Strahan Police Station was built with money from asset sales - no government money.

Bellerive was completely reformed with asset sales money. Devonport has been done twice with asset sales and no government money and $1 million for this. It's all government money we recognise. But we've been very businesslike in selling off anything that didn't serve a useful purpose at this stage, realising the money and putting it back in and that's how we've lived.

Of course, when things are really tight - and that was why we got the Dear John letter saying would you think about selling the whole kit and caboodle and just shoving it over there. Great idea, but the cost and the economics of it really aren't feasible. That's not me being precious; if it could happen, it can happen.

Mr GREEN - No, I was just making the comment because it had been mentioned to us that there were other activities that used to take place here that don't any more and the cost of actually maintaining -
Mr McCREADIE - I think your government have stopped carving up big areas of land like this and turning it into residential.

Mr GREEN - It's prime agricultural.

Mr McCREADIE - It's prime agricultural and we probably couldn't do it under the current regime.

CHAIR - No, you may not be able to do that but you'd be able to plant private forest on it.

Mr McCREADIE - Well, the other issue is, of course, that this is a traditional Aboriginal site and I'm sure if we wanted to carve it up into little houses that they would have some thoughts about their middens and bits and pieces.

Mr GREEN - A good point.

Mr McCREADIE - So, we've played with all of that and it's a fair question. I hope my answer has covered it adequately at this time. It is not a feasible and reasonable thing to be considered.

Mrs NAPIER - A couple of quick questions to ask. The document refers to an audit of asbestos. Given that it was an early 1970s building, do you have a feeling for what you expect to find?

Mr CATHERALL - We've done the audit and the only area that we found asbestos was the ceiling of the gymnasium. One major concern was the white flaky stuff falling off the auditorium ceiling and it didn't turn out to be asbestos, fortunately.

Mrs NAPIER - So where that ceiling is there's holes in it and so on, as tends to happen in gymnasium ceilings, that's not asbestos impacting?

Mr CATHERALL - Yes, it is.

Mrs NAPIER - So what are you going to do?

Mr CATHERALL - Leave it there, label it and sheet over it to protect it.

Mrs NAPIER - So you are going to surface coat it?

Mr CATHERALL - Yes.

Mrs NAPIER - Is that a category 4 in terms of priority?

Mr CATHERALL - It is funded, not in the first year though.

Mrs NAPIER - Right - but it is within the first three?

Mr CATHERALL - Yes.
Mrs NAPIER - Just in case you don't have the extra $281 000 or whatever it is to finish it all.

In relation to maintenance - and here I am referring to the orange document - there are some figures that look at maintenance issues. You argued fairly strongly that if all this work is done it will hopefully reduce the maintenance cost of the building, even though there hasn't been the money to maintain the building. It suggests that a figure of $0.5 million would normally be expected of a building of this worth but it suggests that currently that kind of maintenance figure isn't available in the department's budget, however if you could indicate to me what is for this building?

Mr LATHAM - The budget for the academy for maintenance?

Mr McCREADIE - It's really whatever we can afford on an ongoing year. It's been a moving feast.

Mr OGLE - My understanding is it's $150 000 and, from memory, $65 000 of that goes for the hydro and the rest is just leaks and squeaks.

The other point I would make about maintenance too is that while there will be some maintenance savings we also need to take into account with the accommodation block going to en suite the hot water bill will obviously increase. Also, the cleaning and maintenance will increase. So, without doing the sums exactly, you'll find there is a cost increase as we also save on some maintenance. The maintenance budget for this academy is well below the ideal. Really, what we're saying is we're saving on money we don't have.

Mrs NAPIER - I was going to really ask what are the forward projections as to how you would cover the fact that there will be some additional cleaning costs because of the quality of the facility that's being developed - and I can see the logic in redeveloping accommodation and the classrooms and so on. I can see the logic in it very much. Is there a business case worked out on that? Does it break even or -

Mr OGLE - We haven't done any detailed business case on that as yet. Like most of these things we'll go through the process and we'll have to make some policy decisions, for instance, like will the cadets clean their own rooms once a week and keep them up to a certain standard and then service the accommodation and the bathrooms once a week? Those sort of policy decisions will come in later. So without a policy decision, I can't do an estimate.

Mr McCREADIE - And that's exactly what we're thinking. For your benefit, in the old days with the cadet regime they had a very rigorous daily inspection for dust and penalties and that, but we think that it would not be unreasonable if we left the facility to them to maintain it right through the week and then it's just the once a week make-over. At the moment because they're so run down it's once a day make-over and so forth. We can make the adjustment.

The other thing is with flexibility we've learnt to live very frugally and make adjustments over the period and it really comes down to the priority. If the priority is to shift something extra down here to maintain this at the time we'll do it. In between, this has
survived and we've shifted off to do a whole range of other things in other areas - and that's Bellerive and Devonport and Strahan and all that sort of issue.

So it's the old game of shuffling dollars, quite frankly, and putting it where it's necessary at the time.

Mr LATHAM - The other issue is too we've sold probably over a hundred houses in the last three to four years which means that we're down to a portfolio of approximately 130-odd properties throughout the State now and the Government has provided a $2 million program to upgrade those residences. So our maintenance costs in respect of our housing will be reduced significantly. Whilst we'll be obliged to maintain our police residences it's not going to cost us to the same degree as it has done in the past and that'll free up money to direct back to the academy as well.

CHAIR - I think you were saying over lunch that $2 million has been made available -

Mr LATHAM - $2 million for the housing infrastructure program.

Mr McCREADIE - That will bring our exposure in all the houses nearly right up to speed and we'd expect that there's probably an eight to ten year life in that sort of thing. So it will free up a considerable amount of money and most of them have got so difficult that they are all fairly big projects at the moment. They're pretty tacky.

Mrs NAPIER - So where it says - there isn't a page number on this but it's under 3:2: 'It should be noted that the department is not able to allocate this level of funding to the maintenance of this building' and that was talking about, as I understand it, presumably the 1999-2000 financial year that you're referring to. You seem to be indicating then that, whilst a minimal maintenance budget has been planned on the building thus far given its state, when this additional money is spent to upgrade the facility the department has in its mind a system by which you can allocate adequate maintenance funding to maintain it at the level that I would have thought was needed if you're going to maintain the training numbers, get other groups in for conferences or otherwise. I just wanted some kind of indication as to whether that was going to happen or not.

Mr LATHAM - One of the things and one of the projects that is currently under development within the asset management area is a program maintenance program not only for the academy but all our police stations and police residences throughout the State and that's something that we haven't done in great detail in past years. So we're developing a program maintenance budget which will address all our properties through the State and that program maintenance budget will compete with other priorities within the department for funding, naturally, but we think it's a step in the right direction now that we have identified all our maintenance issues. A lot of those issues have been addressed and we will now be in a better position to routinely undertake the maintenance on the buildings to keep them in a better state than we've done in the past.

Mrs NAPIER - Just following on from the schedule of usage then - one of the issues that we had a look at just towards the end was the gymnasium, which is basically a priority four and I can see that relative to the police force's training needs and priorities - I was thinking of it from the point of view of a whole-of-government issue. What vacancy
level is there in the usage of the gymnasium? Or what usage level is there in terms of percentage of time that it might be used?

Mr LATHAM - I couldn't provide you with an accurate answer on that. I could obtain the information from the business manager here. But I know, for example, that there is a child-care facility that runs four days a week for two hours a morning that occurs here. There's an eastern shore basketball group which uses the facility on Friday afternoons. It's also the home of the Police Citizens and Youth Club for this area. So there is a high degree but the exact usage I couldn't give you, but we'll try to obtain a record of the various groups that use it and the clients that use it.

Mrs NAPIER - I guess I'd be interested as to what the scale of increase was and the particular issue that's in, it seems to me, is that issue of the toilets and which groups encourage the people who are using it to shower and which don't. Some groups wouldn't, the play groups wouldn't, but the basketballers would.

Mr LATHAM - We did have some brief discussions about that when we were doing the planning and the feedback was that most of the kids who played basketball just throw the track tops and pants back on and out the door and home they go. Whether that's something to do with the state of the facilities or whether it's just the lifestyle preference they go home straight after the game and shower at home.

Mrs NAPIER - So, there's not a predominance of school groups, for example, that use the facility?

Mr McCREADIE - No, it's more used in community activities and, of course, the police training. The police use it for their physical exercise in service and so forth, although in some ways, to answer your question, there's probably some slack in there because we've gone into an integrated fitness program now where rather than buy our whole gymnasium equipment we've gone off to Oceania pool facility because when this was built there was always intended to be a pool and, of course, we've long given up that thought and saying it's easier to pop on a bus and go somewhere else. But it has frequent use. It's major use at the moment is a very active youth club. School groups come in some football groups use it for pre-season training and that sort of thing, but I wouldn't say that it's right up to its absolute capacity.

Mr LATHAM - We do have a list of external users in an old document that Mr Catherall had, so if you like it to be tabled.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

Mr CATHERALL - That's 12 months old.

Mrs NAPIER - What you seem to be saying is that there is no pressing need to provide those upgraded female shower facilities on the basis of current or projected usage?

Mr McCREADIE - No, I think that it can sustain itself. The other issue is whilst there are male showers, for example if the girls from Collegiate come down, it's very simple to seal it off and give them the bigger shower room, so it's really not an issue. And I've got to say I was superintendent here for a couple of years as well and nobody ever
complained, albeit that's a few years ago now, that there wasn't sufficient capacity for showering. And they're right, the dominant thing was to come in a tracksuit, disrobe, do you bit, pull the tracksuit back on and pop in the car with mum and off you go to get yourself organised at home. So it hasn't been a problem and it's still not a problem and that's why it's a low priority.

Mr KONS - As far as the tender documentation for the building of the works, will it be a project based on a three-year approach or will builders be allowed the option of funding the projects themselves to do it in one job lot?

Mr CATHERALL - We really have to have that discussion yet. They way Ian and I have been talking about it, it's probably going to be three separate tenders - year 1, year 2 and year 3.

Mr GRIMSDALE - You're talking about design and construct really, are you, by saying you'd get a builder to fund it themselves?

Mr KONS - Instead of doing it over three years, to do it over -

Mr GRIMSDALE - I'm not sure too many builders would want to carry that sort of money and do it all in year 1.

Mrs NAPIER - Are we talking about a $600 000 difference over three years or two? Which did we finally decide upon?

Mr McCREADIE - Three in round figures, yes, on estimate $600 000 over three.

Mrs NAPIER - So if you did it over two years, what are you saying your savings are by doing it in two years rather than three?

Mr CATHERALL - You save on your preliminaries basically.

Mrs NAPIER - If you break it up into three tenders that presumably -

Mr CATHERALL - The more you break it up the more builders you get in, the more expensive it becomes.

Mrs NAPIER - So I guess what I'm trying to get a feel for - and I think Steve's on the same track - is we don't know from whence you would find that additional money at this stage. It might be through a commercial arrangement or otherwise but what are the savings that you could make if you could do the whole project in two years rather than three years? Which presumably would mean you'd do it in one tender rather than three or so.

Mr KONS - Can that go out as a non-conforming tender as an option? You have your three components but the builders would come in, may be given the opportunity to say, 'We'll prepare one contract for the lot, we'll fund it'.

Mr GRIMSDALE - Are you allowed to do that, though? That'd be like the Government would then be taking a loan from a builder.
Mr KONS - No, I think that's been done before.

Mr GRIMSDALE - It's something I'd have to check out with the tender review committee.

Mr KONS - They did it so they wouldn't complain.

Mrs NAPIER - Yes, it has been done before. How do you think we kept the Health budget going?

Mr OGLE - I won't comment on that.

Can I also add, while some of the thought has been around a three-staged approach, the other option is to join years 1 and 2. If you start the project in, say, March it's the end of this financial year and you're joining it with the beginning of next financial year. Really, between those two you have $1.6 million plus $500,000 so you've got $2.1 million.

The other thing you've got to remember in this process in terms of cash flow, that $1.1 million is out of our strategic asset management plan and we've still got some properties to sell. So we need to sell those.

Mrs NAPIER - That's not all yet available. It's budgeted but it's not actually available.

Mr LATHAM - The bulk of the money is there.

Mr OGLE - So, we've got to be careful that we don't spend the money before we've got it and some of those properties are actually what I describe as hard to sell. They've been on the market for some time and haven't sold. Quite frankly, some of them are in the area where if someone knocks on your door you'll say, 'How much are you willing to give?' You know, it's a block of land that used to run horses at the Ouse police station-those sort of properties. So we've got to be fairly careful with our cash flow. I would indicate to the committee that one of the options might be to join years 1 and 2 together so there is that actual continuation through those two years but they're discussions we've yet to have.

Mr LATHAM - I'll approach the government tender committee and look at options there of your suggestion.

Mr KONS - Just having a look at this there's close to $300,000 savings by doing two years together.

CHAIR - Just a couple of matters I have. When there are no courses here, what staff numbers are here? What is the basic minimum number of staff and how are they allocated?

Mr McCREADIE - There is really very rarely a time. Two issues we have: we have an approach of renewal where we have an expectation that to maintain their creditability and their operational relevance that we're continually shuffling people in and out. We run a base staff. The base staff facilitate the courses, develop the curriculum and so forth. Most of the lecturing is done by external people coming in from the field and so forth. For example, that bomb course over there, just to make the point, we don't have
resident bomb experts; we build the course around the need of that course and so it goes. So the university coming on the officers' course and everybody from myself, deputy commissioner, assistant commissioners come down and deliver various components.

The issue is in the last three years it has been as full as a State school. There really hasn't been downtime except for Christmas and any downtime and any downtime, as say we'll send our other staff back into operational areas to refine and to bring themself up to speed.

Christmastime it was shutting down for a short period but now I think we even keep it open over the Christmas period because of shutting down of the plant and so forth was costing more than it was worth.

Mr OGLE - It's also a time to revitalise, like clean. But it's fair to say that the majority of staff during that period are rostered off on leave, as the Commissioner says. The operational police go back into the field to support, particularly over Christmas and New Year.

But in recent years the take-up rate from outside organisations over the Christmas period have been fairly high and that's where we actually get some income. From memory, I think, the Hydro booked it out for one big conference - it was either last year or the year before - and they basically occupied the whole academy and that was quite a profitable issue for us over that four weeks.

CHAIR - So what are the base staff numbers and how are they allocated?

Mr McCREADIE - I think there's about 23 on the campus full-time - that's instructional staff. Then, of course, you've probably got 10 servery ladies cum cleaners, you've got three in the kitchen, you've got a couple of guys doing - mind you the ground's outsourced now; all the mowing and that's all done by contract. There are a couple of just general maintenance gofers as well. So, it's probably up around 50 the rough figure all up, but I'd stand correcting on that.

Mr OGLE - We do employ a lot of casual staff, as you would appreciate. If there's a function on we bring staff in from our casual register for waiting duties and bar duties and those sorts of things, particularly for functions we are able to charge out for again. So we can do a cost benefit on how many staff we'd need for those functions.

CHAIR - So usually you'd have two courses a year with about 20 cadets in each and one specialists course of about 10?

Mr McCREADIE - No, no. In the old days when it was the tail wagging the dog the whole needs of the service were underpinned by the utilisation of this academy and it was nothing for us to have 40 or 50 in-service courses. What we've done now, the academy delivers in the field and we've found it more cost effective to prepare it at the academy and take it to the north-west and to the northern districts. So we take them out to the masses rather than the other way around. But you mustn't get the impression - what I was saying is they've got to do all of the exams, the prep, and people come down for pre-exam period so you've got your senior constables, sergeants, inspectors' exams. Then you've got what we call preparation courses. So the sergeants' course is in three
phases and they come in three times into the academy before they come out of the sausage factory as considered eligible for sergeant. The officers' course comes in for a period of 10 weeks live-in at the academy. In between we do small boat handling, negotiation, domestic crisis.

All the commanders and the commissioner sit and we identify the needs at the beginning of the year so there'd probably be two and three in-service courses whether they be a day or a week running simultaneously right through the year at the academy.

As I say, for the last two years it has been common to have four courses in because we were picking up and getting up the Government's 1 100 numbers from the base that we ended up with. There is still opportunity for more in-service training if the room is available but in the last two years, the crush to get the kids in and get them trained and get them out, has been the dominant thing. So that's been our focus. The other's slipped a little bit but within field delivery.

CHAIR - So the first part of the project involves establishing 50 rooms with ensuite accommodation?

Mr McCREADIE - Yes.

CHAIR - And the second and 39, is that right?

Mr McCREADIE - Yes, that's it.

CHAIR - So that will be a total of 89. On average how many would normally be vacant on average each week?

Mr McCREADIE - At the moment? The problem is we're talking about the extraordinary. I mean, we've had 80 recruits in simultaneously but out of the rooms that are currently available because we're using ceiling bits and pieces from the top floor. There were quite a few rooms on the top floor that were in disservice simply to plug up the other gaps and so forth because we didn't have the money. There are 129, so there's probably 15 to 20 rooms on a weekly basis that aren't being used. Probably a little more sometimes.

CHAIR - Do you have any idea of the cost per student per day for accommodation here?

Mr McCREADIE - You mean how much we charge them or how much it costs us?

CHAIR - No. What is the cost to the academy of accommodating a student per day?

Mr McCREADIE - Once again, it's on the economy of scale. If we've got 80 in it's probably proportionately less than if we've got 20 in because you've got about the same level, albeit we do bring casuals in.

CHAIR - No rule-of-thumb average that you have?

Mr McCREADIE - No. They actually pay a sustenance and maintenance fee while they're here. They actually pay board and whilst it's modest and I think that it probably doesn't
cover it all - they pay $100 a fortnight while they're in training. That probably wouldn't feed some of the healthy, robust, young people that we bring in and run around the academy and so forth, but we can provide it. I'm sure we've done it a number times. We look more at the cost of training them rather than sustaining them and what the real cost are of having educators and bringing in all of the various trainers. But we can give you that in writing, if you like.

CHAIR - No, that's sufficient for my purposes, thanks.

In the first submission in this document - the pages are not numbered in that, but it's on page 8 under 2 - 'Options Investigated' - the following sentence appears: 'Due to the project being a refurbishment of an existing building it was considered that there is only' - I think it means one option available - 'and that is to proceed with the refurbishment'. It sounds too obvious to believe that's what's meant. I'm not sure what the intention of that sentence is.

Mr LATHAM - Well, basically the intention was there. We have this facility with the infrastructure and to look at delivering our training services by either taking the academic side out to the university and then perhaps looking at doing the various types of practical training in a police headquarters etcetera. They weren't considered to be feasible or practical options so to us the refurbishment of this facility is the only really practicable option available to the department.

Mr McCREADIE - In terms of the continuation of service delivery for training. That's what it was intended to convey.

CHAIR - When I started reading the first document, on the first page it has 'Linked Outputs' and there are six dot points. Then I turned four pages over under 'Justification of Need' there are the identical six dot points. So I started marking the duplication because we like to avoid duplication and save reading things over and over and I was noting a few sentences that appeared to be duplicated and then I came across whole pages. The fifth page, the sixth page, the seventh page are all duplicated almost word for word on page 3 of the second submission, page 7 and page 8 but we did have some discussion about this while we were on the inspection -

Mr LATHAM - Within that document, Mr Wing, a lot of that format is the required CIP format to be provided to government and it does duplicate itself in that format.

CHAIR - I see. I'm hoping that in future that can be sorted and not duplicated by the time it reaches us because on the second page of the first one there's a footnote: 'The Department of Police and Public Safety has been advised by SEMF Holdings Pty Ltd' and I won't read the rest of that and it says: 'Cost of this part of the project is $77 000'. The exact wording appears again on page 9 and the exact wording appears on page 10 of the same document.

Mr LATHAM - I will plead guilty to those couple of issues.

CHAIR - There seemed to be quite a bit of duplication. So I just make that point on that. And on this document -
Mrs NAPIER - He's just trying to prove he's read it of course.

Mr LATHAM - He knows it better than me.

Mr LATHAM - I'm not going to move away from the fact that it is a pro forma.

CHAIR - We've talked about the length of the size of the paper on this and we just want to get the message across that we'd like to have them on A4 and where there are plans they can just be folded over. It's very cumbersome carrying them around.

Mr LATHAM - Whilst on that issue and I acknowledge all your comments and take them on board hopefully for future projects if we get funding, is there a pro forma which is issued by your committee for presentation of documents to the committee?

CHAIR - No, not really. It's just a matter of getting to the crux of the matters and putting them forward in an essay form which is easier to read.

Mr CATHERALL - That's an earlier report which I'd not like to lose; I'd like that back.

CHAIR - So do we want this?

Mr CATHERALL - It actually gives you a description of the users of the academy.

CHAIR - Oh, yes. Could it be photostated while we're here? Just one copy and then we can have extra copies made.

I think that concludes the questions and thank you all very much indeed for the valued assistance you've given us we appreciate that. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.