

Simon Scott
Committee Secretary
Public Accounts Committee

By Email: simon.scott@parliament.tas.gov.au

Dear Mr Scott

Thank you for the letter dated 2 June 2026 from the Parliamentary Accounts Committee Chair, the Hon Ruth Forrest MLC. The letter outlined questions taken on notice, following the appearance of the Macquarie Point Development Corporation's Board Chair, Mr Kim Evans, and I at the Public Accounts Committee on 25 May 2026.

Responses are provided below to each of the questions set out in the letter from the Chair, along with supporting attachments. I have noted any information that is provided in confidence.

1. A detailed breakdown of who is in the following committees: Evaluation Committee, Tender Review Committee, and the Procurement Review Committee.

As noted in the session, we are currently in a live procurement process, with the Expression of Interest process being the first phase.

It is an important element of the procurement framework that evaluation committee members are not disclosed. This protects the integrity of the process including by managing the risk of committee members being exposed to lobbying.

For these reasons, the requested information is provided strictly in confidence. The information requested is provided at Attachment 1.

2. How many and who were the parties that put in an application against the Expression of Interest (EOI) process? If the names are not allowed to be released publicly, please note the reason why it needs to remain private.

We are currently undertaking a live procurement process, with the Expression of Interest process being the first phase of the active process.

We are in the Request for Tender phase, which has two stages. It is inappropriate to disclose information related to the bids received while the procurement process remains active. This is important to maintain the integrity of the process and its competitive nature. In addition, maintaining confidentiality in relation to materials received and by whom is important to protect future processes and prospective bidders, so they are comfortable that the process will be confidential, as stated.

Providing the names of the parties who submitted an Expression of Interest, even in confidence, is contrary to the Tasmanian Government's Treasurer's Instructions as well as probity advice. The *Treasurer's Instruction, Financial Management Act 2016, Contracts - Disclosure and confidentiality in government contracting* outlines that:

1.11 Information provided by a supplier during a procurement process, as well as information provided by a panel member when purchasing from a panel arrangement or information provided by applicants seeking to be registered on a multi-use list, must be treated as confidential until the preferred supplier is selected and a contract is awarded.

In recognition of the role of the Committee, the requested information is being provided, however, strictly in confidence, noting this is inconsistent with the Treasurer's Instructions. The information requested is provided at Attachment 1.

3. Confirmation that Webuild did not in their EOI application mention the NSW Government Kimber investigation undertaken by Western Sydney Airport Metro in September 2025.

As detailed above, we are in the Request for Tender phase of a live procurement process. It is inappropriate to disclose information related to the bids received, as it may compromise the integrity of the procurement process.

The Probity Advisor has confirmed that while there is a requirement for transparency of a tender process, there is also a requirement to maintain confidentiality in order to respect the Tenderers' involvement.

The below information is provided regarding the process undertaken through the procurement process for managing any allegations against any nominated organisation.

The Expression of Interest process involved both a Probity Advisor and Evaluation Panel.

The role of the Probity Advisor in the Expression of Interest process was to assist the Macquarie Point Development Corporation to identify, assess and manage probity risks arising during the procurement process such that probity compliance with the relevant policies and guidelines was achieved in all material respects.

This role was separate to the role of the Evaluation Panel whose role was to assess the Expressions of Interest that were received against the established evaluation criteria.

As part of the evaluation process for the Financial Capability Assessment, announcements related to health, safety, environmental issues that may have a reputational or financial impact were considered.

The Evaluation Panel did not contact all of the jurisdictions around Australia to enquire if any nominated organisation was under investigation for an alleged breach. This is not part of usual practice for a procurement process.

The Probity Advisor advised that for the Expression of Interest process:

- There were no observed or reported outstanding probity issues
- The recommendation of the Evaluation Committee was considered defensible from a probity perspective and aligned to their observations at the Committee meetings and based on relevant considerations
- There were no probity impediments to the delegated authority acting on the recommendation of the Committee for the appointment of the preferred contractors.

The procurement remains an active process. Tenders will be received at the end of stage one for consideration and assessment.

The Tenders will then be assessed and related matters can be considered, including any investigations that the Corporation/Committee identifies as appropriate to undertake to inform the assessment, in accordance with the established evaluation criteria.

4. A compilation of the findings from the testing of the roof test rig for Cricket Australia.

Please see attached (Attachment 2) a report with the findings from the testing of the temporary test rig from Cricket Tasmania, and a letter from Cricket Tasmania and Cricket Australia to the Macquarie Point Development Corporation (Attachment 3).

5. By location, the number of people who attended each of the stadium design roadshows between 17 April and 25 May 2026.

A summary is provided below.

Location	Attendance numbers
Huonville	58
New Norfolk	40
Campbell Town	11
Launceston	101
Bicheno	60
Devonport	167
Burnie	106
Queenstown	38

6. A complete schedule of all cost categories included within the \$1.13 billion P90 estimate.

The P90 was tabled in confidence at the Committee Hearing. Pages 7 to 9 detail the cost items included in the base estimate.

The P90 cost categories have been informed by the breakdown of costs set out on page 68 of the Government Response published in October 2025. A copy of that document is attached for ease of reference (Attachment 4).

7. Provide a list of costs associated with the stadium development but expressly excluded from the \$1.13 billion estimate?

This response is provided based on works being undertaken by MPDC and our forward works programme.

Precinct works are excluded from the cost estimate, this includes the:

- Precinct carpark
- Evans Street Substation Demolition to prepare the site for development
- Removal of the Red Shed and Goods Shed disassembly
- Day one landscaping for the Precinct including the retaining wall for the rock escarpment
- Services infrastructure for the Precinct. The services connections for the Stadium are included within the Stadium budget.

8. For each of the following, confirm whether it is included within the \$1.13 billion project budget, and if so, what the estimated cost allocation is for each item:

- a. consultant fees (noting these were previously stated to be around \$65 million)**
- b. site decontamination, including unforeseen contamination or latent site conditions**
- c. review of tender documentation for decontamination and design/construction phases**
- d. dilapidation surveys**
- e. landscaping costs**
- f. demolition of the Red Shed**
- g. removal, storage and reconstruction of the Goods Shed**
- h. the \$2 million cricket test rig**
- i. TasNetworks power upgrades required for the stadium**
- j. the northern access road**
- k. accommodation for construction workers**
- l. project management costs**
- m. travel costs for consultants seeking equity partners**
- n. stadium fit-out**
- o. stadium IT systems**
- p. stadium AV systems**
- q. rectification and repair of Evans Street following construction**
- r. parking under the structure (currently stated to be approximately 40 vehicles)**
- s. surrounding road alignment adjustments**
- t. cricket nets adjacent to the Tasman Highway**
- u. monitoring for noise and air pollution during demolition and construction**

v. rental of office space for construction, design, building and architectural consultants

w. operating costs of Macquarie Point Development Corporation itself, given its current primary public function is stadium delivery, and

x. borrowing costs.

Please see below a table that sets out the information that has been requested. If the item is included in the project scope, we have noted which cost category it relates to, with reference to the estimated breakdown of costs set out on page 68 of the Government Response published in October 2025.

The Construction and Escalation items are identified together, as escalation allows for the increase in construction costs over time. This cost will be included in the contract price at contract award. The P90 cost estimate provided to the Committee in confidence provides further details on exact costs within the estimate.

Item	Included within the project budget?
a. consultant fees (noting these were previously stated to be around \$65 million)	Yes, this is included in the Development Costs Including Contingencies and Consultant Fees line item of \$302,694,464
b. site decontamination, including unforeseen contamination or latent site conditions	Partially, the Corporation was established for the remediation and development of Mac Point with this work ongoing since establishment in 2012. Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740 includes allowance for the impacts of known site contamination. Established contingencies included in the Development Costs Including Contingencies and Consultant Fees item of \$302,694,464 include allowances for unforeseen contamination or latent site conditions associated with construction of the Multipurpose Stadium.
c. review of tender documentation for decontamination and design/construction phases	Yes, included in the Development Costs Including Contingencies and Consultant Fees line item of \$302,694,464 and Project Resourcing of \$17,900,000
d. dilapidation surveys	Yes, within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
e. landscaping costs	No, MPDC has a separate budget for Capital Works to activate the site beyond the Stadium, which covers the day one landscaping of the Precinct. However, the cost for the Stadium plazas is within the Stadium budget within the

	Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
f. demolition of the Red Shed	No, MPDC has a separate budget for Capital Works to activate the site beyond the Stadium
g. removal, storage and reconstruction of the Goods Shed	No, MPDC has a separate budget for Capital Works to activate the site beyond the Stadium. However, fit-out of the Goods Shed once reconstructed sits within the Stadium Budget within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
h. the \$2 million cricket test rig	Yes, within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
i. TasNetworks power upgrades required for the stadium	Subject to the approach. There are a number of workstreams and projects to support power supply and delivery on site including construction power, and continuation of existing power needs to the port and TasWater wastewater pump station.
j. the northern access road	No, this is a Department of State Growth led project with its own funding allocation set out in the 2025-26 Budget papers
k. accommodation for construction workers	Yes, Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740 includes costs for materials and labour
l. project management costs	Yes, it is included in the Development Costs Including Contingencies and Consultant Fees item of \$302,694,464
m. travel costs for consultants seeking equity partners	This is not applicable and not included
n. stadium fit-out	Yes, within Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740 and Day 1 operational costs of \$18,500,000
o. stadium IT systems	Yes, within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
p. stadium AV systems	Yes, within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
q. rectification and repair of Evans Street following construction	The Stadium contractor will be required to make good any damage caused by construction activities; there is no

	separate budget to upgrade Evans Street from the pre-construction conditions
r. parking under the structure (currently stated to be approximately 40 vehicles)	Yes, within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740 and confirmed to be 40 spaces
s. surrounding road alignment adjustments	No, this is part of the Northern Access Road project
t. cricket nets adjacent to the Tasman Highway	Yes, within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
u. monitoring for noise and air pollution during demolition and construction	Yes, within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
v. rental of office space for construction, design, building and architectural consultants	Yes, within the Construction and Escalation of \$788,186,740
w. operating costs of Macquarie Point Development Corporation itself, given its current primary public function is stadium delivery, and	No, the Corporation is responsible for the development of the Macquarie Point Precinct. Equity funding (for capital projects) and operating grants, for operations, are provided separately. The operation of the Corporation pre-dates the stadium and will continue to support the delivery of the precinct.
x. borrowing costs.	No, operating grant funding for this is outlined in the 2026-27 Budget

9. A copy of the revised Master Plan.

Please find a copy of the Site Master Plan at Attachment 5, which is also published on our website: <https://www.macpoint.com/precinctplan>

10. A map indicating where the various levels of soil contamination are expected to be by the EPA Levels 1 to 4 ('fill material' through to 'contaminated soil for remediation').

An illustrative map is provided at Attachment 6.

11. A map indicating the 100 metres radius of potential construction impact.

The below map indicates a 100m radius from the boundary of the Mac Point site.



12. What was the start date for the request for tender (RFT) process with the two preferred parties?

The RFT Stage 1 documentation was released to Tenderers on 17 April 2026.

The documentation was released once the RFT Stage 1 agreements were signed with the selected respondents, following the Easter break period.

13. A copy of the monthly updates of the progress of submitted approvals with the regulators when they are produced.

A summary of documentation submitted to regulators is provided in the table below.

Condition	Submitted on	Approver	Status	Approval date
Schedule 1 Part 4 B1 (2) - Site Environmental Management Plan	8 January 2026	Director of the EPA	Confirmed to the EPA's satisfaction	19 January 2026
Schedule 1 Part 4 B2 – Staging Plan	28 January 2026	Secretary of the Department of State Growth	Approved	18 June 2026
B1 (1)(m) - Preparatory	4 March to Director of the EPA	Secretary of the Department of	Determination received	9 June 2026

works determination	9 April 2026 to Secretary of the Department of State Growth	State Growth, Minister for Planning, Director of the EPA		
Schedule 1 Part 4 B12/B13 - Impact Assessment on Road Reserves	23 April 2026	Secretary of the Department of State Growth	Approved	17 June 2026
Schedule 3 AH5 – Unanticipated Discovery Plan	10 June 2026	Minister administering the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1975	Confirmation of the Minister's satisfaction pending	In progress
Schedule 1 Part 4 B1 (2) - Site Environmental Management Plan	15 June 2026	Director of the EPA	Confirmation of the EPA's satisfaction pending	In progress

14. A copy of the assessment criteria that will be used for the RFT process.

Please see attached the Conditions for Participation and Evaluation Criteria for RFT Stages 1 and 2 (Attachment 7). These were set out at the beginning of the Expression of Interest process and have not changed. The information shared is an excerpt of the documentation provided to interested parties at the start of the Expression of Interest process.

Setting out these criteria at the start of the procurement process protects the integrity of the process.

15. A copy of the assumptions and/or estimates of the interest costs that will need to be met by MPDC, and any interest cost estimates expected to be met by the Government or Stadiums Tasmania.

Borrowing cost estimates for the 2026-27 Budget and Forward Estimates are based on forecast rates for 10-year bonds provided by the Tasmanian Public Finance Corporation. The assumed interest rates applied to new borrowings are 6.52 per cent for 2028-29 and 6.69 per cent for 2029-30. This is set out on page 192 of the Budget Paper 1.

The estimated borrowing costs set out in the Budget are:

- \$7.3m in 2028-29
- \$22.3m in 2029-30

Borrowing costs beyond the 2026-27 Budget are based on an assumption of 6.83 per cent in both 2030-31 and 2031-32 and the projected operating support/borrowing costs are:

- \$31.3m in 2030-31

- \$32.6m in 2031-32

Interest cost estimates are subject to revision and may change in response to movements in borrowing requirements and interest rate assumptions.

Yours Sincerely



Anne Beach
Chief Executive Officer

19 June 2026