

PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON WEDNESDAY, 26 MARCH 2025

INQUIRY INTO THE TASMANIAN GOVERNMENT'S PROCESS INTO THE PROPOSED HOBART ARTS, ENTERTAINMENT AND SPORTS PRECINCT

The Committee resumed at 10:49 am.

CHAIR - Thanks, Kim and Anne, for returning to the Public Accounts Committee Inquiry into the AFL agreement and stadium that's part of that agreement. We appreciate you coming back. We're trying to wrap up this particular part of the inquiry. It is a bit of a rapidly-moving feast, as I am sure you're aware, or not-so-rapidly, from some people's perspective, perhaps.

It is a public hearing. Everything that you say is covered by parliamentary privilege, and if there is anything of a confidential nature you wish to share with the Committee, you could make that request. Otherwise, it is all public. I assume you don't have any questions before we start. If I could ask both of you to take the statutory declaration, then we'll invite you to make an opening statement, if you wish, Kim, then we will go to questions.

Mr KIM EVANS, CHAIR, and **Ms ANNE BEACH**, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MACQUARIE POINT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION, AND WERE EXAMINED.

Mr EVANS - Thanks for the opportunity of meeting with you again. For me, this is my second appearance as Chair of Macquarie Point, but this is Anne's sixth appearance.

CHAIR - She is a serial offender, then.

Mr EVANS - She loves it. We last appeared on 21 June 2024, and a fair bit has happened since then, obviously. I know the Committee's interested in a progress report and an update on where things have moved since we last appeared.

A couple of significant things have happened. One is that, in August [2024] last year, we finalised the precinct plan. If you'll recall, the precinct plan came about because the Government had decided that Macquarie Point was the ideal site for the multi-purpose stadium but it wanted it to be part of an integrated precinct with a focus on urban renewal. The Minister directed the Corporation to engage with stakeholders in developing a broader precinct plan. We did that over a 16-week period of public consultation, with two rounds. We received about 2,500 submissions. We had 100 meetings with local organisations, businesses and individuals, collaborating with other Government departments like TasPorts, Department of State Growth, including Infrastructure Tasmania, Stadiums Tasmania and Brand Tasmania, Homes Tasmania and the Department of Health.

Through that process, we developed and submitted to the Government a broader precinct plan. It sets out a broader vision for the site, which includes residential development on the public foreshore. It provides for an Antarctic Facilities Zone adjacent to the working port - so we've still set aside space for an Antarctic zone on the site - a Complementary Integrated

PUBLIC

Mixed-Use Zone, we have provided for the Aboriginal Culturally Informed Zone and, of course, the multi-purpose stadium was in that precinct plan.

In parallel with the work on the precinct plan, we obviously needed to respond to the Project of State Significance (PoSS) following the establishment of the PoSS order. We had, midway through last year, a very, very intense process of developing our PoSS submission, and submitted that to the Planning Commission in September 2024. It is a very, very detailed submission covering some 4000 pages of specialist reports and advice covering economics, transport, visual and heritage impacts, noise, lighting and site remediation, amongst other things.

The Commission received our submission, published it, then, in November of last year, came back to us with a series of questions seeking further information and further submissions. I have to say, that is a pretty normal part of any planning assessment process, particularly with a complex project like a stadium. The Corporation worked through those questions and requests. Between December [2024] last year and March [2025] of this year we responded to all of those requests for information, taking our total submission to nearly 5,000 pages of material. We're about halfway through the 12-month PoSS assessment process. From all accounts it's on track.

The Commission has published its process to move forward to be able to submit a recommendation to the Government later this year. They've indicated that their draft integrated assessment report, which is a critical document in terms of the overall process, is on track to be released on 31 March [2025], which is only a few days away. That's the PoSS process, the precinct plan.

In parallel again with that we've been working through with a whole team of consultants led by Cox Architecture and others. The design process we've progressed from a concept through schematic design. We're now in the really detailed design, which is nearly about 50 per cent complete. Along the way, we've engaged with a whole range of stakeholders and users, including exploring specific details of designs such as sports lighting, turf management, product offerings and functional relationships. Stadiums Tasmania have been key to that work as well.

We still continue to activate the site. Remediation of the site is now nearly complete with independent order to sign off being scheduled for ordered areas 3, 5 and 6, which cover the south-east and south-west corners of the site. We're in the process of getting that independent sign off on the remediation work that's happened over the last year or two.

I might pause at that point, Chair. I'm really happy to take questions.

CHAIR - Sure. One of the things I want to lead off with - and I know you probably have questions too, Josh - is that I understand the WT Partnership were engaged to cost the stadium build. Where's that at the moment? What's the most current advice on that?

Mr EVANS - I might pass to the CEO, Anne Beach

Ms BEACH - Yes, so WT Partnership is our quantity surveyor. They sit alongside our design team and are working throughout the process. That includes working through individual parts of the design and monitoring the broader project. As the Chair said, as part of user

PUBLIC

engagement, there are specific elements that come through and different requests. We'll work through each of those as they're identified for potential inclusion, we'll work with Stadiums Tasmania, draw those up and work through individual costings. WT will help us throughout that design process.

CHAIR - Where is it at the moment? Have we got an estimated cost for the various components at this stage?

Ms BEACH - As part of the information we've provided through the PoSS submission process, we've outlined the different sections that informed that process. The individual sections can be identified through that. The current costings take us through to schematic design. We're just in the detailed design process at the moment.

CHAIR - What are the figures? This is a Committee that wants to be able to report the figures ourselves rather than have to go to the TPC (Tasmanian Planning Commission). Can you tell us what the figures are?

Ms BEACH - We don't have a cost resolved as yet. It depends on how we work through the design process. In the PoSS submission we were sitting at around \$775 million. The final cost will depend on decisions around the inclusion, which we're working through as a detailed design. For example, the fundamentals that are included in the costs that have been identified are things like back of house basic spaces provided for food and beverage, the seating bowl, the roof. Those elements have been set out. The final course will depend on the final things that are resolved to include - the amount of food and beverage, some of the specifications that we're working through with users. That is part of the design process we're going through at the moment.

CHAIR - With the roof, I'm sure you've seen the media this morning, but I had up until that -

Mr WILLIE - You got a letter two weeks ago.

CHAIR - Yes, that's right, but it's public now though, isn't it? Has the design of the roof been finalised?

Ms BEACH - No. The roof that we're working - the stadium has a full roof. A dome design is what's outlined in our design. The design process is going through - so it is fully designed as the shape and the approach, but as we go through the detailed design, that's finessed further.

CHAIR - As I understand it - and I'm happy to be corrected if I'm not right on this - but this sort of roof has not been constructed anywhere else previously?

Ms BEACH - There's lots of roofed stadia across the world. What is unique about this one is there isn't a roof over a facility for cricket, and obviously AFL because AFL was played here. There are roofs over a number of other stadia across the world, so there's a number of models for us to base it on.

The unique nature of this one is it would be the first for cricket. The England and Wales Cricket Board are looking at a potential one in England. They've identified that recently as

something they're interested in doing, but at this point in time there are none that exists. With that come risks. No venue can be accredited until it exists. Having a roofed venue would require us to go through an accreditation process to be able to play things like Test and One Day Internationals.

CHAIR - The risk associated with this roof design, though - as I understand, there's not another roof that spans that same span that's dome-shaped that's made of timber beams. We know and understand there's concerns about that casting shadow on the ground, particularly on a cricket pitch. I'm just trying to understand. There's a huge risk here that hasn't been quantified in terms of dollars, in terms of whether it can be done and how it can be done. Is that the case?

Ms BEACH - There are a few things there. The roof is primarily a steel structure and then it has timber beams as supporting secondary elements. The steel structure and using a steel structure to support a fully covered roof is not unique. Doing it in a dome structure - we need a dome structure for cricket and AFL - is part of the unique element. The shadowing is something we need to work through. Because we have a fully transparent covering, you then get a fair bit of contrast on a fully clear day between the fully transparent element of the covering and then the solid beams. The beams have been made as efficient as we can. They're relatively small, but they are still there, so they do cast a shadow. That's what we've been working through.

There's a number of ways that we can look to address that. With a structural roof that's primarily steel, with timber beams at 5 metre intervals, we can reduce some of those timber beams, which reduces the amount of shadow that casts. We've looked at some of the material that's used; ETFE (ethylene tetrafluoroethylene) is fully transparent. There are other ways we could look at the material that's used in some sections of the roof. We've also looked at ways that we could put in place adaptive measures. This is looking at how the sun is sitting across and projecting shadow during summer, and the areas of the field that would be impacted across the pitch, and how we could protect that to reduce the extent of contrast in the shadow that's produced.

CHAIR - None of this has been costed though, all these mitigation measures?

Ms BEACH - In terms of risk, the cost plan includes a design risk and a construction risk contingency.

CHAIR - What are the contingencies for the design risk and the construction risk?

Ms BEACH - We have a 7 per cent allocation for design contingency and 10 per cent for construction.

Mr EDMUNDS - In the article this morning, it talked about a reinterpretation of what constitutes a roofed stadium. Does that mean that MPDC is still committed to the roofed stadium?

Ms BEACH - Our brief is to design a roofed stadium. That's what we submitted through the PoSS process. As I've said, there's a number of ways we can look at how we manage the shadows. We've modelled those and it is a bit of a unique situation.

One of the things we need to think about is that we are in a planning process. As the Chair noted, we're anticipating seeing a draft integrated assessment report next week alongside everyone else, which I'm sure everyone will be eager to read. As part of that process, there have been through the planning process questions from the community, because this is quite unique about how the roof will work and the impacts of that. We have thought conceptually about what some contingencies might be. Our design though is for a fully roofed stadium.

It is important to note there is a bit of a conversation that I think for people who - I mean, this is new to all of us - about a roof or no roof. All stadia have roofs. It's the extent of roof and the function that they provide. If you look at a stadium, there'll be a roof that will cover patrons, where they're sitting. The extent of cover, it performs a number of functions. One is the drip zone - they're usually between 70-100 per cent - which just means how far it comes out to cover seats. They also perform services and functions and will hold speakers and, in some cases, will support lighting structures as well. If we're looking through the planning process and there are questions about alternatives to the extent of roof, that might be something we need to look at. However, our design is for a fully roofed stadium.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes, and your understanding, from an AFL perspective, is that when they say a 'roofed stadium' they mean the entire coverage of the ground?

Ms BEACH - That's been our interpretation of it, and that's what we've designed.

Mr EDMUNDS - Are you considering any revisions to the PoSS submission?

Ms BEACH - Our submission is our submission, and we'll wait and see what comes out of the draft integrated assessment report, if there are questions that arise out of that. The same as the Chair noted, there were some requests for further information - some of those were clarifications, some of those were further information, and we've responded to those. We'll treat any other questions in the same way.

Mr EDMUNDS - If a significant design change is required, what might that mean for the deadlines and timelines for this project?

Ms BEACH - I don't think we'd anticipate a substantial design change, but if there were questions around different visualisation impacts and how we might manage potential reviews of how the roof is structured and the extent of roof, they are things that we could look at.

As part of our submission, we have heights. We've identified keeping the edges of the stadium as low as possible. There are a number of things that contribute to shadow. As well as all stadia having roofs, all stadia cast shadows. The hard edges of the stadiums will cast shadows. In a large stadium, like the MCG, that will cast a much bigger shadow than something smaller like ours, where the edges are only 22.5 metres high. That reduces the extent of shadow, to some extent.

We would look at the extent of the form that we've designed and how we can work within that. As the Chair noted, the Project of State Significance process is a very extensive one. While visualisations and land use planning is only part of it, they're an important part, so they would inform any alternatives we would look at. There are also things around noise, wind, environmental management, and a lot of things that would be unimpacted. We would look at all those questions, depending on what comes through in that draft assessment.

Mr EDMUNDS - In regards to the story today, are you confident a solution can be found?

Ms BEACH - Throughout the design process, we've had user workshops and there's been a number of questions raised. We work through all of those questions. This is just a question that's been raised. As I noted, there's some design things we can do to mitigate those. It's obviously a complex one that involves risk. For Cricket Tasmania and Cricket Australia, they want to be able to play Tests here, and I believe the community does too, so we need to work through the best way to do that. As they've indicated, a review of the way we've approached the roof is one of those things and that's something we'll have a look at.

Mr EVANS - We've been in communication with Cricket Tasmania and Cricket Australia for months and months now, so this is not a new concern that's been raised with us. We've been working with our specialists to try and mitigate and remove those risks, those issues.

Mr EDMUNDS – Whilst also working towards the criteria in the contract to actually deliver the stadium?

Mr EVANS - Yes.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay, thanks.

Mr WILLIE - The Devils are kicking goals off the field and they are starting to be a few concerns in the community about the Government side of this. How do we prevent this from being another ferry fiasco where it doesn't get delivered? Do you have a plan B if you can't get through the PoSS process?

Ms BEACH - The PoSS process is a 12-month process. It started in September last year and will end in September this year. The community will have the opportunity, as will we, to see the draft integrated assessment report next week. There will then be public consultation and hearings. The Commission will make a recommendation to the Government. It doesn't make an approval. Then the approval goes through the parliament. The report obviously will inform what is put before the parliament. It is a decision for the parliament about what is approved under what conditions, so there's an opportunity there to inform what decisions are made. If the parliament resolves not to proceed with the project because it has concerns, or the assessment hasn't answered some questions it may have, or whatever the case, there is the extensive assessment that's been done. The design work has been done to potentially inform an alternative, but we are focused on the pathway that's been put in front of us. It's an extensive assessment and could inform any other alternative.

Mr WILLIE - What are those alternatives? A legislated act of parliament, or going through major projects or different process?

Ms BEACH - They are all options that Government could consider, but the parliament has the first point of call around whether or not to approve the project.

Mr WILLIE - We are all very aware of that.

PUBLIC

Mr EVANS - It is fair to say that the Corporation has a very specific role. Its role is to take the project through the planning process and prepare a detailed design, and then moving forward into construction. We have a very well-defined role. There will be broader considerations depending on what comes out of the planning assessment, but they'll be broader considerations for the Government that won't really impact on the work that we are doing.

Next week is a really important date, though, because we will see for the first time, in the draft integrated assessment report, the views of the Planning Commission. That's an important milestone and obviously we will need to properly consider and fully consider their draft report and then work out how we respond to that, as will other stakeholders, no doubt.

Mr WILLIE - In terms of that process, you just mentioned the PoSS. We have a letter from Dr Gruen with some concerns around some of the documents that were submitted, particularly the supplementary document from KPMG. He raises concerns that the Planning Commission have asked for an opportunity cost analysis, looking at an alternative project and alternative investment. The document outlines that you don't believe, or KPMG don't believe, that that's necessary. You haven't necessarily submitted all the documents to -

CHAIR - An account of actual estimate as well.

Mr WILLIE - Yes, an account of actual estimate as well, so you haven't necessarily submitted all the documents to the Planning Commission that they're requesting.

Ms BEACH - That's an opinion, and we note that opinion. The 30-page bespoke guidelines that we responded to were designed specifically for this project and they were pretty extensive. They are guidelines, not criteria. We've made best endeavours to respond to every line of those guidelines, and some of those individual dot points have required individual consultancies. It's been quite an extensive piece of work. There are 40 attachments to our original submission and we've just submitted 850 pages of additional further information over the last few months.

In looking at the alternatives, there was no original proposal for a Government-led development at Macquarie Point. An alternative would be a Government-led proposal. Government builds public facilities. In the supplementary report, there is a counterfactual outlined and how that could be approached, and that is our response to that request.

Mr WILLIE - Will there be an opportunity to respond if they say next week that your submission is deficient because you haven't done what we asked?

Ms BEACH - Yes. We will get to see the draft assessment next week, as will everyone. Then, as the Chair said, we will work through that report and look at any further questions that have been raised. We are able to provide further advice and answer further questions, including in the hearing process. That will be an opportunity for us to, in a really open and public forum, answer those questions; present evidence, but also be questioned ourselves.

CHAIR - If I could just go back to that point, in terms of what the KPMG report actually said - it's on page 15 of the supplementary report they prepared - they're talking about the counterfactual assessment, if you like. It says:

PUBLIC

The above examples demonstrate that it is not a trivial task to develop a robust counterfactual investment by the Government. We simply do not have the information required to support such an analysis for an arbitrary public investment.

It seems they've taken it to KPMG on behalf of Macquarie Point Development Corporation, who Commissioned the work, obviously, and have made a decision that they don't have the information they need to actually do that work that was requested by the TPC.

Ms BEACH - The point that they're making there is to be able to say, if the Government were to choose to build something else on the site, which there would have to be a driver for that decision for public infrastructure - they've listed examples like a hospital, transport infrastructure, community sport facilities, something that Government would normally do - there would have to be a decision to do that. Each of those are quite specific infrastructures that would have particular benefits that would require analysis and particular costs. They're specific projects in themselves that would require a comprehensive analysis and are individual projects, it's quite separate to the project that we're focused on here.

CHAIR - Yes, that's the argument KPMG are using, but the TPC did particularly ask for that.

Ms BEACH - It's difficult to compare the merits of developing a stadium, which is what [inaudible] proponents for have been asked to do, to compare that to the development of some transport infrastructure, so if we turned it into a depot, for us to do the analysis about 'what are the benefits of that', it's quite a comprehensive investigation and we'd have to run consultation, we'd have to work with other areas of Government. It's a 'what would the drivers for that be?' It's a whole project in itself. It would be difficult to do that in a genuine way, which is why they've done, more indicatively, looked at other projects that have been Commissioned and work that has been Commissioned that were proposed Government work. They've looked at the Northern Correctional Facility and the proposal for an Antarctic and science precinct and the Hobart airport upgrades where they could at least have access to some data where there was some analysis behind those numbers and they could do something where they felt that was in a genuine way rather than doing an arbitrary benefit analysis that wasn't really informed.

CHAIR - Have you got any indication of what's been spent to date on preparing all these documents? Obviously, there's a lot of consultants you've had to pay, so have you got an update on what's been spent to date?

Ms BEACH - On the project to date it's approximately \$12 million.

CHAIR - Can you provide a breakdown of that?

Ms BEACH - Yes.

CHAIR - Not now, later.

Ms BEACH - Yes, we can take that on notice.

CHAIR - In terms of the design, it seems that you're getting into the more detailed component of that. We still expect to see the integrated draft assessment next week, have you

had detailed discussions with broadcasters to get their input into this and have they basically signed off on where you're at at this stage?

Ms BEACH - One of our user groups is media and broadcast, another is emergency services, and then we work with users like rectangular sports, cricket, AFL, but the media and broadcaster one we meet with pretty regularly. What we do at stages in the design process is give them a brief on how we're going through the process and then it allows us a two-way discussion around different things.

Lighting is one of the ones where we've worked through different lux levels and where they'll be, we work through camera positions so they can see exactly where cameras will be, different heights, angles, different sections of the field. That's a continuing iterative process as we work through that.

Similar to all other users, they'll flag any questions that we need and we continue to work through that, but we haven't - it's not so much as sign off, as such as we continue to go through the design, but haven't been any issues as such to flag that there's substantive issues with the design.

CHAIR - What about access for bump-in and bump-out for broadcasters but also event - concerts and the like?

Ms BEACH - Yes, so part of particularly the back of house - so that underground design includes - there's outside broadcast - is a dedicated facility which we're required to provide. That's part of the venue guidelines for a number of sporting codes. We're making sure we can provide for those. There're four parking spaces for outside broadcast. The location of media rooms is important. Where we have written press, radio, they all have allocated spaces and there's different requirements for different sports. Media will be involved in that, but so are different users. For example, cricket like to sit in a different location to AFL, so we make sure we have the requirements they need around the different elements.

CHAIR - In terms of the external access, like in the parking you've got four parking spaces - I don't know, will they cater for big semis trailer?

Ms BEACH - Yes, so the outside broadcaster large trucks, and there's four parking spaces for those to meet their tier 2 requirements.

CHAIR - And they don't impinge on Evans Street or any access?

Ms BEACH - They'll be entirely invisible. This is part of our below ground facilities where all the outside broadcasts will be. This is a safety element but it also provides a secure environment; people are coming, pedestrians coming to and from the stadium, and will be completely separated from those outside, those internal functions.

CHAIR - Is there any carparking underground as well?

Ms BEACH - For operational purposes, yes.

CHAIR - How many spaces?

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - We need to accommodate 40 car parks to meet the Tasmanian and AFL - the Tasmanian Government AFL agreement requirements

CHAIR - That's all been signed off?

Ms BEACH - We can accommodate that in the facility.

Mr WILLIE - Your submission to PoSS excludes a number of costs, including moving of the Goods Shed. The Heritage Council have made a submission saying that there hasn't been a feasibility study done on whether the Goods Shed could be moved. What happens in that instance if it is found that it can't be moved?

Ms BEACH - This is part of the scope of the Project of State Significance application. The *Cultural Heritage Act* has been called in as part of the PoSS. It's all part of the one assessment, part of the recommendations that the Planning Commission will make. There are a number of things we will need to do as part of that. One is the development of a conservation management plan, and we are just working on providing a first iteration of that to the Commission, to inform their assessment. That informs how we will manage the pack-down and the relocation and then the re-establishment of that. The relocation of that is part of the submission through the Project of State Significance process, and the funding of that will be from the Corporation's existing funds.

Mr WILLIE - From the existing funds of the Corporation? Okay, so it won't be part of a public-private partnership to have some sort of commercial arrangement to move that?

Ms BEACH - The pack-down, relocation and re-establishment of that structure will be funded by the Corporation.

Mr WILLIE - Hobart City Council have a number of concerns that they've raised about infrastructure surrounding the stadium that is required for flow of people and a range of other things. It's in line with Dr Gruen's second recommendation that the stadium fits in with a broader plan for Hobart. There's a northern access road, a Collins Street active travel bridge to get pedestrians into the city, event bus plaza, and reconfiguration of 47 Hunter Street carpark. How are they going to be funded?

Ms BEACH - They were identified in our transport study that identified those elements. There has been a number of iterations that inform this. The first was our precinct plan, which the Chair mentioned before. That was the initial piece of work that then informed the transport study that became part of our Project of State Significance application. In doing that work, we formed a working group that included Hobart City Council officers, it included Department of State Growth representatives. We were making sure, when we were planning for the stadium when it's operational, we were thinking about how the city would be operating in any planned or existing infrastructure strategies and services, as well as infrastructure. That's why the thinking included things like Hobart City Council's proposed pedestrian bridge from Collins Street across -

Mr WILLIE - The highway.

Ms BEACH - Yes. That was one of the things that we considered as part of the planning, because it was identified and we were asked to do that as part of integrated planning. That

engagement was at officer level. Just working through the four things that you identified: the northern access road was originally identified in the Hobart City Deal as a northern access road to the port. It's really important for Antarctic logistics. That is a Crown project, so that would be led through the Department of State Growth and funded through the infrastructure program. In the 2024-25 Budget, there is \$3 million allocated to the design and planning of that, which will inform the final budget of that project.

TasPorts have put in a representation as part of the Hobart Local Provisions Schedule finalisation, seeking a utility zone for that road, because it is really important for the operation of the port. That's why we included it in our precinct plan working closely with TasPorts. The budget for that will be informed by the planning process that is underway, and State Growth is working on that at the moment.

The travel bridge we did include in our modelling, but we considered with and without that bridge, because it's not a state-led project, so it's not something we can control. We also weren't sure around the timeline of when that would be in place and if it would be in place. We have, in our supplementary transport advice that we submitted through the RFI process over January, February and March, clarified that that's a required element. It will require some operations to support the movement of people. If we don't have people going over that bridge, we will have a larger amount of people that are walking alongside Davey Street, which might require some operations for the particularly large events, so when we have a sell-out or a concert.

Mr WILLIE - Does that mean traffic management, shutting down lights and things like that to allow the flow of people?

Ms BEACH - Yes. It may require a restricted use of one of the lanes or more of the lanes to just provide wider space for people to walk along. That already happens for events now. We have events that are larger than we can fit in the stadium that happen in Hobart already. We have lanes closed down for things like Run the Bridge, the ironman events, where it's pretty standard for those -

Mr WILLIE - Yes, but at non-peak times - very early in the morning.

Ms BEACH - We have also had Dark Park closing down lanes and similar, and it's a relatively limited period just during that exit, so it can be controlled and there is precedent for them.

Mr EVANS - Taste of Summer's another one.

Ms BEACH - The bus event plaza is actually an extension to the northern access road, so that's where the northern access road comes into our site. It's an extension of the pedestrian area. so it's making sure we have enough width to have the bus parking and safe space for people to be on and off. That's gate 4 of the stadium and that's where we'll have the event day buses where people can come in and out efficiently. That will be an extension of the northern access road project.

The last one you mentioned was Hunter Street. Just for clarity, for people that might not have seen, there's Evans Street and then Hunter Street, next to the Mures space. At the end of that, there is a carpark area next to the IXL Jam Factory. That area is a car park. It's a bit uneven,

PUBLIC

so the intent there was, when we have a large number of pedestrians coming through Sullivans Cove, there are some tripping hazards. That was estimated to cost around \$300,000 to level out some of that area just to avoid some tripping hazards, which we would address.

Mr WILLIE - In terms of the things that aren't funded - there was a Goods Shed - some of this stuff it sounds like State Growth might pick up, but it's unknown what the funding source will be yet and whether some of it is required straightaway. Then there's revenue-generating facilities that haven't been included in the cost. I'm interested in the public-private partnership progress. We had a release from Mr Abetz in January saying that there had been some interest, and I think there was some 'market sounding' process?

CHAIR - Market sounding process.

Mr WILLIE - Market sounding process. I haven't had an update since then, I don't believe. How many people expressed an interest in that first round?

Ms BEACH - The first part of the question is around those other costs. The relocation of Goods Sheds and the carpark - the carpark is likely something we could address as well as the Goods Shed relocation and Crown for the infrastructure of the road.

On market sounding, registrations closed, as he said, in January, sort of mid-January. There were just over 40 registrations received. During February, there were meetings with some of those parties, working through getting some feedback. I think that all parties that made a submission had an opportunity to provide a written questionnaire and have input into that process. That was an inter-agency process, given the importance of getting cross-agency advice and input into that. The feedback from that is currently being considered, it hasn't been formally closed out as yet, and will inform Government decision around delivery.

Mr WILLIE - Out of the 40, are we able to have a breakdown on what part of the sector they represent - whether they're a tier 1 construction firm or whether they're a private equity firm, without identifying any of them?

Ms BEACH - Yes. We didn't run the process, but did have officers involved in it. We could certainly get you a list of the types of entities that participated.

Mr EVANS - We were part of that process,

Mr WILLIE - Part of the Government's, yes.

Mr EVANS - Run by Premier's Department, State Growth, Treasury, and we inputted, along with Stadiums Tasmania, so it's a whole-of-Government or intergovernmental.

Ms BEACH - We can take that on notice to get a list of the scope.

Mr EDMUNDS - With that, though, can we also have the quantity of each one as well, rather than the least? Is that possible?

Ms BEACH - Yes, I can certainly ask the question.

Mr EDMUNDS - Thank you.

PUBLIC

Mr WILLIE - I think I heard you correctly saying that the Macquarie Point Development Corporation can cover the costs of moving the Goods Shed. Will that require further borrowings on your behalf as an organisation or you can meet that within your existing budget?

Ms BEACH - No. We're managing that within our existing budget.

Mr WILLIE - Okay. Do you have an estimated cost for that?

Ms BEACH - \$6,500,000.

Mr WILLIE - \$6,500,000 to move the whole building?

Ms BEACH - Well, it's a heritage-listed building, so it will be pulling it apart - it isn't a nice, uniform structure, so all the parts will need to be carefully numbered and managed, then it needs to be carefully reconstructed. There'll potentially be some storage in between as well, so we've allowed a fair bit of contingency in that.

Mr WILLIE - That includes putting new footings down on the whole lot?

Ms BEACH - Yes. Also, it is an old building and we need to make sure we have allowed for making sure it's structurally sound when we put it back in place.

CHAIR - Have you had any contingency for what might be underneath the Goods Shed? Because that's obviously an area you haven't been able to drill completely under. I know you have done around, but what's the contingency there?

Ms BEACH - We have sampled around the Goods Shed. As you said, obviously, we haven't gone underneath. As part of the project budget, we have an allocation for the excavation of that area to bring it down to the road - the level of the field will be about the same as the road, but it does vary across the site. It'll be relative level 3, which is about what the road is if you're standing equivalent, and that's included in the scope of the excavations required.

CHAIR - The excavations as part of the project, not the removal of the Goods Shed?

Ms BEACH - That is right, because the Goods Shed is in part of the space that will need to be excavated.

CHAIR - Have you allowed a contingency for that? Because you don't really know what's under there?

Ms BEACH - Remediation. We have included remediation of that whole section. That includes sampling and then needing to - depending on the levels and what we find, there is the different locations where we can then dispose of those.

CHAIR - Have you got a contingency to cover the cost of that? You know roughly and you've done a lot of the remediation on site already in the other parts, but not here, obviously, because the sheds is there.

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - Yes, but we have sampled around it and we've been able to estimate some of it that could be level 3, which is worst-case scenario and some level 2. We have allowed some capacity for that.

CHAIR - You have allowed for an expensive excavation because of the nature of that material underneath?

Ms BEACH - That's right. When we do remediation, the area is then capped so that it provides protection between what's new and what's being managed.

CHAIR - When you investigate an old house, you never know what you're going to find underneath it until you lift the floor boards.

Ms BEACH - Yes, which is why we cap it once we have done that so that if you dig down you know when you have hit where we've got to.

Mr BEHRAKIS - To segue back to the conversation around game day traffic - or event day traffic, it's not just about the games. What comparison has been done of expected game day traffic and expected game day people movements compared to day-to-day traffic and other large events that have been held in the past such as Dark MOFO and Dark Park and stuff like that? What has the MPDC team learned from that? Have they factored that in going forward?

Ms BEACH - As part of the traffic modelling, we have been required to model what the traffic situation will be like in 2030 and all the way up to 2050 and look at that on a normal day and also game day. What we have found is that, on a worst-case scenario, a Friday night game when we'd have a lot of people already - the network already under a bit of pressure and people coming into the city for the game - the extent of delay would be no worse than a Monday to Friday peak. What people would experience sitting in their car getting to work every day of the week, it will be no more than that.

Mr BEHRAKIS - Is that because people are moving the opposite way to the peak hour traffic in the afternoon?

Ms BEACH - It is because there's not actually that many cars. If we achieve even close to what we were targeting for 24,500 people, which is a fully booked out venue - that's seated and standing for a game - when we're activating the field. If we're able to get 40 per cent of people using private cars or taxi or rideshare, then we're looking at 7,350 people coming by car and 2450 people coming by taxi or rideshare. When we allow two to three people in those vehicles, it is actually only 2,823 cars. There're 6,000 car parks already available within a short walking distance to the site. If we look at concert venue, we're looking at around the equivalent sort of estimations - we're only looking at 3,630 cars. It's still well under what's already available.

If our targets are not even close to being met, we still have almost double the car parking capacity already available than what will be required.

CHAIR - That's assuming they are all empty; all the car parks are empty.

PUBLIC

Ms BEACH - It is, but when we only need a small portion of them, I think that people get a bit anxious because they hear a large number of seats and capacity and then sort of think that is how many cars are on the road -

Mr BEHRAKIS - 24,000 people with 24,000 cars is the immediate sort of thought, I suppose, but that's not how it factors down.

Ms BEACH - That's right. One of the real assets in having a centrally based stadium is some of the people that are travelling are already in the location. If we were to build the stadium somewhere that's a bit more remote, it means every single person has to travel and all that pressure is on the network. By putting it in a central location, we're allowing for people to already be quite central and they may live, they may have travelled in advance, and they're able to walk and they already are existing services and infrastructure that they can use to get there. It reduces the pressure on the network.

Mr BEHRAKIS - A different tangent -

CHAIR - Can I cut to the public transport access while you are on that?

Mr BEHRAKIS - Yes.

CHAIR - I understand that part of the precinct plan identified a coach pick up and drop off at the domain. Can you update the Committee on where the discussions with Hobart City Council are regarding that?

Ms BEACH - I might need to take that on notice. I'm not sure that we've resolved the specific coach drop off. We do have the event plaza, the event day bus drop-off. I think we haven't yet resolved the coach specific drop off, which would be about 2 per cent of people. Individual patrons for a sell-out of using the field - of 24,500 it would be 490 people - and in concert mode would be up to 630 people. It's not a huge number, but I might have to check that and come back to you.

CHAIR - Okay. Those numbers that you're reading out there, how have you put those together in terms of making - there's obviously assumptions in that of how many people will use a bus, how many people will walk, how many people will drive their car and try and park, and a number of people who use taxis and rideshare arrangements.

Ms BEACH - Yes, so as part of our transport study, there are a number of things that were undertaken. One was origin studies to look at where people were coming from and another is the transport study that then modelled how people would get to the venue. In attachment 1 of our transport study - which is appendix N of our post-submission, which I can send a link to the Committee to - there's this summary - which I can leave a copy - that shows the modal targets for each of those. We have 31 per cent of people coming on our public bus, be that rapid bus, event bus or using park and ride facilities and then connecting to an existing bus service. 30 per cent of people coming via private car. That includes both parking and when people are being dropped off by a friend or family member and then walking some of the way. 22 per cent of people walking, so starting not from a car but actually walking from a nearby location. 10 per cent of people taking taxi or rideshare. 3 per cent using cycling or scooting - scootering, I'm not sure what the verb for scooting is. Scooting?

CHAIR - Riding a scooter.

Ms BEACH - Riding a scooter. 2 per cent on coach - it is important to differentiate between a bus, a public service and coach, which is when there's a dedicated coach private service - which is 2 per cent and 2 per cent people coming via ferry.

Mr BEHRAKIS - On a different tangent, because it's something that's been talked about a little bit. How are we ensuring in the design of the stadium that there'll be opportunities for local producers and local retailers to get exposure and leverage that Tasmanian element and Tasmanian businesses? Recently, I visited the Albert Brewery with a few Ministers - Abetz and Howlett - and we heard from them and they were pretty keen to and put forward pretty strongly to see local producers - not just them - benefit from getting all these people - interstate visitors - down and being able to leverage that. What do we have to tell them? What opportunities will they have to get exposure on game day and event days?

Ms BEACH - Yes, it's an important question. It's where we're up to in the design process to start to look at some of those spaces and some of those opportunities. I think what we can say is that that is an important part of the design and there will absolutely be opportunities to showcase local suppliers, providers and brands. We're working through the design and build process; Stadiums Tasmania will be operating and we work really closely with them about how they would like to activate the space. In working closely with them, this is something they have highlighted as an objective for them to make sure it's something that they're delivering. There will be opportunities to showcase Tasmanian products. Part of this is about delivering choice for people who are visiting but also showcasing what Tasmania has to offer.

It'll be about balancing venue value for people that are coming and choice for people coming to the venue, but also revenue for Stadiums Tasmania. They will obviously have larger supplies as well. Some of the examples, in talking to Stadiums Tasmania, they've referenced that when they're looking at other venues, some of those larger deals, they do tend to look at reflecting an increasing need of venues wanting to have local product. Instead of having full coverage, they tend to have, for the larger deals, somewhere around 70 per cent coverage. It means that you then have spaces that can be dedicated for local product. That's how you can manage licensing and similar within a venue.

CHAIR - Just to take another direction on local impact, what recent consultation has there been with key stakeholders, such as Federal Group, TSO, RSL, the Hotel Grand Chancellor, et cetera, particularly in terms of access to their properties, and noise and other impacts on them? That's part of it - what consultation have you been doing with them? Will access be a challenge during construction, particularly via Evans Street?

Ms BEACH - Evans Street will remain open. It's really important for some of those businesses. It states in our precinct plan that Evans Street will remain open. Any closures will be limited to immediate hours around an event. It's important for the operation of the port. It's important for businesses such as Federal Group that operate in that space. There are a number of smaller businesses that operate in the commercial cruise zone of the port that require that, and we require it for our precinct as well. On Evans Street, the street-side interaction will be shopfront style space. There will be opportunity for day-to-day seven-days a week interaction there as well. It is a critical access point from the stadium and our service vehicles.

PUBLIC

In terms of engaging with stakeholders, as the chair said, there was the broad engagement we did at the start of the precinct planning process. For each of those stakeholders it has been more around the things that are important to them. For example, the TSO, a critical thing for them is noise, and vibration as well as noise, because that can result in a noise in their building. The chair also mentioned that we've been finishing off some physical remediation works last year. We installed vibration and noise monitors inside and outside Federation Concert Hall and also in a room in the Hotel Grand Chancellor, with the support of the Hotel Grand Chancellor as well as the TSO, and also in the Henry Jones Art Hotel, working with Federal Group. This allowed us to monitor, as we were working through, some of those more disruptive works, like cutting concrete, if there was any noise experienced, and to give us some baseline data to help inform construction.

With things like the noise analysis you then did, I provide a copy of that to the TSO five weeks ahead of making our PoSS submission. I have conversations with the CEO around that work. We're currently doing an assessment of that building to understand a bit more about the Federation Hall's ability to withstand noise. That can then inform both the construction and the operation of the stadium.

With Federal Group, we've had, I guess, occasional conversations. We notify them of things that are relevant, like when the market testing process started, we made sure they were aware of that. We shared the concept designs and had some engagement around those, at key stages in the project to keep them informed.

With the RSL, their issues I think are pretty well articulated and known, around the sightlines that run around the edge of the stadium. Our discussions with them are more around the proximity of the precinct to the Cenotaph and how there can be opportunities for there to be spaces they could potentially use or operate from, and support events that they may have.

Was there another stakeholder you mentioned, sorry?

CHAIR - You've sort of touched on it a little bit, you said that Evans Street would be closed during events. I believe you said that.

Ms BEACH - Yes, for a limited period Evans Street would be closed for safety around events. There would be a manage point that would enable restricted traffic, but it would be closed to general traffic during an event.

CHAIR - A guest arriving or a cruise ship needing access to the cruise centre, or the people engaged in cruising would have to find another way to access their accommodation or the cruise centre, is that what you're saying?

Ms BEACH - They're already - when cruise ships come in, because people arrive by foot, the roads between there and Sullivan's Cove tend to be closed for safety for the large number of pedestrians. What's more important is access for those hotel guests and similar that might be using those spaces. There is ability to use Hunter Street as a direct access to there and there would be opportunity for. There is a control point in our transport map that I'll send a link through to for a control point to allow for limited access through there as well.

CHAIR - Have people on the Federal Group commented on that?

Ms BEACH - Their preference would be for the road to be open all the time, but it already is closed for events that occur now.

CHAIR - Are the operational cost for the stadium factored in and have you got any formal advice on that, the operational costs?

Ms BEACH - Part of the work KPMG did as part of the economic cost benefit analysis was informed by operating costs. That was submitted as part of the PoSS process. They looked at the events that we forecast to use the stadium and the associated costs with operating the venue. It also considers life cycle costs of the stadium itself, so the actual maintenance of the facility.

Mr EDMUNDS - I was just keen to ask a few timeline questions if that's alright. What deadlines are you working to for the stadium?

Ms BEACH - The agreement sets out some key milestones that are set out in there. The submission as we've talked about was made in September and we're working towards a planning approval coming out of there. That's slightly behind the initial targeted milestone of end of June, so we're looking more likely to be - it does need to go through Parliament so the report will come back from the TPC mid-September going through the Parliament, we're likely to see approval October or November, noting there are limited sitting days in October and the Parliament will want to take some time to consider this, I imagine. So, there's no change in that timeline from when it was submitted in September, but it is a slight delay of a few months compared to the previous target. The agreement also sets out that in October we'll need to notify the AFL of our anticipated 60 per cent completion date and then the furthest completion date within the agreement sets out that the stadium must be complete by 31 December 2030.

Mr EVANS - It is fair to say though that in terms of that planning approval date, the AFL itself has been taken on that journey. They've been part of the steering Committee, so there's no surprise to the AFL around that. Their view, like ours, is get the planning submission, right, rather than work towards an artificial day.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay, just to be clear, I think you've just said it, but just to be crystal clear, the AFL has accepted that there will be a change to that deadline.

Mr EVANS - Those matters still need to be negotiated between the Government and the AFL, but I do understand that there have been discussions with the CEO as recently as a month or so ago. He was briefed on the timeline. He seemed pretty supportive and pretty comfortable.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay and you did touch on the 60 per cent completion. Are you confident that you will achieve that 60 per cent completion two and a half years from now?

Ms BEACH - We need to - by 31 October [2025] this year, we need to notify or if we don't think we'll meet that 60 per cent completion and give a date for that. So we'll work through to make sure we can provide an update by then.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay and are you able to -

Mr WILLIE - Sorry, it will be hard to give an update if Parliament hasn't considered it and voted. How are you going to proceed?

Ms BEACH - Well, we'll be able to give an estimate based on our work program of when we'd anticipate construction will start and we'll need to also confirm how 60 per cent will be measured. So 60 per cent of work, 60 per cent spend will just need to work through what that means and then we can clarify our projected date.

Mr EVANS - The priority is to take this through the planning system, but in parallel with, as I've indicated earlier, we're working on the detailed design. We're working on what a procurement process might look like so we're ready to move, but that's work that we would need to do subject to the Parliament's decision. We wouldn't start that work [inaudible]. We need to be moving and getting ourselves prepared and ready.

CHAIR - For parliament to make a decision - and I don't know what the TPC is going to say and I'm sure you don't either just yet - but will the parliament have the actual realistic estimated cost of the project available to make a decision?

Ms BEACH - Because we'll have clarity on what is proposed and if there's any changes we need to make or any tweaks to the design, we would be able to articulate that so the parliament can make a decision based on our cost estimate.

Mr EDMUNDS - Back to the timeline questions. You might table this, I'm not sure. Are you potentially able to outline your key milestones and when you expect to hit planning approval, commencement of construction, key construction milestones and the dates you expect to be hitting those? Is that something you can provide? Pending, obviously, the work Mr Evans just spoke in terms of preparing for an approval in advance?

Ms BEACH - Yes, we could give some indications.

Mr EVANS - They'd only be indications.

Mr EDMUNDS - Yes.

Ms BEACH - As you noted, the caveats are work starting on approval. Obviously, we're doing a fair bit of planning about how we can move as quickly as we can. That includes identifying early works we can do and look to commence on approval but have started the process we need to go through to identify someone to do that work through our procurement framework. If there's an approval, they can start straight away just so we're maximising the time and doing this as quickly as we can.

I do have a summary that sets out the planning process and the key stages in that that I can leave with the Committee, but we can also look at some of those other dates that you've mentioned as well.

CHAIR - Do you want to table those documents now and then we

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Mr EDMUNDS - You might not be able to answer this, but has there been any steer from the Government about which block of sitting weeks they expect this to come in? I'm just looking at the schedule now. We've got two in September [2025], then a break for school

holidays and then - yes, there's some serious gaps in October [2025], for instance. Have they given any indication about when they might expect to do this?

Ms BEACH - The report would be due on 17 September [2025]. My understanding is that's gazetted. I think everyone will see that report, including the Premier, who's the responsible Minister for that act, who will receive the report. Then it will need to be considered and then the proposal prepared for parliament's considerations. I wouldn't imagine it would be an October presentation.

There're obviously some decisions for Government around what they would like to present.

Mr EDMUNDS -Yes, the first, the first sitting of the House of Assembly in October [2025] is the 28th.

Mr WILLIE - If Parliament requires more information, it's got to progress through two houses, the debate.

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Mr WILLIE - It could potentially be held up.

Ms BEACH - We'll be available to assist that in any way we can, but they'll be decisions for Government about what they table and when, and we'll be available to brief and support and answer any questions.

CHAIR - Are there any - or if they're not in place now, when will there be - commercial arrangements in place to contemplate the team getting revenue streams from stadium events? Is that something that's being worked on now or is that a later, down the path?

Ms BEACH - Yes, based on the design work we're doing, Stadiums Tasmania are working through some early work to inform a business operating plan so they can start to think about what revenue generating opportunities there will be and different ways we can then consider what to include in the design. That work is sort of starting now.

CHAIR - What do you anticipate will be the revenue streams from within the stadium for the team?

Ms BEACH - Key things that have been flagged are big event. They're things like concerts and sporting games. A big part of what the stadium will offer and has been an important part of our thinking is some of the corporate and business events and some of those small events that won't require all the event day buses, but they are important. They're looking at attendances of 250 people plus, but allow bringing in people from interstate and having those. There'd be somewhere between 100 and 150 of those a year where we're activating the function room capability, which has 1,500 person sit down space and allows to have functions and events, but also having the Goods Shed and the meeting room facilities means that they can be exhibitions and allows us to have those much larger events that we are struggling to get in those sorts of one to four-thousand type venues.

PUBLIC

On a day-to-day operation, on both game and non-game or non-event days, food and beverage will be an important offering. Including we are looking at opportunities to have spaces that could be fit out for restaurants so allows people to come to the facility every day even when there is not an event on.

CHAIR - I am talking about revenue for the team. I imagine if it is a private operator providing food and beverage, then the money will go to the private operator. They won't do it for nothing - out of the charity for the team, I would imagine.

Ms BEACH - Sorry, I was more outlining for Stadiums Tasmania as the operator. There are opportunities for the team, it will depend on what they want to use the stadium for. There will be for any team activating it, whether that is for cricket, AFL, rectangular sports - there'll be merchandise sort of spaces, there's a number of fit-out, cold shell, I guess, spaces that can be fitted out along Evans Street that could be a presence every day of the week. There's a range of facilities, so it will depend on how the team would like to use it and opportunities to activate that. We are just starting those types of conversations with the teams now about how we can theme and activate individual spaces, and we will need to get feedback from the individual teams about what they would like to use the stadium for outside of its core functions.

Mr EVANS - As Anne has outlined, the team is really critical.

CHAIR - This is why this stadium is being built as I understand the agreement. That is why I want to talk about how the team are going to be financially sustainable.

Mr EVANS - We are focusing more on the multipurpose nature of the stadium and the total offering. Anne mentioned the 1,500-seat conference facility, that will put us in the market for a whole range of business events, for example, that we currently miss out on in Tasmania.

CHAIR - Yes, I want to focus on the team for a minute because the team - Mr Dillon himself said that he will want to set the team up for success - and part of that is the stadium. What I am interested in is how - in this whole development of the plan for the stadium, acknowledging all the other possible revenue streams for Stadiums Tasmania - how will the team directly benefit, what revenue streams will they have, and what's been worked on to support the financial sustainability of the team?

Ms BEACH - There is a couple of things there. When there are discussions around using the stadium and setting the team up for success, part of that is around having facilities. Having the back of house and all the player facilities that we are designing and meeting current requirements. The current venue guidelines that are emerging make sure we are meeting those requirements. That is about being at par with our counterparts that would be in the competition already, so being able to offer comparable or better facilities both for training and for competition. That is where the stadium is critical. That is the bit where we have a role. In terms of the revenue generating, the team would be best able to comment on that directly.

Mr EVANS - When Mr Dillon talked about setting the team up for success, he is talking about things like the training and admin facilities, he's talking about playing in a boutique high-quality stadium. It is the total experience that makes -

CHAIR - Yes, but the cost of running a team is not insignificant.

PUBLIC

Mr WILLIE - The business case requires \$18 million from stadium revenue, corporate partnerships, and memberships. There is a significant revenue part to the business case from the stadium.

Ms BEACH - Yes, part of that is things like merchandise, but it is also seating, so spaces for members and similar. In terms of the add-ons that the team is envisaging, they would be best to comment on those.

Mr EDMUNDS - I have a question going back to the conversation about deadlines and timelines. I want to double-check. I believe you said that the latest completion date that the agreement sets out is the stadium must be complete 31 December 2030. Is that correct?

Ms BEACH - That is what the agreement has, yes.

Mr EDMUNDS - That's not a revision of the date?

Ms BEACH - No, that's what's in the agreement.

Mr EDMUNDS - That's the furthest date that was agreed, not the necessarily the target date?

Ms BEACH - Yes, if you look in - yes, the stadium must be complete by 31 December 2030 - is the final date in the agreement.

Mr EDMUNDS - Is that the new target? Or is that still the furthest date?

Ms BEACH - That is the maximum we would be working to, when it must be complete by.

Mr EDMUNDS - Okay, thanks.

Mr BEHRAKIS - We've spoken about traffic and siting and some of the planning aspects. It obviously comes down to one of the things that's been talked about a lot, which is the siting and the location of the stadium. What's the considerations around the selection of the site at Mac Point, what are the advantages of that versus other locations? It is something that gets spoken about quite a lot.

Ms BEACH - Yes, it is. It does come up a lot. There are a number of things that make our site particularly useful for infrastructure subsidies. One is the sheer size. Some of the ideas that have been spoken about over time look at dividing the site into smaller parcels. As a large piece of land close to the city, the opportunity to develop large infrastructure to service the city is quite unique. That's one of the key characteristics of the site that makes it quite unique.

An important one is state ownership. If we were needing to acquire land, there's cost and time in property acquisition that would impact on the ability to deliver both to a set price but also to a time line, that brings in quite a bit of uncertainty.

I already mentioned the proximity to the city from an accessibility point of view for transport and the need to then top up, I guess, rather than have to take that whole transport task.

The proximity to the CBD also means there's the existing services that are already there, like hotels, bars, cafes and restaurants and all those businesses that are nearby. That's something we've particularly seen in speaking to the Adelaide redevelopment that happened there, seeing some of those businesses - not necessarily new ones, but just existing ones - getting substantial increases in trade. There's real opportunity to both provide good quality services, but to support the businesses that are already there.

Another key part is the work that has already been done. The site is part of the remediation. Not only has the site been remediated, we've also done significant site investigations. That means Aboriginal cultural heritage, European heritage. We've done archaeological studies. The investigations we've done mean that we've already identified any areas of significance and we can avoid those in where we place infrastructure. It removes time delays in then doing those investigations and discovering those as we go.

We've done significant geo-technological investigations with over 700 bore sites, which informs design and is work that doesn't need to be done, because we've already completed it.

By being close to the city and having the space, it can be part of a mixed-use precinct. In some of the stadia that we've looked at, they're quite isolated assets that people travel to. They go to the stadium and then they go home after the event. Having development around the stadium will allow it to be activated every day and it avoids it being sort of a 'dead swan'.

CHAIR - Can I just come back to when we were talking about some of the key neighbouring stakeholders, which we've named up. Can you provide, maybe not now, but maybe on notice if you haven't got it now, is when you last met with each of those stakeholders? Do you have that information now?

Ms BEACH - I don't have it in front of me, but I could indicate when I last met in person and when I last sent any correspondence to them.

CHAIR - Yes, and so broadly, there was some that you indicated you probably haven't talked to for a while. Was some of the most recent engagement with some of these stakeholders prior to your presentation of information to the Tasmanian Planning Commission?

Ms BEACH - In September [2024]?

CHAIR - Yes.

Ms BEACH - Yes. They'd be before and after.

CHAIR - You have spoken to some of them after?

Ms BEACH - Yes.

CHAIR - Do you know which ones you've spoken to after?

Mr EVANS - The RSL was December [2024].

Ms BEACH - Yes. The TSO would have been after, the Regatta Association, I think, is after, and the Federal Group was certainly after.

CHAIR - Can you provide the dates for those, and the cruise centre as well? I assume you spoke to them?

Ms BEACH - Do you mean TasPorts?

CHAIR - Whoever is the stakeholder you speak to in relation to that, maybe TasPorts, because it's their facility.

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Mr BEHRAKIS - Whilst we're waiting for the planning process to get underway and conclude, what work's being done on site, especially remediation work, to get ready for the development? How extensive has that work been? Have any Tasmanian companies been used to deliver that work or carry out that work?

Ms BEACH - Yes. As of January the last key areas to remediate have been the south-east and south-west. In the south-east, we had to remove historic naval diesel pipe and remove that section out. Previously before that there was an old shed that we removed from there. The south-west used to be part of the old gasworks, so we needed to do some excavations and some in situ solidification works below ground. In the south-west, it was just under 1.5 hectares of work, space that we treated and removed 14,600 metres cubed of material, and treated 1,400 metres cubed of tar-impacted material below ground. In situ solidification is where a concrete slurry is pumped into the ground and mixed in with the soil, and it avoids any groundwater contamination.

In the south-east we worked through removal of that pipe. That work is now complete. As the chair noted, all physical works have been complete on those. We're just working through our independent auditor verification process. The works were completed by BlackCap Construction in both instances, they led both of those.

In addition to that work, we have been doing a number of other things around [inaudible] for the infrastructure upgrades - working closely with TasNetworks, working with TasWater who are currently on site to install a pump station to enable works to progress for the wastewater treatment plant relocation.

We've also been doing works that are enabling but non-physical, working with Skills Tasmania and Keystone to develop a workforce training plan. Particularly with the construction and this period, there's a real opportunity for Tasmanians to have an uplift in terms of apprentices and pathways. We're looking at how we can create a pathway in to be ready and then have Tasmanian apprentices that are part of that construction process. We're working to develop a workforce plan to enable that to happen.

Mr BEHRAKIS - That's great. I suppose aside from things like the Bridgewater bridge, this kind of construction is something that's not common in Tasmania. It's not like we can just pull from the people doing resi work to work on this. It's a very specific sort of skill set.

Ms BEACH - Yeah, that's right. The broad spectrum of skills means that because this is an isolated development, we'll have other developments on site. There'll be opportunity to work on a number of projects, which will hopefully give an interesting skill set for people to then take into other things.

PUBLIC

Mr EDMUNDS - Do you hold any concerns with the potential for the Bridgewater bridge to be finished shortly, and approval process for the stadium that, if parliaments are relied on, sounds like it'll be November, that there's risk of losing some of that workforce?

Ms BEACH - I think that if we have a procurement process underway, that will help provide some certainty around the pathway. It will be important for that work to commence to minimise any gap.

Mr EDMUNDS - The early workaround, as you say, around the Tasmanian jobs plan and apprentices et cetera?

Ms BEACH - That's right. I think if we can map out our plans around supporting those pathways - but the advantage of looking for opportunity for early works as well is that by disaggregating that from the main contract, it means more likelihood that there'll be local businesses that are able to do those smaller parcels of work to help, once we have an approval, do some of that prep before the larger-scale work commences.

Mr WILLIE - Just earlier, did you say that you're now working to a 2030 timeframe on the stadium?

Ms BEACH - I said that's the end date in the agreement.

Mr WILLIE - That's the end date in the agreement.

Ms BEACH - Yes.

Mr WILLIE - Okay, so you're still working to a 2028 date?

Ms BEACH - The date for the season is the 2029 season, so we're focusing on that.

Mr WILLIE - You have to be 50 per cent completed in the agreement in 2028.

Ms BEACH - We have a completion notification for 60 per cent completion where we have to notify in October this year if we're still going to meet that. We'll review and then provide an update if required to amend that.

Mr EDMUNDS - Can you give that update with any confidence if it's not through parliament?

Ms BEACH - I think we can provide based on - there are a few things that inform our program. We develop a construction program using, especially, programmers. We have construction advisers, which is Zancon. They have tier one construction expertise and are providing separate to the design team and separate to the programmers who advise us. Having construction advisers direct to us allows us to provide an independent lens, and be a voice for us to crosscheck across a number of things. There has been a crosscheck there and we've just completed third crosscheck of the constructability of our program. That gives us some certainty to say, 'This looks reasonable and we can map out when those things will happen'. Some of our stakeholders are quite sophisticated, like the AFL have done the redevelopment of Docklands, or most people refer to it currently as Marvel Stadium. They understand the process, the

timelines involved. If we are able to articulate that process and provide some clarity, they will be informed enough to have some confidence in that.

Ms THOMAS - You mentioned the detail design work is underway. Did you say when, or can you tell us when that detail design work will be completed and when the final quantity surveyed costs are likely to be available?

Ms BEACH - We are working towards - our next sort of consolidated drawing set will get us to around 50 per cent, which we will get to next month. Where we go from there depends a little bit on the procurement process. Whether the design team is then working with us, or they transfer across to their construction contractor. The full design completion actually happens with the delivery body. What we're about to start work on is setting out our requirements, which are informed by the design, to say these are the [inaudible] we must have. Then, the actual delivery body will look at the designs and look to bring in some innovation. We need to get to at least 50 per cent design to then inform the procurement process for the delivery.

Ms THOMAS - You mentioned the transport study and I could not find that appendix N, so I'd appreciate if you could send the link as you'd mentioned. Can you tell me what the transport study said about the northern suburbs transit corridor?

Ms BEACH - The transport study has considered existing services, the rapid bus services that were identified in the 'Keep Hobart Moving' plan, and then additional sort of top-up event day services for large events. I don't think there were any assumptions there around the northern subways transit corridor. Activation of that would be an additional boost to any activation that was happening at that time.

Ms THOMAS - Yes, so it is not relying on that occurring?

Ms BEACH - No, that would be an addition.

Ms THOMAS - Finally, Kim mentioned earlier conference facilities and potential revenue raising from those sorts of facilities. We have heard a lot about the focus of all the discussion on the stadium has been about sport and concert uses. Is there information available on what some of those other uses will be? Will that be presented somewhere or is it available somewhere? Not just about conference facilities but also the community uses that you mentioned before. And, what community access will there be to the site and the facilities, and those other non-sport and conference uses of the development?

Ms BEACH - The activation of the individual spaces is something that Stadiums Tasmania will work through, but we will have the Goods Shed continue to exist in our proposal as it does now. That gets used for a range of community and commercial events. That would be the same sort of scope and size and presentation as it is now. There's the function room that's a 1,500-person seated dining that will be able to be divided into three separate spaces, so it can be made into smaller spaces which make it more accessible and more affordable for smaller and large events.

In the financial impact report, in the attachment to that, is the event schedule that has been used to estimate some of the financial analysis. I can pull out that reference and send that through to the Committee. That just shows a sample of an event schedule and some

PUBLIC

commentary around that. I think some of the opportunities will emerge as we have more conversations with the community about how the space can be used.

Ms THOMAS - That's all. Thank you.

CHAIR - One other thing. This may be in amongst all the information provided to the TPC, but does the construction management plan deal with potential acid sulphate soils? If so, do you have any documentation about that, being as it is below sea level?

Ms BEACH - There has been one section where we have identified some acid sulphate and we are working through some mitigation measures. We will work with our remediation specialists to do that and we will map that area.

CHAIR - There hasn't been any information provided to the TPC about this as part of the construction management plan?

Ms BEACH - We have identified that it is an area that we are investigating. The construction management plan we provided an initial draft of and it is something that will further populate as the project progresses.

CHAIR - Okay. Nothing has been sent to the TPC about it at this stage, is that what you are saying? I am just trying to clarify what is known by the TPC about the risk here.

Ms BEACH - Yes, I will just double-check. We have provided a study that has provided the initial area that we have worked through, we have identified but we do need to work through mitigations to manage.

CHAIR - Sure, is that what you have provided to the TPC?

Ms BEACH - Yes. I can send through a copy of what we have submitted.

CHAIR - I am conscious of the time, are there any other questions from members?

Okay. We will write to you with those as well. We appreciate your willingness to take some of those further questions on notice. Is there anything you want to say in closing before we wrap up the hearing? Either of you?

Mr EVANS - Not from me, no. I think it has been a pretty good discussion.

Ms BEACH - Hopefully that's been helpful.

CHAIR - Yes, thanks very much for your time.

Mr EVANS - No problem. Thank you.

The witnesses withdrew

The Committee suspended at 12:17 pm.