

PUBLIC

THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON FRIDAY 19 OCTOBER 2012.

RISON PRISON REDEVELOPMENT

Mr ROBERT WILLIAMS, DEPUTY SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE/DIRECTOR OF CORRECTIVE SERVICES; **Mr GARY HANCL**, PROGRAM MANAGER, PIRP STAGE D; **Mr MICHAEL FLOOD**, PROJECT MANAGER, PIRP STAGE D1; **Mr KAVAN APPELEGATE**, DIRECTOR, GUYMER BAILEY ARCHITECTS; AND **Mr BARRY GREENBERRY**, DIRECTOR OF PRISONS, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

CHAIR (Mr Harriss) - Welcome, gentlemen. As always, site visits are valuable to inform the committee of the constraints within which people work, whether it be a road project or a school project. On this occasion the submission clearly sets out the government's aspiration in upgrading the facility at Risdon. We appreciate the comprehensive tour we were able to undertake this morning. Robert, would you like to lead off with an overview? We try to keep out questions until the presentation has finished, but for clarity there may be a need along the way to interact with questions.

Mr WILLIAMS - We are in your hands. Thank you very much to the committee for allowing us the opportunity to present to you. This project is very important for the Prison Service. It is no surprise to anyone, if you have been reading the papers over the last few years, that we've had our share of troubles in the prison system, especially around the Risdon Prison complex. We received the report from Mr Mick Palmer last year, the Palmer report, detailing some significant areas of improvement. The completion of this stage of development was one of the key things he said we could do to improve outcomes for our staff, inmates and the community.

Mr BOOTH - I was wondering whether the work Palmer did was effectively complementing things that were already there or are they new suggestions? In other words; were the things he was suggesting to go ahead with just part of the plan you already had, or was it a new plan suggested as a result of Palmer?

Mr WILLIAMS - At the time the Palmer report was done we hadn't gone into a detailed planning phase for this development. By and large they were the things that were in scope. This is a follow-on from PIRP stage C, which happened about six years ago. Most of the things in scope now were things that were in scope before. Not everything, though; for example, we're not building a kitchen in this phase because the money doesn't run to it. We had decided that what we had put in scope is more needed in the system now.

Palmer did not really add a great new range of things but he supported the sorts of things we'd been talking about in the lead-up, especially around the Tamar Unit. He recognised the deficiencies in the infrastructure around that unit especially. The main scope we have now came from the processes we instituted after the Palmer report. He knew

PUBLIC

building this was on the horizon. It was the Palmer report that convinced the government to bring the money forward. We would have been starting a year later, so in that sense it influenced the timing of this project.

Mr BOOTH - More the money and financing rather than the direction that you would go?

Mr WILLIAMS - That's right. The money was set in the out-years already and it was brought forward by one year because of the Palmer report.

CHAIR - In addition to that - and I am relying on the department's submission - Mr Palmer recommended that in fact not only should the government revisit its decision to allocate the \$20.7 million but it should roll out the full \$48 million and get stuck in and do the whole lot of stage D.

Mr WILLIAMS - You would have to ask the government on its deliberations about that because the only thing I have to do is to deliver the government's decision which is the \$20 million and make the best job of it within the circumstances I am given.

CHAIR - Yes, I appreciate that, Robert, but Kim was going to the Palmer recommendations, the report and so forth and I have relied on that in terms of that contention. I appreciate that is for another forum but, nonetheless, that is what Mr Palmer recommended that there was such a deficiency there that needed to be attended to as a matter of urgency.

Mr BOOTH - Further to that, it goes to the point which is part of our duty to scrutinise the fit-for-purpose nature of any project and whether, given Palmer's recommendation of \$48 million, the \$20 million development will be adequate. You can take that as a question, if you like.

Mr WILLIAMS - There is no doubt that more is always better. There are certainly more things we could do with more money. We have been through an extensive consultation process with our staff and managers, including talking to prisoners, to determine what we could have in the scope for this project and by and large we have had to take some things out of scope that we originally thought of, but we think we have come up with a package of works which meets a whole range of needs and will significantly improve the operation of the prison. For example, we won't have a kitchen, which was one of the original things, but we think that the money is better spent on the things we have chosen to look at such as education, recreation facilities, an industry facility and those sorts of things.

If I step back to the beginning we have the *Breaking the Cycle* strategic plan which Minister McKim put out just over a year-and-a-half ago. We started with that as the basis for our thinking about what sorts of facilities we would need. Goal number one, which is about rehabilitation and reintegration, has been at the top of our minds in this because apart from a number of prisoners, which you could count on your hand, every one of the people who are in gaol are going to come out. We have taken it on ourselves to do the best we can to make sure that when those people come out and they live in a suburb next to myself or to you that we have done the best we can to create better behaviour, better responses and reduce the level of recidivism. That is why the focus of the current building has been on education facilities, multipurpose classrooms, recreation facilities, education capability, and the industry capability, because at the moment people

PUBLIC

in maximum security do not have significant education or recreation facilities to use. Exercise yards are far too small for the number of people who are using them and they don't have an industry facility.

Busy prisoners make a well-run prison and we have that in other parts of the prison. Our women's prison and our minimum-security prison run really well, in fact, they are probably as good as any you could find in the country because prisoners are busy with education. We have a bakery, a kitchen, a vegetable processing facility. Those sorts of things make prisons run well; people are busy and we are giving them skills. We really needed to complete the process in maximum security around that. In addition, making sure the infrastructure is safe for our staff. It is unacceptable that people are injured when they go to work. Working in prisons is a higher-risk occupation and we need to make sure that what we put in place such as these facilities that help the prisoners with education, keep them busy with industry, and reduce the tension inside the prison and that creates a situation where staff injury is less likely.

Mr BOOTH - It is implied that this will be part of a staged thing to get to the full Palmer \$48 million job that the chair was talking about or is this development the penultimate prison now?

Mr WILLIAMS - The ultimate question is for the government. We will certainly be putting up in the future further advancements in the system. There are issues to be dealt with. For example, Launceston Remand Centre needs to be looked at; it's quite an old prison. There are other parts of the system. We will be continually putting forward ideas. What the government decides to do with them is its business.

Mr BOOTH - The current works proposed in the Risdon development now obviously don't meet the suggestions or the recommendations that have come through Palmer. Is there anything here that would preclude, for example, retro-fitting the kitchen into the works or have the works compromised the whole by doing them this way?

Mr WILLIAMS - I don't think they have compromised. There's enough land on the site and inside the maximum-security fence to permit us to be flexible. We have different areas that we could use for those facilities.

We are pretty happy that what we are getting with is a significant improvement in the operation of the prison. You could always have more, that is just a truism.

We have worked through this with staff to come up with the list of things that are in scope. We have done some scaling back and some adjusting to make sure we put together a package that fits the budget, but by and large, we have been able to accommodate the great needs that have been put forward to us. I am confident that we are getting a significant improvement.

I think it is a decision for the government to make in the future; where it prioritises it in the system. There will come a time when what we do in Launceston, for example, has to be considered. Ron Barwick, which is a minimum-security prison, is a 1960s building. It functions well at the moment because of the level of programs and activity. It's not really about the age of the building it is about how you run it. At some stage that will

PUBLIC

need to be considered. The process, in its origins, had a vision of a new minimum-security prison, a new northern prison and further development around it.

Mr BROOKS - I refer back to the history of the prison and, more recently, a couple of years ago, the minister, Mr McKim, admitted that there were flaws in the design and conceded it was probably due to an issue of inadequate funding. Are you confident that the funding on this one is adequate to deliver what you need?

Mr WILLIAMS - As we saw this morning, maximum-security accommodation was built, but with little activity capability available. In that sense, it wasn't the design, it was the fact that we didn't complete the capability rather than the design itself. I am confident that we will get very good outcomes from this.

Mr Palmer was very clear when I spoke to him that, while we needed to have this development - and he wanted us to have all of the \$48 million worth - it wasn't the only reason that we had to say that the place was dysfunctional in some ways. We had to change the morals of operation. We had to have a culture change and we have Mr Greenberry and Mr Edwards, who are both people with international experience. We have already achieved significant things without the infrastructure. I am really careful to not say that the infrastructure is a silver bullet because there are other things in terms of culture and operations that we have to do. With this investment, we can make the place a properly functioning prison in terms of infrastructure. The rest is up to us and our culture, attitude, staff and those sorts of things.

Mr BROOKS - If you look at the example of the fence that was done more recently the cost was blown proportionately on that and it said due to delays and problems and discovery of Aboriginal relics it was not planned properly. Are you comfortable that the \$20 million in here is not also going to blow out and is enough to get the job done so we are not back here in six months or 12 months, or two years or three years fixing it and needing more money?

Mr WILLIAMS - That is something that has been at the very top of our mind in terms of the planning process. The way we have put the model together is we have hired the architects, we have hired the quantity surveyors, we have hired procurement advisers to make sure that we get the best possible projection of cost. Once this hearing is over and, if we get permission to proceed, we have a managing contractor in place who will then come in and start to work with our architects and give us a final staging of the process. We are confident now that we have got advice from experts that what we are proposing in the scope and what the designs have come up with is affordable within that \$20 million.

Mr BROOKS - So you didn't do that for the fence? I am using that as an example.

Mr WILLIAMS - The fence wasn't funded upfront. It became a need once we discovered that contraband was coming over the fence and we needed to put a barrier around it. We built what we needed to and it cost what it cost. It was not a forward planned thing like this project is.

Mr BROOKS - It had an original budget, didn't it, and it went over that budget?

PUBLIC

Mr WILLIAMS - It did, and there there were delays for a whole range of reasons including Aboriginal heritage issues which we take seriously because the site has a significant amount of Aboriginal heritage and artefacts. We had to move those and store them in an appropriate manner.

We have dealt with all of those issues in this planning. Council permits have been issued. So as far as we are able, without having engaged the managing contractor in advance of this process, we have good advice that we are in the ball park cost-wise.

Mr BROOKS - So you are absolutely confident that the funding for this is sufficient to get the job done?

Mr WILLIAMS - As confident as anyone on a building project could be. We have engaged the right sort of experts who work with architects and quantity surveyors to put the scope together and then do some designs and then cost them. We think we are able to build this in the current cost envelope.

Mr HALL - You talked about the northern prison. I presume you are talking about the Launceston Remand Centre and what might have to be done there. I will expand on that for a little bit. Some years ago there was a Legislative Council report. I was not on the committee. One of the recommendations was that there ought to be a northern prison. Obviously that is a government policy area, but you spoke this morning about the fact that New South Wales has 30-odd prisons and therefore it is much easier to categorise prisoners and disseminate them into the appropriate facilities.

Therefore, has the department or anyone looked at a separate facility in the north? It would probably assist with the issues that you have by keeping those regional groupings. We talked about the regional groupings of prisoners and all those sort of things.

Mr WILLIAMS - In the original plan for the prison redevelopment there is a northern prison which was scoped. It had some preliminary designs. Whether it goes ahead is a matter, in the end, for the government and based on whatever priority settings.

Mr HALL - It is separate from the Launceston Remand Centre?

Mr WILLIAMS - If we were going to do that we would probably put them together because then you would have your workforce centralised. You probably wouldn't set about building a new remand centre and a separate prison. If you were going to do it you would probably put them both together, possibly on a greenfield site. That is all hypothesising and guesswork because it really is a government decision as to whether they invest in that.

Mr HALL - On the mainland we have a lot of private prisons - and here the government has budgeted x amount of cash - have you looked at PPPs, for example, in order to do the whole job, finish it off, as recommended in the report?

Mr WILLIAMS - We haven't looked at anything in terms of private-public partnership for this phase of the project. That would be an issue for government as to how it wanted to progress something like that in the future.

PUBLIC

Mr HALL - And the private prison concept?

Mr WILLIAMS - Hasn't been mentioned.

Mr HALL - Something they might do in the north then?

Mr WILLIAMS - Certainly not something that has been considered so far as I am aware.

CHAIR - On the same theme; Robert has clearly indicated, and correctly so, that the construction of a prison facility in the north will be a government policy position. In terms of management of prisoners - the things we discussed on the site visit this morning - because of those regional segregations, managing people from other parts of the state and families have to travel - purely from a management point of view and dissemination back into the community - would it be desirable to have a northern facility?

Mr WILLIAMS - There's no doubt that having a northern facility would be beneficial to the prison system. It was in the original designs of the future plans for the prison infrastructure redevelopment programs, so it was clearly envisaged. While it remains completely a government policy issue as to whether we go there, if you're asking whether we would make good use of it, the answer is yes.

Mr BROOKS - Are you confident and comfortable with the time frame as laid out in the submission? We have gone through the costs and you believe you can deliver it on budget, but can you deliver it on time?

Mr WILLIAMS - We believe so. At the moment we can't have meaningful conversations with the managing contractor who has to cash flow the designs for us because it's a bit hard to tell them accurately what the cash flows should be. Our advice is that the timing is achievable, but until we get to talk to the managing contractor in more detail it's a bit hard to put the timing into sequence properly. We think the timing is achievable. That is what we out to do and what we have taken advice on.

Mr APPLEGATE - We have benchmarked the time frame in the program against similar facilities in mainland states, for example - projects around 30-beds, which is the most significant component of the construction. Many of the other small components of the work can either occur in correlation with those or either put it on the end as the last component of the works once the 30 beds have been delivered and are in use. Working through the detail of that with the managing contractor when they are on board will nut out the finer nitty-gritty. In terms of the program in the submission, we are confident it can be delivered within that program.

Mr BROOKS - How many registered interest?

Mr WILLIAMS - In terms of the managing contractor?

Mr BROOKS - Yes.

Mr WILLIAMS - Three.

PUBLIC

Mr BROOKS - Were they Tasmanian, interstate, or both?

Mr FLOOD - One was wholly Tasmanian and two were mainland groups with local representation.

Mr BOOTH - Robert, getting back to the northern prison proposal and your views with regard to it being something that would obviously be worthwhile to have, does spending this amount of money on improving this prison, effectively pre-empt a northern prison? In other words, would you have too much capacity then to justify building a northern prison? Will it reduce the pressure to build a northern prison?

Mr WILLIAMS - I don't think it changes the dynamics. As we found today, maximum security is full today and now we are shuffling people around with difficulty. It depends on what the scope of a northern prison would be, which would then depend on questions about cost and how far you want to go; whether you build only a new remand centre or whether you build a fully-functioning prison with minimum, medium and maximum precincts and a women's prison. All those sorts of things are a bit hard to imagine, but I would say that if we don't build at least what we have put in the scope we still won't have the functioning Risdon site that we need.

Mr BOOTH - In any event.

Mr WILLIAMS - In any event.

Mr BOOTH - If the state went ahead and built a northern prison in five year's time, for example, it is not going to leave Risdon half empty?

Mr WILLIAMS - No. One of the things that I would put into that mix is that we have the Hobart Reception Prison which is meant to be a temporary facility for people to come in, adjust to prison life and then move off into the system. Because of lack of capacity at Risdon we have people staying there for a significant time; it is part of having a small system. As we heard, if you have 30 prisons in New South Wales or a big state like Western Australia, if someone plays up or someone is vulnerable or someone needs protection you simply shift them to a prison where they don't have those sorts of problems. In Tasmania, it is much more difficult because of the small size. We keep people in, say, the Hobart Reception Prison for protection reasons.

Mr HALL - Is that the old Hobart remand?

Mr WILLIAMS - Yes, it is the same. It has the police watch house in one bit and the prison in another bit and it services the courts. Even if you did have some sort of northern facility some time in the future, we still have a level of dysfunction that we won't solve at Risdon until this is done, no matter what you have elsewhere in the system, especially around education, recreation and industry facilities. Those things are critical because what we have in maximum security is warehouse-type accommodation with very little exercise capability.

Mr BOOTH - You spoke about different groups who might be contained within the prison from the same community group; do you have a problem then, given the regional nature of Tasmania with north-west and northern prisoners, with people who have committed a

PUBLIC

crime and end up in Risdon? Do they get a whole lot of networking and cross-fertilisation of new criminal ideas by being put together like that?

Mr WILLIAMS - I don't think so. We have to be careful about who we put where. There has traditionally been a bit of north versus south stuff in terms of managing the prison and keeping things calm; stopping standover tactics and that sort of stuff, but by and large we have managed that. We don't tend to let that fester. We are very careful to try to keep that at a minimum. I suppose criminals can learn from other criminals in a system, but we try to keep them apart for safety reasons; the safety of our staff and the safety of other inmates.

Some people are vulnerable without having any association. Some people have psychological issues that make them vulnerable or they are very young; those sorts of things. We need to have places where we can protect those people in the system, especially young people coming in who are not young enough to be in the juvenile justice system but are just old enough to be in the prison system. To try to keep those people in the safest way and away from harm is a real trick in a system that is pretty small because, in other places - and certainly in other countries - you would have a juvenile justice system and you would have a place in the adult system for young prisoners. It is very difficult in our system to separate those people out. Once you say, 'You are a young person, but you are also part of family *x* who can't be near members of family *y*', or 'You have been in gang *x* and can't be near gang *y*'. It starts to make it quite difficult.

Sometimes we are moving people on a daily basis as new people come in and we identify the risk. Risk assessment is what we do in prisons every single day on every front; assessing risk of harm, of escape and all those things.

CHAIR - I was wondering whether we are disrupting the flow of your presentation? This has been valuable -

Mr WILLIAMS - What is important to the community is what we want to convey.

Mr BROOKS - I am wary of how this could come across. I have had representations from some in the community - not all - that if there were \$20 million being spent on a prison to make the facilities better for prisoners, it could be spent elsewhere for public sector needs. One comment to me was, they should have thought about before they went and robbed someone or committed a crime.

Will the investment of \$20 million add value to the community either through rehabilitation or making it a better environment for the community in the long-term?

Mr WILLIAMS - I believe so, but I can't answer the question about how the government sets its priorities. That is absolutely its domain.

In terms of a prison, go back to *Breaking the Cycle*. If you want a safe community, if you want corrections to contribute to a safer community, we have to use the time we have those people with us in a way that helps them deal with the issues that cause them problems; drug abuse and making poor choices. We have to work on all those things because if we don't, they will come out worse than they go in, and that makes us less

PUBLIC

safe. You can put people in prison, but they come out and they are going to live somewhere near you or I, and if we haven't given them some skills -. We do a mandatory literacy and numeracy assessment when people come in and it shows what you would expect, that a very high percentage of people have literacy and numeracy problems.

The government committed last year, through the education system, to literacy and numeracy coordinators for corrections and community corrections and in the prison. We have volunteers who are coordinated to come in and assist. We have people like the Red Cross come in to do things with parents to help them, not only helping the parent to read but to maintain the family connections because all of those have to exist for someone who comes out of prison. They have to have friends, they have to have family connections. They have to have some skills to get a job. You can't get a job if you can't read. You can't even get a basic job these days with OH&S requirements and things like that.

If we don't invest in having a prison that does more than just make people angry because you've locked them up and you've given them nowhere to learn and nowhere to use their physical energy or engage in industry, the community will be worse off. I have no doubt about that. This is for maximum security. While we have a system where we want people to move from maximum security, through medium into minimum before they leave, it doesn't always happen because some people remain badly-behaved in prison. They will leave prison from maximum security. If they leave angry and unskilled, no-one is better off.

My sense is, we don't do this. The other thing is, people go stir-crazy. It's a real concept. It's not something from TV comedy. You lock people up with nothing to do they get agitated, they then take it out on the staff. We have had horrific injuries in the prison system that we should not have. It is absolutely soul destroying to see people, to talk to people who a year after they have been bashed in prison are still not coping with coming back to the place where they go to work every day. If you or I went to work with the notion that we could come home in an ambulance we would not want to go to work either. This whole thing, as Palmer pulled it together, is not one thing.

Workplace safety is one of the key things that we are trying to achieve. Prisoner comfort is not something we are really concerned about. We want to make sure we keep people humanely, their punishment is going to gaol. We do not exercise unnecessary activities in gaol to further punish them.

Mr BROOKS - As I said, some representations were made to me, but I think what was reinforced on the visit was the fact the staff would be in a safe environment. I want to make sure that the budget and the time line can be delivered and it will achieve what we want to achieve, taking into account those concerns which have been addressed. Will it do that?

Mr WILLIAMS - I am pretty confident, but perhaps you would like to hear from Barry or Gary in terms of the project management and prison management.

Mr GREENBERRY - Without these facilities we are not doing as much as we could do to help make the community safer. Although I can fully understand from outside the prison

PUBLIC

you are applying different priorities, the reality is that this is an investment in the community, because people will come out with more skills, with more support, with more direction to help them stop re-offending. That is obvious because at the moment we have got a prison that was half built and I understand that this committee previously wanted the prison to be fully built. It is only fulfilling that previous design. It is as simple as that. It is no more complicated. If we do not have places and facilities to train prisoners we are not going to help them in a way that we should be doing as a public service.

Mr BOOTH - Do you have any comments in regard to the breakdown of the different crime types that people end up being incarcerated for. Some of them would be violence, robbery, addiction to drugs, people who become addicted to poker machines and commit crimes. Do you have a breakdown of that?

Mr WILLIAMS - We do. I know you have an interest in gambling. It is one of the really hard ones because it often isn't reflected in the sentences that are given. The sentence might be for theft. It is really hard to get statistics on what caused it; whether, for example, it was family need. In the justice system it is really hard to get that data because there is no crime of gambling; the crime is stealing or drugs or whatever.

Mr GREENBERRY - I can submit to the committee a list of the current offences for which people are in prison. Anecdotally, if you were to ask prisoners - and we have, here and elsewhere - what the four main reasons are that you are in gaol, it is drink, drugs, they are impulsive or they are selfish. Again anecdotally, if you were to ask prisoners from their perspective what we need to do to change their attitudes so they no longer wish to offend, they say bring the family in and remind us of what we have lost. Bring victims in and make us feel guilty about what we have done. Bring in successful former prisoners, peers, to give us hope and meet us at the gate. Have a gate mate. Someone who can mentor us after we are released. The latest information is that the most crucial time, post-release, is about 56 days. The longer one stays out the less likelihood. It does not stop them coming back, but the likelihood is less. That is the sort of approach we need to take.

Mr BOOTH - The value of this to me, in terms of the deliberations here, is to what extent we keep on building infrastructure to incarcerate people rather than preventing them getting in there in the first place?

Mr WILLIAMS - I have corrections as a whole in my bailiwick and one of the things we have seen over the last few years is a response by the courts and community corrections to create alternatives to prison. I will give you an example that keeps people out of prison. In community corrections we introduced a course we got from New South Wales called 'Sober Driving'. It is for recidivist drink-drivers. They are people who, in many cases, the magistrates are fed up with. Without the course they would go to gaol, but the magistrates have accepted this course as a good one. The independent academic research into the programs that has just been completed says the reduction in recidivism is 44 per cent if you do the course. We have a waiting list for that course because we introduced it and it became popular and the magistrates said, 'We like that and we're going to sentence to that. That can be your community service, that you complete that course'. If you did not have that running, you would have people going into the prison system. What we are achieving with that course, if the studies are right and we're reducing recidivism, is a

PUBLIC

safer community without using gaol. The gaol population has stabilised at just under 500 at the moment.

We also have a court-mandated drug diversion program, which has about 60 people on it. Those people are sentenced to gaol but are held out of gaol while they participate in the program which includes drug testing, counselling and those sorts of things. It is supervised by the courts. If you look at that, that is probably 50 or 60 people for those programs alone who are not in gaol.

We don't have a projection that the number of people in gaol is going to increase significantly in the future. I think under *Breaking the Cycle* - the opening foreword from the minister is that gaol should be a last resort. It's a place for some people, and we need it, but it should be the last resort. The 'Sober Driving' course is a very good example of keeping people out of gaol. They keep their jobs and family relationships; they don't become a welfare burden or disenfranchised in the world. They get the treatment and punishment that fits the crime and we get a safer community because we haven't just asked them to pick up papers on the side of the road, they are sitting in a program that has an impact.

Mr BOOTH - Is there evidence that if those people had ended up being incarcerated they would have learnt new tricks and become a broader criminal?

Mr WILLIAMS - It is always possible, but it is not very likely because these people probably go into minimum security where people keep themselves fairly tidy.

Mr BOOTH - Is that a problem in the prisons; that people end up getting into a new culture with a new bunch of friends?

Mr GREENBERRY - I think that's inevitable, bearing in mind a lot of the people know each other outside anyway. It happens all around the world. We are looking after people who are there for very particular reasons. The problem with the gaol here at the moment is that they are bored; they have nothing else to talk about. If we keep them more occupied by doing other things and get them interested in the talents they have -. People look at prisoners and say, 'You're just a prisoner', but the reality is - and I found this very encouraging since coming to Tasmania, and the healthy approach to criminal justice that Robert has described, where prison is rightly seen as the last resort - you see people have the potential to change. It is the most wonderful thing to be part of a service where, if we had a motto, it would be, 'We don't give up on anyone'. The people we're not giving up on are people whom lots of other people would give up on. We can't afford to give up on some of these people.

We have to make this investment, in my view, in order to divert them to things that can use their talents, get them out to be law-abiding, tax paying citizens who treat each other with a bit more civility and don't harm other people instead of what they are doing now. They are twiddling their thumbs, and the committee saw it today, in a very claustrophobic environment where they have nothing else to talk about but their previous crimes. This won't fix everything, but this investment will do what most decent gaols are doing. It will avoid some of the problems you are talking about and which are happening at the minute.

PUBLIC

Mr HALL - A few years ago, on a micro-scale, did AYDC, Ashley of course, and we found that the lack of programs was one of the biggest issues. Things in the culture have changed now that there has been an investment in programs. Obviously, since stage one was done the infrastructure hasn't been there - and this is what this is all about - to enable those programs to be run. The next question is, with the capital expenditure to run those programs, are you going to have recurrent operational expenses much higher than now? That is obviously in the Justice budget somewhere along the line, is that how that works?

Mr WILLIAMS - Those issues are still to be considered by government, but you are absolutely right, we will need some extra resourcing to run those programs. One of the things that Barry and Brian have been looking at in the last few months is; we haven't reached the stage where the way we operate now is as efficient as it should be. We have high overtime. We have high sick leave. Before I go to the government and say that I need more money to run the prison service we have to get some of those things under control because until they are we can't say that we are under-resourced because we need to actually fix those things. There is no doubt more resources need to go into that operation. It is how much can we take from an inefficient system to do that.

Mr HALL - I suppose that is a government policy issue. For example, in Ashley the education part is funded by Education. Is it a possibility that with increased education -

Mr WILLIAMS - I can say that in the last year we think that the amount of education effort that we are getting into the prison has risen more than 50 per cent, especially in the area of vocational education and training. It helps that you have a Minister for Education who understands the prisons intimately, but these are people who haven't got to year 10. These are people who haven't finished their basic education. We have focused in the last year on increasing vocational education so that people are coming out with tickets to do scaffolding, first aid, and OH&S, so employers go, 'That's three months of training costs I don't have to do to get someone onto the building site to start an apprenticeship or to get into some sort of labouring job.' You need certificates in things to get on any site where you are doing blue-collar work these days. We are trying to give them that and the education system has added a lot to that.

Mr HALL - Whilst it would be good for all prisoners - those who come in very deficient in those area - to leave with those literacy and numeracy skills, is there any way that you can mandate that that they have to attend classes?

Mr WILLIAMS - We have had a debate with the shadow attorney-general about mandatory, courses for sex-offenders. Our advice is that if you mandate them you can get negative outcomes because some people aren't suitable, some people can't start the courses because at the beginning of those courses you have to admit you are offending, so if you don't admit it then there's no point in starting the course.

In those circumstances, where we think people should be doing a course of how to deal with their sex offending or anger management, we encourage that and we actively go back to the people who say no, especially for the sex offending courses, and we try to convince them to do it.

PUBLIC

Some people are in and out so quickly that they don't get much benefit from our educational or criminogenic [*sic*] programs. If they are in for three months they are barely in the system before they are planning their release, so they don't get a lot.

For people who are in there long-term - we have a huge number of people doing years 10, 11 and 12 education and large numbers of people are now doing VET (vocational education and training) courses in construction and hospitality. We have had people leaving who have done barista courses in the prison who now have jobs from that.

Mr BOOTH - What are the pass rates like across the board with those things?

Mr WILLIAMS - In terms of?

Mr BOOTH - Year 10 or 12?

Mr WILLIAMS - I don't know whether we have reported on that data. I think we have quite good success rates because people have a lot of time to sit and do it. We have to get back to the basics because some people want to jump to that when they can't read. This is what these multipurpose classrooms will do in the maximum-security area.

We have programs run by Red Cross called, reading onto CD. I don't know whether you've heard about it. If you go and say to a big, burly prisoner, 'Do you want to read a Little Golden Book?' They say, 'Get lost, we're not doing that'. If you say, 'Would you like us to help you read. The aim of the program is, you'll read onto a CD to send home with the book to your kid?' It is different outcome. Red Cross runs that program. It is highly successful. People who have never read in their lives send their kids a CD and they listen to dad at home. Red Cross is now introducing a program for kids to read onto CDs, so dads can hear their kids.

With those programs it is about finding the right hook for people who have never worked in the traditional education system. If you want to do the small engine course you are going to have to read the workshop manual before you can pick up a spanner. That is the rule, so they will do it. There are all sorts of ways.

We have a lot of good programs in the prison. We send people out of the prison, as you know, to go to education. We send people out on work gangs to work on the Risdon Rivulet which, as you might know, was a willow-infested tip. We have a gang working up that rivulet, getting rid of the willows, planting native trees again. They have built bridges, they are building a track and the local community says that is an absolute bonus for them.

These activities that we are able to offer to people in minimum security are the things that change people's lives and stop them from wanting to re-offend because they feel valued and they feel like they have achieved something. We are offering none of that in maximum security which is why these are so important because these people can't come out because they are too much of a risk. They can't go and work at the scouts. They can't go and do the foreshore at Bellerive Bluff and they can't -

Mr HALL - Mediums can't either.

PUBLIC

Mr WILLIAMS - No. That's why it's so difficult in the medium and maximum areas because they can't come out and do stuff.

CHAIR - Let's go back to you, Robert. Are there any other matters that you wanted to cover off that we haven't covered by this exchange.

Mr WILLIAMS - I brought some copies in case people haven't read *Breaking the Cycle*. We are still using *Breaking the Cycle* as our guide to say, if you want to save the community then the corrections system has to do a good job with people while they are attached to it. That is what this is about. Safety in the workforce: part of the spend on the project is about safety and security features which are both for the protection of the community and the staff in their daily roles.

When we set out to do this program, we decided we were going to make sure that staff had a say in what they wanted, because they are the people who have really suffered. They are the people who have been assaulted. They are the people who have to face this workplace every day. While we gave some parameters - and there were some parameters set very loosely by the decision to spend this money in maximum security - what is reflected here in the scope has been driven by what our staff and management have said they think is needed. They have been running the place for more than six years now, so they do know. I am very confident that what we've put in the scope is what staff think is needed to make the place a safer workplace. More is always lovely, but we don't have more, we have what we have. I think this is going to make a real difference to the prison, the safety of staff and the outcomes for the prisoners leaving the place. At the end of the day, that's the real job, isn't it?

Mr BROOKS - I, and no doubt my colleagues, were very impressed with the professionalism showed by the staff out there. We spoke to one gentleman who had been in the high-end area for three years and he would [inaudible] and I think he expressed the changing of operating needs or standards and facilities would make his and many others' jobs a lot easier and safer and have a better outcome in the community. Is that something supported by the senior management of the prison?

Mr WILLIAMS - It is driven by Barry and Brian. That is exactly what they are doing, driving a cultural change from the top down.

Mr GREENBERRY - The Palmer report had three key elements: infrastructure, culture and leadership of that management group. Part of leadership is to allow some good staff the ability to make decisions within the place and to do the right thing. The previous discussion we've just had, I think re-emphasises that being a corrections member of staff isn't just about standing around and opening and shutting gates. Part of the way this prison - the RPC prison, not the others; the women's prison or Ron Barwick, which runs extremely well - we have turned staff back into turnkeys where their job is actually highly complex and very sophisticated.

The whole community needs to have a prison service, but not a lot of people are able to stand up to the mark. It gives us an opportunity at moments like this to remind ourselves of how professional the staff are and how complex their roles are. They need to motivate and get the best out of people who, for whatever reasons, have got to where they are, and we need to try to untap the talents they have - sometimes with a community looking on

PUBLIC

and saying, 'Why bother?'. The truth is, if we say that, we will not ever see the fruits of what a decent prison service is all about. It is all about those things joined up together: leadership, culture - which means being non-judgmental, proportionate and legitimate.

The safest gaols in the world are where authority is used legitimately so people can see that when decisions are made they are believable and done for the right reasons. It is amazing how you can train people to respect the law by applying it appropriately. All of that goes on within a gaol but, unfortunately, for obvious reasons, people outside miss it all. I think there are the right staff with the right talents and a very good management team to take advantage of this investment. As Robert said, it has been done collaboratively by the team have been leading the infrastructure to make sure all the views of those staff have been taken into account. I can't wait to get going with it. This is such an opportunity, given your support.

CHAIR - Can I pick up on the thread you have both just reinforced? I go to the submission. Robert, you mentioned the engagement of the correctional staff with this proposal, but the submission makes it quite clear that correctional staff were very critical of stage C of the PIRP because of that perceived or real lack of engagement with operational practitioners. The submission suggests that many of your own people have referred to stage C as a Queensland prison in Tasmania without taking account of the Tasmanian context. So, having that observation provided to us in your submission, the question then is have you taken sufficient account of that deficiency, back in that time, to ensure that what we get this time has been adequate engagement of correctional staff.

Mr WILLIAMS - I think that is a really good point. It was a point that we started off with. There are a lot of staff who feel let down that the first stage did not include these sorts of facilities. That was one of the key drivers of some of the industrial unrest; they felt betrayed. That they were told they were going to get a prison with all the bells and whistles and they just got accommodation. There were all sorts of reasons for that and I am not criticising that, but that is how staff felt. We have got this \$20 million - Mr Palmer suggested it should be \$48 million - and I am absolutely hell-bent that we would engage the staff in a way that they understand that if this is all we are going to get in the foreseeable future for that facility then they had to agree that we were getting the best value for the money in terms of their expertise.

We ran workshops with the staff to get the scope sorted about what they thought we wanted. To fit it into the funding we have had to adjust here and there and things are not quite as big as they might have been, but we have got general agreement from the staff that we have managed to capture most of the things that they wanted. I don't know whether Gary might want to talk about that if you want some more information because this was the most critical thing; when this project is done if we have not got it right for staff we are back where we were last year with inadequate facilities and industrial unrest. To me this was the heart of the project. The staff had to say what they thought we needed because it is their prison. They live in it every single day. They get hurt in it and they have got to tell us how to get out of that cycle of prisoner unrest, staff injury and essentially a badly-managed facility.

Mr BOOTH - It is terrific that you are using that methodology, but part of the problem with assaults was staffing levels, irrespective of the fact that the prison environment itself was creating issues of bad behaviour. Clearly now not only have you improved the culture

PUBLIC

and it is very impressive. I echo everything Adam said a moment ago with regard to the professionalism and the culture is quite different. Having never been in a prison before it was a very revealing experience and quite daunting in some ways looking at the conditions that those prisoners are kept in. There is obviously no redemption for some of them happening in those crowded rooms in that high-security area. You simply could not provide the sorts of services that you want and are able to do. It is quite clear to me that you need to have some infrastructure development, but part of the issues with the problems before was that you had only two staff on duty in the maximum-security area escorting prisoners to that tiny little exercise yard.

Mr WILLIAMS -That is absolutely right and we have had to adjust things. Over the years there was a level of mistrust that built up between management and staff. Until Brian and Barry arrived we were finding it really hard to get compromise and to get sensible changes happening because there was this level of mistrust largely because the staff felt let down that they did not have the fully-built prison.

The trust factor is not fixed yet, but we have certainly come a long way in the last few months and we now have the staff and management agreeing on innovative ways to manage some of these things. One of them was to move more staff into that particular area and let them manage it. Palmer was quite right; we cannot blame the infrastructure alone for all the problems we had, but if we don't put it in there we will still have all the problems because prisoners who go stir-crazy are going to assault staff and that is just unacceptable.

Do you want any more information on the staff engagement?

CHAIR - I am happy with the evidence that you have given and the things which we heard from the staff over there this morning so unless other members -

Mr BROOKS - I have a final comment. It was an example I was given during the visit this morning by a staff member where, under previous arrangements and procedures they couldn't do things that would calm the environment or a prisoner. They now have freedom to interact more with prisoners and that stops them getting upset or agitated and then assaulting staff. It is a much calmer environment coupled with the other measures. I think we would all agree that it is a better environment.

Mr WILLIAMS - We would agree with you.

CHAIR - We have covered off the operational side. I want to go to some architectural matters. It has been well documented in the public domain that stage C had some deficiencies and the obvious question is what account has been taken of those deficiencies in terms of the design from architectural and operational points of view with this stage?

Mr APPLEGATE - It also comes back to your previous question about staff engagement. The approach we took was quite extensive in terms of staff engagement. Because there were always going to be individual building areas, the way we approached it was to put the request out to staff and they were encouraged within the TPS to attend these user group sessions. The system backfilled all those positions so they were free to come along. We had a very good turn out. We used a whiteboard session where we initially

PUBLIC

put up what was included in the original briefing document that we were given and we were open with them and said, 'This is what we've been told the need is in this particular area. To start with, do you agree?' and then we filled the whiteboard for each of these areas. There was some good analytical discussion, both at operational and program-delivery level. We stayed right away, at that early stage, from what the infrastructure solution would be. It was purely about needs. It was about what they needed to do the job. What were the issues they were having with their current facility and what sort of things would be needed to fix those.

We filled the whiteboard and took photographic evidence of it and then, when we went away, we had further discussions with prison management and bounced a few more ideas around, then we came back a number of weeks later and presented the scheme back to the staff. The way we did that was, we had the photographic evidence of the whiteboard and we put that back up on the screen and said, 'This is what we talked about' and then we went through point by point, 'These are all the things you asked for and this is how we have incorporated them'. It was quite eye-opening for many of the staff. They were actually taking ownership of individual bits, 'That's right, that's what I asked for and this is how it has been incorporated'.

There were a couple of minor things where we understood something they had said a particular way and they said, 'I can see how you took that, but you've probably misinterpreted it a bit', so we refined those in the next scheme and there were others where they said, 'Yes, that's exactly what I asked for, but now I don't think that's going to work the way we thought it would. Can we change those?'.

We went through this process a number of times through each of the building areas including accommodation, recreation, industries and also how we were dealing with the gatehouse. The TRG area was a great suggestion that came out of the staff body. The original brief we had was that the TRG area was an extension to the gatehouse building but, driven from within that group, they were saying, 'Its clearly going to be an expensive solution to try to extend an operating gatehouse and maintain the security'. There were some limitations in what they could achieve in that environment so eventually we relocated the whole TRG to a separate location Ron Barwick centre which gives them more area in a most cost-effective way than was originally envisaged.

Rob mentioned the value management process we went through. A lot of those ideas came from the staff group as well. Once they saw what was being proposed and they were aware of the cultural change that was occurring, the shift of any infrastructure design solution was greatly influenced.

Another good case in point is the recreation building that we saw the location of onsite. That was initially a large basketball court with a weights room off to the side and a programs room. We were looking to have more programs rooms in the individual, maximum-security accommodation areas. The more we discussed that with staff, the more they were telling us that the whole idea of trying to get the prisoners out of their units and into a normalised environment and the daily routine of leaving where you live and going off to school or work, was being hampered by the fact that we were trying to build these programs rooms inside a maximum-security unit. We were also aware that we may not be able to vacate to do the construction work, which was going to create all sorts of construction issues. It was through that discussion that the idea arose that we

PUBLIC

should put more of these programs and education spaces adjacent to the recreation building. This is a much easier build and a much more cost-effective solution and provides much more flexibility for staff in how they manage those areas.

Mr BROOKS - I did have a question about the design.

Mr APPLEGATE - I'm more than happy to go into any of the design areas in as much detail as would suit.

Mr BROOKS - There has been some examples in older design where the light fittings have been used as weapons. There have been fires started in the cells and those things. What have you done to address those?

Mr APPLEGATE - It has been a great part of the learning on both sides where, over the last years that RPC has been operating, there have been these issues of an amazing ability to dismantle components of cells. A lot of the rectification of that has been some great research and development work by the prison's own internal maintenance area. They have come up with a number of the solutions that have been retro-fitted into some of the existing facilities; light fittings, the deluge system sprinklers that we spoke about in the transitional unit this morning.

Mr BROOKS - The deluge system stops them setting fire because it ruins their personal equipment?

Mr WILLIAMS - It has that impact. They may still find a way to start a fire but it will go out much faster.

Mr APPLEGATE - Effectively, you can put the fire out even before you open the cell door. There is a life-safety component there as well as staff safety. There is a number of these areas where we are making sure we are taking onboard the learnings that have occurred within the facility already. In some ways it is - we have a model of things that have worked fine in other jurisdictions. The prisoners in RPC have managed to treat them with a lot more rigour -

Mr BROOKS - They are more creative?

Mr APPLEGATE - Yes. We have been working very closely with the prison services maintenance area. We walked through each of those areas with the maintenance area and they pointed out to us the things that had been damaged before. We have a list of all those and we are working through the solutions as to how we install those in such a way -

The other thing we have included in the project is a prototype cell. We are going to build a whole new cell and that is costed and part of the earlier works package in the program. We're looking at a more contemporary cell layout. It was a recommendation from us, and supported by TPS, that we build a whole new cell so that the managing contractor can walk on board and completely understand any issues with building one of these cells before they roll out the final 30. It is an ongoing value to the prison services as a training facility. When new staff come on board they understand how you go about searching a cell as part of their training regime before they are in the facility itself.

PUBLIC

Mr WILLIAMS - Adam, the question is germane to what has happened over the last couple of years. I think it is back to the very basic issue of when people are bored they'll do anything; they will be very creative. Our aim is to get people out of their cells and engaged in activities, whether it is industry or education, so they are not sitting around trying to pick things apart. There is nothing that's indestructible and humans are the most ingenious animals and can do almost anything with anything. The fundamental thing is that a prison without activities is a recipe for problems. We expect these will decrease because other facilities around the country that have exactly the same hardware don't have the problems we have because they have people out doing things.

Mr BROOKS - One prison that has had problems is in Victoria, with recreational access that brought [inaudible] materials - we know of a recent high-publicity case in Victoria where someone could access something to pull apart. My understanding is there is some loose furniture in your common areas and one was turned upside down and had the potential to be done. Does the costing and the design include fixed furniture or is that going to be an additional cost or requirement to this?

Mr APPLEGATE - Furniture is included in the budget and has been costed on the basis of being secure and robust furniture in the locations it is needed. I went through and analysed particular areas as to which areas needed the robust bits of furniture and which spaces needed robust but lightweight furniture that could be relocated but couldn't do any damage if used as a weapon.

Mr BROOKS - In their own cell it needs to be fixed fairly well, but you would presume there would be higher requirements for common areas, tables, chair legs and those sorts of things.

Mr GREENBERRY - Adam, this has been discussed before. It isn't just about the equipment, it is about the environment in which people are. The more normally you treat people in an environment the more normally they act. If you treat people like caged animals, they will act like caged animals. If you think about the total number of prisoners held here and the total number of incidents that have happened recently, which has been very few, and look at the prison service and the complexity of what the staff have to do, it is less to do with whether some of the furniture is fixed on the floor and the cost of that as to what the staff are doing to motivate the prisoners to act in a respectful way. I looked at the reports before I arrived and I have now experienced the prison for four months and the overwhelming point I have is it could have been so much worse if the staff hadn't battled against the conditions they have; getting the environment right, treating people as one might want them to treat you, having those sorts of values within a practice community which is a joined-up concept for this facility. We will do more to stop damage than when you bolt things to the floor.

Mr BROOKS - You are not going to arm with a shot gun either are you?

Mr GREENBERRY - People could use anything for a weapon if they wanted to. I think the concept of a good prison service and what a lot of places miss is that we can do what we want with offenders, but only offenders can stop offending. So somehow in the limited time we have prisoners in a prison is not just about providing activities and needs

PUBLIC

assessments and interventions. We need to do that, but it is about how you get prisoners to change their attitudes and influencing them through our own behaviour.

It is the point that Robert has been making all the way through this, that it is about getting the culture right; the environment, the leadership and treatment of staff, and the leadership of prison officers and the infrastructure. If you miss one of those three out the rest don't work properly. That has been the experience I think of this prison service and why this is so important to get right and why we are so anxious to get your support for this, because it is right thing to do.

Mr HANCL - This brings together the point Paul and Adam made about design and also the learning's from PIRP stage C. I was around for PIRP stage C and much of the consultation that I recall was with the management-level team. I was in the management level. I can't recall ever talking directly with the architects. We had very deliberate discussions about some of those things that happened during PIRP stage C. We focused this program on correction outcomes not buildings. Then we went through a process of saying, what are the functional needs of the facility? We focused on functions; so the building form follows function. The staff are the people that use these facilities every day and I recall, sitting in some of those workshops, and them saying to the architects -. More importantly, putting the staff in direct contact with the architects - the people who are going to design the buildings - that built in a lot of those day-to-day issues. Would that be correct, Kavan? I recall someone saying, 'That won't work because this is how they do it in the field'. By putting that methodology together I am very confident that the design that Kavan has come up with, and being tested again with the staff, has built in some of the lessons from PIRP C. We built that in through the program by changing the delivery model but also their direct involvement and, as you always say, the people that do the job are the ones that know the problems. So I am confident that that has been built in.

Mr APPLEGATE - Senior prison management was not part of most of those user group sessions. It was entirely the people on the ground. Therefore, we were comfortable that they weren't holding back on what they were saying about any of the ideas.

Mr BROOKS - Wouldn't happen I am sure.

Mr WILLIAMS - It might have. We designed the process so that it didn't. So we got a genuine view. As I said, if this \$20 million is spent and we haven't got the facilities that the staff genuinely believe are what they need then I have real problems. They have to be the drivers of it or we are in trouble.

Mr BROOKS - Does it include adequate provision for equipment or that is outside your operating budget?

Mr WILLIAMS - Some of those sorts of things will come out of our operating budget.

Mr HALL - In the cost estimates, on page 32, the infrastructure costs are about \$14 million, and the total project is \$20 million. So we are looking at a good 30 per cent, or a third, which is not infrastructure costs. If you put all those PIRP fees together.

Mr BROOKS - Art work.

PUBLIC

Mr HALL - Yes, you have the old art work back in there again. Just as a general comment, here we have a project of which one third is consumed by matters other than bricks and mortar.

Mr APPLEGATE - The FF&E - furniture, fixtures and equipment - and IT is in the lower -

Mr HALL - There is some IT in there, I will concede that one.

Mr WILLIAMS - As far as we are aware, it is in line with what these sorts of projects take and to make sure that we don't get the sorts of problems we had in PIRP stage C, we have made sure that we have the right experts onboard. Those people cost money to make sure that what you spend in terms of the construction comes out right.

Mr APPLEGATE - The nature of the managing contractor [inaudible] not all has been delivered. We have pulled out the managing contractor fees below that \$14 million mark. If it were a traditional tender project, the whole project would go out to tender and all of the builder's overheads and [inaudible] and management fees would be contained within that tender price. Because of the method of the delivery, it has actually pulled that number out which is part of the build-cost in a traditional tender.

Mr WILLIAMS - Gary, do you have anything to say about that?

Mr HANCL - No. That has been articulated as I understand it to be correct. It is the delivery of the model - that Kavan just picked up - normally that would be included, so it would be 17-something. Because of the way we have done it, the manager contractor fees have come out.

Mr WILLIAMS - It means when we look at the tender that there is transparency and certainty about what the costs going to the managing contractor are and that the money that is listed above the \$14 million is to be spent on actual buildings and materials. We felt that it was a more transparent way of making sure that the costs going to the managing contractor wouldn't vary and fluctuate.

Mr HANCL - You have the \$750 000 which picks up what Adam raised earlier about the furniture, fixtures and equipment. That has actually gone below the line because it is not building the buildings.

Mr HALL - Yes, I can see that. I think you mentioned three tenderers at this stage.

Mr HANCL - Yes.

Mr HALL - And you have a construction contingency in there of 851 but I think you mentioned that you were as confident as you could be that the job would fall within budget - bearing in mind that it is a pretty competitive environment out there for construction at the moment.

Mr WILLIAMS - Our advice is that if we can secure a contract fairly soon that the industry is in such a place that we will be doing quite well. Next year or later this year we will probably see costs increase. We have been able to get more out of the process because of

PUBLIC

the timing than perhaps we would have otherwise. There is some capacity in the industry now to pick this up which will disappear next year.

Mr BROOKS - I apologise for hogging the questions. Have we changed the hinges on the new design for the doors for the cells?

Mr WILLIAMS - The hinges?

Mr BROOKS - Yes. There was a problem with the last doors, is that correct?

Mr WILLIAMS - Post what we call 'toilet gate' where there was an issue with the toilets, we took the opportunity to listen to the staff and we did some retro-fitting in some of the higher security areas on the food hatches. It is probably the hinge on the food hatch that was fixed up.

Mr BROOKS - Yes, thanks for covering me there and not embarrassing me. We have addressed it in the new design, I presume.

Mr WILLIAMS - The design brief is to be a contemporary correctional facility and to take people like Kavan and his firm's expertise in the area to make sure they bring the best that we can. But if you put someone in a cell with nothing and give them long enough they will find a way to break something. You can't turn it into an environment where people are living with nothing around them. If you want people to behave, as Barry said, with decency and civility you have to treat them that way and you have to make sure that the level of comfort you provide is of a basic and adequate nature.

CHAIR - Thank you very much. My judgment is that we have done with the evidence and we appreciate all of the information shared.

Barry, you did mention in answer to a question from Kim that you had a document there that you were prepared to table for us with regard to the mix.

Mr GREENBERRY - The crime list.

CHAIR - Thank you very much.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.