LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

1993-1994 NEW CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM

REPORT NO.16 OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

AUGUST 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Resolution of Appointment

Resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly on 27 March 1992:

'The following general purpose standing committees be established to inquire into and report on matters referred to it by the Assembly or matters that are considered by the committee to be of concern to the community...

'a Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure to examine matters related to planning, land management, transport, economic development, commercial development, industrial and residential development, infrastructure and capital works, science and technology.'

Resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly on 20 May 1993:

'That:

(1) the proposed 1993-1994 New Capital Works Program be referred to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure for inquiry and report by 24 August 1993;

(2) if the Assembly is not sitting when the Committee has completed its inquiry the Committee may send its report to the Speaker or, in the absence of the Speaker, to the Deputy Speaker, who is authorised to give directions for its printing and circulation; and

(3) the foregoing provisions of this resolution have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders.'

Members of the Committee

Mr David Lamont (Chairman)
Mr Trevor Kaine (Deputy Chairman)
Mr Tony De Domenico
Ms Annette Ellis
Ms Helen Szuty

Secretary: Mr Rod Power

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: That the specific agency responsible for a Program item in the Capital Works Program be clearly identified in the documentation.

Recommendation 2: That the layout of the basic documentation provided to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure in relation to the Capital Works Program be improved to provide fuller descriptions and explanations of terms used.

Recommendation 3: That the Capital Works Program contain information on the anticipated capital works expenditure of all Government bodies (including ACTEW and the ACT Housing Trust).

Recommendation 4: That the Capital Works Program contain brief information on the capital works expenditure over recent years.

Recommendation 5: That the Capital Works Program include a summary statement of the significance of the Program (and of other Government related capital works expenditure such as ACTEW and the ACT Housing Trust) to the overall level of economic activity in the ACT for the forthcoming year.

Recommendation 6: That Treasury officials appear at the start of public hearings on the Capital Works Program in order to explain the documentation and place the Capital Works Program in the overall context of economic activity in the ACT, as well as to respond to questions about matters raised in the Committee's Report of the preceding year.

Recommendation 7: That the Capital Works Program include a status report on all projects carried over from previous years, identified by project.

Recommendation 8: That the Capital Works Program include information updating the status of items that appeared in the previous year's forward design program (to show if and where money has been spent, together with an indication of whether the project continues to be rated highly by the agency).

<u>Recommendation 9</u>: Before a project is placed on the draft Capital Works Program for consideration by the Executive (and then forwarded to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure), a clearly defined user brief should have been developed by the agency concerned and enough technical assessment completed to ensure the nature of the project is defined.

Ideally, the project and the design solution should be the subject of a value management study to ensure the brief requirements meet the agency's needs and the prepared design solution is appropriate. This will also ensure that the whole of life costs for the project have been developed and considered at the decision-making stage and cost benefit analysis done where necessary.

There needs to be a process within the administration, with management responsibility to be clearly identified, to ensure that this critical examination of the project is carried out.

This will ensure agencies plan the capital works well ahead and will require maximum use to be made of the forward design program. It will also require appropriate technical and financial expertise to be brought to the project before it becomes part of the forward design program on the Capital Works Program.

In particular, the value management approach could be utilised in the development of all project proposals before they are put on the Program and form the basis of more detailed value management studies as the designs are developed.

<u>Recommendation 10</u>: That information on the three, four or ten year indicative works design program of each Agency be included in the documentation provided to the Executive and then to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure.

<u>Recommendation 11</u>: That the Capital Works Program contain brief information about the type of works to be constructed under headings such as 'Minor New Works', as well as information on the works actually constructed under this heading in the past year's Capital Works Program.

<u>Recommendation 12</u>: That the Department of Urban Services make provision for some progress to be made in 1993-1994 on bicycle access paths to Gungahlin from the rest of Canberra.

<u>Recommendation 13</u>: That in all cases where a sponsoring agency has conducted a whole of life costing of a project, that information should be presented to the Executive and to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure - irrespective of the value of the project.

<u>Recommendation 14</u>: That none of the money shown in the Capital Works Program for North Watson Stage 1, North Duffy/North Holder Stage 1 and Richardson Section 450 Stage 1 be spent until the respective draft variations have passed all necessary stages of the draft variation process, including consideration by the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure.

<u>Recommendation 15</u>: That information updating developments occurring since the initial capital works documents are first prepared be provided to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure in written form prior to the start of public hearings - such information to include instances where projects have gone to tender because of their time critical nature.

<u>Recommendation 16</u>: That the Capital Works Program for 1994-1995 explicitly draw out information on planning for the delivery of services in Gungahlin.

<u>Recommendation 17</u>: That the Capital Works Program include information on an agency's list of outstanding new works, in order to provide an insight into the type of projects being considered for future years.

<u>Recommendation 18</u>: That all steps be taken to expedite the construction of Tuggeranong Youth Resource Centre and that the adequacy of the Centre (once in operation) be closely monitored to ensure it meets the needs of the young people of Tuggeranong.

In addition to the above recommendations, the Committee made the following observation in the body of this Report:

The Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure gives agencies notice that it will consider recommending to the Assembly that proposed expenditure in the Capital Works Program next year on items such as 'Minor New Works' and 'Landscaping' <u>not be passed</u> unless adequate documentation has been provided to the Executive and the Committee.

1993-1994 NEW CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM

BACKGROUND

1. The 1993-1994 New Capital Works Program (CWP) was referred to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure (PDIC) on 20 May 1993. The actual documentation was received by the Committee on 17 June 1993. The PDIC called for public comment via advertisements placed in the 'Public Notice' section of the *Canberra Times* (26 June 1993) and also in the other local press.

2. The PDIC received nine responses from the public (see Appendix A). These responses were authorised for publication. The PDIC also received a great deal of written material from Government agencies, all of which was authorised for publication (see Appendix B).

3. The PDIC held five days of public hearings on the CWP (from 3 August to 10 August 1993). During this time, 59 individuals appeared before the Committee, of whom 38 were from Government agencies and 21 were members of the public (see Appendix C). The transcript of these public hearings runs to 485 pages and will be available on request from the Committee Office once editing corrections are made.

4. The Committee was required to complete its report in a tight time frame, given that the last of the public hearings was held on 10 August and the tabling date was 24 August 1993. In the short time available, the PDIC has attempted to distil the principal themes arising out of its consideration of this year's CWP.

5. The PDIC thanks those who made submissions and/or who appeared before it. The PDIC especially thanks the Government agencies that have so promptly responded to the Committee's request for additional information.

6. Two page references are used throughout this Report - one identifies page numbers in the CWP itself, and the other refers to page numbers in the Transcript of Proceedings (the Hansard record of oral testimony before the Committee). The latter references are to the uncorrected copy of the transcript.

THE CAPITAL WORKS PROGRAM

7. The CWP is set out in Program order with the following Programs containing items in this year's CWP:

- Program 2: Corporate Management (*the responsibility of the Social Policy Branch of the Chief Minister's Division*) - capital works item to the value of $2.959m;

- Program 6: Environment and Conservation (*the responsibility of the Environment, Culture and Sport Division of the Department of the Environment, Land and Planning*) - capital works items to the value of $5.115m;

- Program 8: Land (*the responsibility of Land Division of the Department of the Environment, Land and Planning*) - capital works items to the value of $17.678m;

- Program 9: the Arts (*the responsibility of Environment, Culture and Sport Division of the Department of the Environment, Land and Planning*) - capital works items to the value of $2.160m;

- Program 10: Sport and Recreation (*the responsibility of Environment, Culture and Sport Division of the Department of the Environment, Land and Planning*) - capital works items to the value of $2.650m;

- Program 13: Administration of Justice (*the responsibility of the Attorney-General's Department*) - capital works items to the value of $0.200m;

- Program 14: Maintenance of Law and Order (*the responsibility of the Attorney-General's Department*) - capital works items to the value of $0.250m;

- Program 15: Housing and Community Services (*the responsibility of the Housing and Community Services Bureau*) - capital works items to the value of $2.700m;

- Program 16: Public Transport (*the responsibility of ACTION within the Department of Urban Services*) - capital works items to the value of $2.500m;

- Program 17: City Services (*the responsibility of ACT City Services within the Department of Urban Services*) - capital works items to the value of $5.230m;

- Program 18: Fire and Emergency Services (*the responsibility of ACT Fire and Emergency Services within the Department of Urban Services*) - capital works items to the value of $0.300m;

- Program 20: Corporate Development for the Department of Urban Services - capital works items to the value of $0.500m;

- Program 21: Government Corporate Services (*the responsibility of the Corporate Services Bureau of the Department of Urban Services*) - capital works items to the value of $7.000m;

- Program 22: Canberra Institute of Technology - capital works items to the value of $0.800m;

- Program 23: Government Schooling (*the responsibility of the Department of Education and Training*) - capital works items to the value of $21.950m;

- Program 26: Health (*the responsibility of the Department of Health*) - capital works items to the value of $1.005m.

8. As well as the above components, the CWP contains Forward Design work to the value of $6.000m and projects to be funded from the Casino Premium to the value of $12.00m. In summary, the new capital works outlined in the CWP amount to $90.997m.

CONSIDERATION BY THE PDIC: BROAD THEMES

9. The first recommendation of the PDIC in relation to this year's CWP concerns the absence of information in the Program identifying the specific agency having financial responsibility for a capital works matter. None of the information listed in italics in the above list of capital works projects is identified in the documentation, yet it is essential to know the agency responsible for a program if accountability is to be made clear.

Recommendation 1: That the specific agency responsible for a Program item in the Capital Works Program be clearly identified in the documentation.

10. The CWP overview statement is at Attachment A of the documentation provided to the Committee on 17 June 1993. The statement comprises three tables. The first shows capital works spending in 1992-1993 by 'cash' and 'revote', the second or middle table shows capital works spending in 1993-1994, and the third table is a summary table. There is no explanation of terms like 'authorised', 'cash' and 'revote.' While the PDIC has become familiar with the terms, it is likely that many community groups are not - and yet, these groups are among the members of the public making considerable use of the documentation (as became clear to the PDIC by the attendance of these groups at the public hearings). It should be possible to add a brief explanation of such terms where they first appear in the CWP. [For the uninitiated, Treasury officials explained that 'cash' is the dollar amount to be expended in the current year and 'revote' is the level of expenditure likely to be rolled over into future years.][1]

11. This comment receives impetus from statements by the Master Builders Association of the ACT (MBA). The MBA observed that the layout of the CWP was poor, unhelpful to any reader and looked like 'it was simply an extract of a past Cabinet submission'.[2] The PDIC considers the layout of the basic documentation provided to the Committee and hence to the public can easily be improved.

Recommendation 2: That the layout of the basic documentation provided to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure in relation to the Capital Works Program be improved to provide fuller descriptions and explanations of terms used.

[1] Transcript page 5
[2] Transcript page 233

12. Treasury's oral testimony to the Committee about the CWP was as follows:

> the new works approved for 1993-1994... [are] about $94.5m, of which approximately $30m is expected to be spent in 1993-1994. That new works program adds to the works in progress which amount to $71m, plus what is remaining in the continuing hospital redevelopment project of about $66m. Of that total of works in progress, the expenditure in 1993-1994 is about $88m and that adds to the new works recommended for approval in this report which is $30m and that would mean $118m of expenditure on ACT general Government works in 1993-1994 if this program goes ahead.[3]

13. Treasury noted that the activities of ACTEW and the ACT Housing Trust are not shown in the CWP but that if they are included, then the total Government capital works activity is $182m. Treasury considers this expenditure will maintain the present level of economic activity in the ACT [4] but the PDIC heard a contrary opinion from the MBA (see more below). The PDIC considers that brief information on the capital works of these other Government bodies should be included in the documentation provided to the Committee, because it enables the Committee (and the public) to obtain a view of the overall level of Government capital works expenditure in any given year. The PDIC observes that such information may require only the addition of some lines to Attachment A of the CWP.

Recommendation 3: That the Capital Works Program contain information on the anticipated capital works expenditure of all Government bodies (including ACTEW and the ACT Housing Trust).

14. The PDIC also would find it helpful if brief information was provided on the trend line of capital works expenditure over the past few years. The Committee invariably requests the Treasury officials to comment on this matter, meaning that this oral request could be anticipated in future years. Again, the purpose of such information is to better appreciate how the capital works expenditure proposed for the current year fits into the pattern of overall economic activity in the ACT.

Recommendation 4: That the Capital Works Program contain brief information on the capital works expenditure over recent years.

15. Also relevant here is an indication of how significant Treasury considers the CWP to be in the total ACT economy. This requires some analysis of overall activity in the ACT. In oral evidence to the Committee, Treasury gave such an analysis, concluding that 'the likely level of construction activity in the ACT... with this Program is very similar to the level that was effected last year.'[5] The MBA queried this claim, noting that the level of capital works proposed for 1993-1994 was $30m less than that for the previous year and stating this would have severe repercussions for the local building industry. The MBA expressed concern that a cut back in capital works expenditure might seem attractive 'merely to prop up an excess recurrent

[3] Transcript page 5
[4] ibid
[5] ibid

program'.[6] Treasury provided additional information to the Committee on this matter and undertook to do so in the future.

Recommendation 5: That the Capital Works Program include a summary statement of the significance of the Program (and of other Government related capital works expenditure such as ACTEW and the ACT Housing Trust) to the overall level of economic activity in the ACT for the forthcoming year.

16. When considering the CWP in previous years, the PDIC has benefited from a private briefing by Treasury officials prior to the public hearings and then a further appearance by Treasury at the end of the public hearings. The PDIC appreciates this practice and wishes to continue with it. Also this year, the PDIC asked Treasury to appear at the start of the public hearings so that it could speak to the whole CWP and answer questions on the public record about the implementation of the Committee's recommendations in the previous year (bearing in mind the Government's formal response to the Committee's 1992-1993 Report). The Committee found this additional hearing very useful and wishes to continue the practice.

Recommendation 6: That Treasury officials appear at the start of public hearings on the Capital Works Program in order to explain the documentation and place the Capital Works Program in the overall context of economic activity in the ACT, as well as to respond to questions about matters raised in the Committee's Report of the preceding year.

17. The PDIC noted that the documents provided to it do not include a status report on the particular projects being carried over from former years. The documentation does provide an overall dollar total carried over (under the 'revote' heading on Attachment A of the CWP), but not by project.

Recommendation 7: That the Capital Works Program include a status report on all projects carried over from previous years, identified by project.

18. In a similar vein, the PDIC asked about items on last year's forward design program that had not made it into the CWP this year. There was no information in the documentation initially provided to the Committee about why these items had not appeared, nor was there information on whether any funds were expended on them in the past year. Such information is useful in understanding the background to the CWP and on changed priorities from year to year. The Committee stresses that it is not criticising the fact that priorities are altered, as this is inevitable as Governments respond to changing circumstances. But it would be useful to have brief information on the status of past forward design items.

[6] Transcript page 247. The MBA also asserted that the ACT's leasehold system acts as an impediment to development (Transcript page 251). The Committee requested that any evidence in support of this contention be provided to the Committee, as it would relate to the Committee's on-going reference to 'examine matters related to... [inter alia] economic development...'. The MBA undertook to provide such information on a confidential basis. The Committee appreciates this offer by the MBA.

Recommendation 8: That the Capital Works Program include information updating the status of items that appeared in the previous year's forward design program (to show if and where money has been spent, together with an indication of whether the project continues to be rated highly by the agency).

19. The CWP this year contained no information showing the through-life cost of projects, despite the Committee's recommendation last year that 'the concept of through Life Cost Liability be applied to the ACT Capital Works Program, beginning with the Program for 1993-1994'. The Government's response to this recommendation was as follows:

> The Government also agrees with the Committee that there is a need for a better cost/benefit assessment of projects in the Capital Works Program.
>
> We propose that, beginning with the 1993-1994 program, major projects over $1 million should have an assessment of costs and benefits wherever practicable. The $1 million threshold will avoid excessive administrative expenses for smaller projects.[7]

20. The Committee noted the formal advice from Treasury to agencies requiring them to conform to the Executive's decision. In oral testimony to the Committee, Treasury described the response of agencies to the Government's decision as 'patchy' and commented that 'there is a learning exercise on certain techniques and data accumulation that is required...'[8] Treasury denied that differences with agencies might be inhibiting the learning experience.[9]

21. The PDIC does not accept that the response is adequate. Nor does the Committee consider that Government agencies should be able to avoid their documentation requirements in the future because of 'learning' difficulties. In the Committee's view, the absence of through-life costings in the present CWP for projects costing over $1m is an 'appalling' omission.[10]

22. The basic position of the PDIC is contained in the following comments:

> We are charged with the responsibility of assessing whether or not the projects that are being considered by Government are appropriate projects for the taxpayers' dollar. We believe that for us to provide that analysis and be informed in relation to that, that we need this information... It is a question of this Committee being confident that when it reports to the Assembly - which, at the end of the day, has got to pass the Budget, has got to pass the Capital Works Program, has got to satisfy the people of Canberra that the taxpayers' dollars are being spent wisely - it is a question of this Committee being satisfied that other alternatives may or were properly not considered because of the cost implications.[11]... How can we assess whether or not one bus shelter is different and better that another bus shelter system...? How can we decide whether or not the construction of schools around the same size serving around the same client population in Gungahlin is being built as efficiently.. as one in Tuggeranong?... that is the essential information that we need to be able, in an informed way, to comment on the Capital Works Program.[12]

[7] Ministerial Statement: ACT Government Response to the Report by the PDIC on the New Capital Works Program for 1992-1993, delivered by the Chief Minister and Treasurer on 22 October 1992.
[8] Transcript page 13
[9] Transcript page 15
[10] Transcript page 13

23. The PDIC notes that this places a heavy responsibility on Treasury to get its act together because it is the agency responsible for oversighting the CWP through the Executive and on to the PDIC.[13]

24. The above comments were made at the start of the public hearings. The PDIC came back to this issue at the end of the public hearings, noting:

> we are getting a distinct impression that there is a substantial problem between the sponsoring agency, Public Works and Treasury's view of the world... in terms of this Capital Works Program it just seems as though we can be doing it better between all of the agencies.[14]

25. The PDIC wants to be certain that the priorities for capital works are determined in the most cost efficient, time efficient and necessary way, but:

> It is not being done at the moment. The Public Works area, themselves, have an internal process but it appears... that before Public Works actually gets hold of some of these projects that there is substantial work being done in the agency so that when the agency then refers it off to Public Works you have virtually got, because of the instruction document, which is the briefing document which accompanies the agency request, you are virtually locked into a particular delivery method, project construction and size and the way it hangs together and so it is extremely difficult to challenge the philosophy behind the agency decision to proceed on a particular program.[15]

26. One suggestion might be for Treasury to toughen up on the documentation required from agencies - for example, if the value management approach was adopted for projects above a certain amount (of which more below), then:

> it would be interesting to see what the result would be were [Treasury] to say to those agencies, 'You must now adopt this method to assess whether or not this is an appropriate one to remain on the forward design program'.[16]

[11] Transcript page 34
[12] Transcript page 18
[13] ibid
[14] Transcript pages 482-483
[15] Transcript page 482
[16] ibid

27. It is possible that if Treasury and Public Works were involved in the process at an earlier stage then the Treasury would be more aware of any difficulties associated with agency proposals. It seems to the Committee that the agencies are critical in the process for they are the genesis of the proposals.[17]

28. The PDIC is reluctantly forced to conclude that the detail in the original documents provided to it:

> is simply not enough for us to make a realistic comment to the taxpayer saying, 'Yes, we have scrutinised every dollar of expenditure and every dollar of expenditure in here is necessary' or, put another way, to enable the PDIC to say to the taxpayers of Canberra, 'Yes, we have assessed what the executive are proposing to spend your money on and we believe it is reasonable and we believe it is reasonable on this basis'.[18]

29. The PDIC heard evidence from Mr D Hannan in support of a method called the value management approach that is said to offer real savings in overall Government expenditure. Mr Hannan noted the 'vast difference between cost conscious[ness] and applying value management'[19] and said that value management needs to be applied very early in the life of a project. He thought the value management approach quickly revealed 'the lowest practical cost alternative which will meet the agreed functional requirements of a user'.[20]

30. Mr Hannan offered the following definition of value management:

> value management is a systematic, formal and documented process used to eliminate unnecessary life cycle cost, which include initial cost, of an engineering or architectural project without comprising or diminishing the safety, operational, aesthetics, useful life or any other functional aspects of the finished product.[21]

31. Mr Hannan informed the PDIC that the United States House of Representatives has just passed a bill making value management mandatory for all Federal projects over $2m[22] and that the NSW Government has successfully trialed the approach (for projects of about $5m).

32. The PDIC is aware that the responsibilities of Treasury and Public Works are not always the same and that an approach introduced in just one body might not be welcomed by the other agency. In response to a question raising this sort of issue, Mr Hannan commented that Treasury would need to be convinced of the worth of any new method introduced elsewhere in the Government service; but that he expected this would occur once the benefits became obvious - The PDIC appreciated Mr Hannan's oral and written evidence.

---

[17] Transcript page 18
[18] Transcript page 105
[19] Transcript page 258
[20] ibid
[21] ibid
[22] Transcript page 255

33. The Committee is convinced that the capital works process in the ACT needs to be improved. The following recommendation, although lengthy, suggests the direction the Government may consider:

***Recommendation 9:* Before a project is placed on the draft Capital Works Program for consideration by the Executive (and then forwarded to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure), a clearly defined user brief should have been developed by the agency concerned and enough technical assessment completed to ensure the nature of the project is defined.**

Ideally, the project and the design solution should be the subject of a value management study to ensure the brief requirements meet the agency's needs and the prepared design solution is appropriate. This will also ensure that the whole of life costs for the project have been developed and considered at the decision-making stage and cost benefit analysis done where necessary.

There needs to be a process within the administration, with management responsibility to be clearly identified, to ensure that this critical examination of the project is carried out.

This will ensure agencies plan the capital works well ahead and will require maximum use to be made of the forward design program. It will also require appropriate technical and financial expertise to be brought to the project before it becomes part of the forward design program on the Capital Works Program.

In particular, the value management approach could be utilised in the development of all project proposals before they are put on the Program and form the basis of more detailed value management studies as the designs are developed.

TOWARDS BETTER DOCUMENTATION

34. While the Report thus far has been critical of the initial information provided to the PDIC, the Committee appreciates the worth of the supplementary information provided by Treasury and agencies in response to the Committee's request. This additional information has been of significant benefit.

35. Following this overview of the broad matters elicited by the Committee's examination of this year's CWP, the Report now makes some comments on matters concerning specific departments and the programs for which they are responsible. This material is arranged in the order in which Programs were examined by the Committee during the public hearings.

CONSIDERATION BY THE PDIC: SPECIFIC PROGRAM AREAS

Department of Urban Services (Programs 16-Public Transport; 17-City Services; 18-Fire and Emergency Services; 20-Corporate Development; 21-Government Corporate Services)

36. The PDIC was pleased to learn that most projects in the Department of Urban Services (DUS) have been the subject of cost benefit studies, including many programs costing less than $1m. The Committee acknowledges that DUS, along with all other Government agencies, was not required to refer in the documentation to the fact that such studies had been done - the Treasurer's response to the Committee's 1992-1993 Report specifying that they should be done for 'major projects over $1m' (see earlier in this Report). The PDIC asked for these cost benefit studies to be provided and for those that had been passed through Treasury to be identified

37. The PDIC was also pleased at the straightforward account of progress being made by Public Works in preparing whole of life costings:

> there have been quite dramatic improvements... [In] areas like roads where we have done a very comprehensive study of whole of life costing of roads and that has led to a very clear understanding of what sort of money you should spend on roads and when to maintain them at an optimum level. I believe also in the traffic management area there has been a lot of work done. There is now a comprehensive manual which has been prepared which is a guide to how to do a project, how to justify it, how to do the cost and benefit.[23]

38. The PDIC was interested to learn that DUS has a ten year indicative works design program and a three year indicative program. The Committee considers this is useful information and should be referred to in the documentation provided to the Committee.

Recommendation 10: That information on the three, four or ten year indicative works design program of each Agency be included in the documentation provided to the Executive and then to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure.

39. The PDIC asked DUS whether it experienced some difficulty in liaising with the Department of Education about the construction of schools. DUS informed the Committee that it was using the novated design and construct method for Palmerston Primary School and Pre-School, which is the first time it has been used by DUS on a project of this size. DUS described the novated method as one where:

> we take the design to a point prior to finishing detail documentation, and then call tenders and ask the contractor to take responsibility for doing the detailed design in accordance with the overall final sketch plans that are

[23] Transcript page 20

> provided, and that is effectively detailing the electrical, mechanical equipment etcetera.[24]

40. DUS expects the novated method to speed up construction time and the Department does not expect problems. DUS told the Committee that there is no cost penalty in using different project delivery systems.[25]

41. The PDIC asked about the priority numbering system used in the documentation. The Committee noted, in relation to DUS projects, that a priority 5 item ('Bus Stop Pads and Shelters') was included in the CWP, leading to the question 'what priority 1,2,3, and 4 items were put aside for this priority 5 item?' The PDIC appreciates the need for an agency's capital works program to be flexible and for the Government to be able to impose its directions, but suggests something could be done to make greater sense to the lay reader of these priority numbers.

42. One particular item in the Public Transport Program led to detailed questions by the Committee. The item is headed 'Bus and Taxi Passenger Facilities at City East and City West', costing $1.7m that is described as being of 'a preliminary nature only' (pages 65-66 of the CWP). No information on the total cost of the project was provided in the documentation and the item was not in last year's forward design program. The PDIC was informed that the project had to wait upon a decision on the permanent site for the Casino, but the Committee was disappointed by the poor documentation initially provided. The Committee subsequently called for supplementary information on the likely cost of repairs, service and maintenance costs - which the Department has provided.

43. The PDIC requested further information on 'Minor Works' projects (like those on page 68 and 74 in relation to DUS). Again, the PDIC accepts that flexibility is necessary in such programs but public accountability is best served by an agency providing some clue to the type of works to take place under such headings. In addition, the Committee feels it would be useful to have a brief reference to the type of work done under this heading in the past year's Program.

Recommendation 11: That the Capital Works Program contain brief information about the type of works to be constructed under headings such as 'Minor New Works', as well as information on the works actually constructed under this heading in the past year's Capital Works Program.

44. The PDIC was advised that the finds allocated to the bus shelter construction program (page 67 of the CWP) were to be reduced from $0.350m to $0.100m. The Government may care to consider allocating the unutilised funds to accelerate work on 'Playground Safety and Landscape Development' (page 27 of the CWP).

45. The PDIC appreciated the manner in which DUS handled inquiries by the Committee at the public hearings. With the Secretary of the Department in attendance, various officers in charge of specific items on the CWP were made available to answer questions of detail, thus leading to a quick resolution of many

[24] Transcript page 40
[25] Transcript page 41

questions from Members. One example concerns traffic management devices in Hughes and Garran (page 73 of the CWP), where departmental officers were able to answer detailed questions on the spot. The PDIC complimented DUS on the extent of its public consultation and extensive documentation on this matter.[26]

46. The PDIC examined proposed expenditure on NATEX (page 86 of the CWP) in light of the Committee's recent report on *Possible Uses of the $19m Casino Premium*, which recommended that $1.5m be spent on NATEX. The PDIC is also aware that $200,000 was recently allocated to upgrade one of the buildings in NATEX. The PDIC noted that it had not been provided with a whole of life analysis of the works proposed for NATEX and requested this information be provided.

47. Useful comment on matters in DUS' capital works program was made by representatives of Gungahlin Community Council (GCC) and the Belconnen Community Council (BCC). The GCC pointed out that no bike path access existed into Gungahlin from the rest of Canberra. The PDIC notes the proposed expenditure of $400,000 on 'Bicycle Network and Facilities Improvements' (page 71 of the CWP) and considers the Department could consider using some of these funds for this purpose.

Recommendation 12: That the Department of Urban Services make provision for some progress to be made in 1993-1994 on bicycle access paths to Gungahlin from the rest of Canberra.

48. The BCC raised concerns about the proposed expenditure on Ginninderra Creek gross pollutant traps (page 76 of the CWP) and the upgrading of the hazardous waste facility at West Belconnen Landfill site (page 82 of the CWP). The BCC noted that the wording of this second item is not strictly accurate, in that the Department is proposing long term burial of the hazardous wastes rather than 'storage' as stated in the CWP. The Committee is concerned at the potential remifications of the treatment of hazardous waste. The PDI sought further information from the Department on these matters.

49. Both the GCC and the BCC tabled a list of concerns affecting their areas, which the Committee passed on to the relevant Government bodies for reply. The responses were then made available to the community groups in order that they can assess the viewpoint of the Government agencies and follow up those matters still of concern.

50. The PDIC notes the range and diversity of issues brought forward by the community councils. The Committee also notes the request of BCC and GCC for some way to be found for them to provide input into the forward design program. The PDIC reminded the councils of the need to ensure they keep the relevant Minister informed of any concerns and invited them to send a copy of any correspondence to the Minister to the Committee for information (and possible follow up).

[26] Transcript page 72

Housing and Community Services Bureau (Program 15-Housing and Community Services)

51. The PDIC noted that the CWP contained no whole of life costings for replacement/refurbishment of Quamby Youth Centre (Stage 2) (page 58 of the CWP). The Committee requested this information be made available, and it was subsequently provided. The Committee makes the observation in this, as in other cases, that agencies do themselves a disfavour by neglecting to put information of this kind in the initial documentation provided to the Executive and hence to the Committee. The omission is all the more surprising where agencies actually have the information at hand, as was shown on this occasion.

Recommendation 13: That in all cases where a sponsoring agency has conducted a whole of life costing of a project, that information should be presented to the Executive and to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure - irrespective of the value of the project.

Attorney-General's Department (Programs 13-Administration of Justice; 14-Maintenance of Law and Order)

52. In relation to the item headed 'Minor New Works' (page 57 of the CWP), the PDIC asked for information on the long term strategy for police accommodation in the ACT. The Department undertook to seek the approval of the Minister to release this information to the Committee.

Department of the Environment, Land and Planning (DELP): Land Division (Program 8-Land)

53. The PDIC closely questioned DELP on the objectives and timetable for urban renewal. The Committee also heard evidence from North Watson and North Duffy/Holder community groups objecting to the urban renewal proposals for these areas. The PDIC acknowledges that the documentation contains no indication of the total cost of the projects although the proposed expenditures exceed $1m in both cases.

54. The PDIC was told by departmental officers that if the urban renewal proposals for these areas do not proceed (along with that for Richardson Section 450: the Tuggeranong Homestead area), then DELP will move to increase the pace of greenfields development in Gungahlin to ensure that the anticipated demand for housing units in Canberra is met (expected to be about 3,300 this year).[27]

55. The PDIC in its report on the *Draft Territory Plan* has called for the preparation of a consolidated paper on the urban renewal program. The Committee was pleased to learn that the Minister may provide such detail in the very near future.

[27] Transcript page 127

This should alleviate some community concern and facilitate wider understanding of the issues giving rise to the urban renewal program.[28]

56. The PDIC is conscious of the fact that local communities want to be involved in forward planning for their areas as well as in the actual implementation (for example, in proposals for tree planting). The PDIC has been concerned about the consultation process used in relation to the urban renewal program and thus is pleased to note significant improvement in the handling of proposals for Richardson (the Tuggeranong Homestead area). The officials appearing before the Committee indicated the Department wants to improve linkages with community groups[29] and that it has, over the past year, 'initiated a program of consultation with community councils'.[30]

57. The PDIC noted the apology by departmental officers for words in the CWP pertaining to proposed capital works expenditure on North Watson Stage 1 (page 41 of the CWP), North Duffy/North Holder Stage 1 (page 42 of the CWP) and Richardson Section 450 Stage 1 (page 43 of the CWP).[31] In each case, the words appear under the sub-heading 'Public Consultation' and read: 'A Preliminary Assessment is being prepared for public consultation. This will lead to approval of a draft Variation to the Territory Plan.' It is obvious that such terminology presumes the outcome of the Government's consideration of the Preliminary Assessment, and thus is entirely inappropriate. The Committee wishes to stress that it has in no way formed a considered view on these urban renewal programs. At the appropriate time, the Committee will examine any draft variation for one or more of the areas if it is forwarded from the Executive.

Recommendation 14: That none of the money shown in the Capital Works Program for North Watson Stage 1, North Duffy/North Holder Stage 1 and Richardson Section 450 Stage 1 be spent until the respective draft variations have passed all necessary stages of the draft variation process, including consideration by the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure.

58. The PDIC questioned the Department about the proposed expenditure on the Gungahlin Town Centre Trunk Sewer (page 33 of the CWP). The documents indicate this work is required to facilitate development of the new suburb of Harrison as well as of the town centre. The PDIC requested that it be advised of any proposals for development in the town centre area, following its support for the concept of an urban village in its report on the *Draft Territory Plan.*

59. In relation to the proposed expenditure on Gungahlin Bulk Provision (page 34 of the CWP), the PDIC again noted that the documentation should provide information on the type of works constructed under this heading in the past, as well as some indication of what it is proposed to spend the money on in the current year.

[28] Transcript page 156
[29] Transcript page 140
[30] Transcript page 128
[31] Transcript page 163

60. A similar issue involved the item 'Minor New Works' (page 44 of the CWP). Though the proposed expenditure is $1m, there was no cost benefit assessment provided in the initial documentation. Under the items 'Neighbourhood Landscaping' (page 45 of the CWP) and 'Flood Protection Works' (page 46 of the CWP), the same issue arose - though the proposed expenditure in these cases is less than $1m. The PDIC is very concerned about the number of such instances in the CWP.

The Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure gives agencies notice that it will consider recommending to the Assembly that proposed expenditure in the Capital Works Program next year on such items as 'Minor New Works' and 'Landscaping' not be passed unless adequate documentation has been provided to the Executive and the Committee.

61. The PDIC queried the item dealing with hydraulic services associated with the road construction of Heidelberg Street and Conder Group Centre (page 38 of the CWP). The PDIC was told that tenders had been called for this work because it is time critical (meaning that there is a need to call tenders prior to the Budget being brought down).[32] The Committee considers this sort of information should be provided to it as soon as it is known.

62. Also in this category was information on the time critical nature of constructing neighbourhood ovals in Conder and Palmerston School and Pre-School. The Committee notes that the priority listing shown in the CWP does not reflect this high priority, which is another reason for examining the matter of priority listings in the documentation (see the Committee's earlier comment on this matter). The PDIC considers that it should be told of these changed deadlines and priorities.

Recommendation 15: That information updating developments since the initial capital works documents are first prepared be provided to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Infrastructure in written form prior to the start of public hearings - such information to include instances where projects have gone to tender because of their time critical nature.

Canberra Institute of Technology (CIT) (Program 22)

63. The CIT informed the Committee that it had completed all the capital works listed in the 1992-1993 CWP.[33] This information serves to give the PDIC an indication of whether agencies are likely to actually complete the projects for which they have sought capital works funding in a particular year.

64. The PDIC asked the departmental representatives about progress in planning for CIT services in Gungahlin. The Committee was told that the Institute is awaiting clarification of where rapid public transport lines will go in Gungahlin but that it should be in a position to inform the Committee of more definite plans during

[32] Transcript page 151
[33] Transcript page 186

hearings on next year's CWP.[34] The Committee would appreciate such advice on planning for services in a newly developing area like Gungahlin.

Recommendation 16: That the Capital Works Program for 1994-1995 explicitly draw out information on planning for the delivery of services in Gungahlin.

65. The PDIC was pleased to find that departmental representatives provided a detailed list of outstanding minor new works. This gives the Committee an indication of what items did not make this year's program but which are likely to be included in next year's CWP. It is the Committee's opinion that the CIT sets a benchmark for all agencies in the provision of such information.

Recommendation 17: That the Capital Works Program include information on an agency's list of outstanding new works, in order to provide an insight into the type of projects being considered for future years.

Department of Education (Program 23-Government Schooling)

66. The PDIC questioned the item covering Palmerston Primary and Pre-School (pages 89-91 of the CWP). The Committee noted a letter from the Chief Minister during the public hearings advising that this project is time critical. The PDIC sought further information on the justification for this claim, taking into account the comment by representatives of the Association of Parents and Friends of ACT Schools (APFACTS) that the CWP did not contain sufficient information to justify the construction of Palmerston School in the current year.

67. APFACTS stated that cost savings could be achieved by delaying the project by just one year (even taking into account the cost of bussing schoolchildren to schools out of Gungahlin).[35] The Education Department subsequently provided a fuller explanation of the rationale for proceeding with Palmerston in 1993-1994 and the Committee accepts that it is desirable a Government school opens in Gungahlin as soon as possible.

68. The Committee asked departmental representatives why the plans for Palmerston Primary and Pre-School did not reproduce (with appropriate modifications) those for Conder Primary School. The Committee is not entirely convinced of the adequacy of the Department's response but in the short time available was unable to pursue this matter further.

69. The PDIC is sympathetic to the claim by APFACTS that the ACT in the past has devoted too much land to education and that schools have been built too big.[36] The Committee is also aware that costs can be reduced by greater cooperation among education sectors and noted on a recent visit to Adelaide that this was being done at Golden Grove. The Committee supports further work being undertaken on the

[34] Transcript page 187
[35] Transcript page 198
[36] Transcript pages 204-205

possibilities for joint development of school facilities by the Government and non-Government sectors.

70. The PDIC noted that information on 'Minor New Works' was lacking, yet the proposed expenditure is $1m (page 97 of the CWP). Again, the Committee requested - and received - supplementary information on this matter.

Department of Health (Program 26-ACT Health)

71. The PDIC asked Health officials whether any capital works funds were going towards the provision of a Minor Procedures Unit (including an abortion clinic) in the Health Building at the corner of Moore and Alinga Streets in the City. This followed testimony by representatives of the ACT Right to Life Association that such a facility in this location would endanger patient health care in that it was too far from hospitals.[37] The Association also claimed that the overall costs of this facility are underestimated.[38]

72. Health officials advised the Committee that about $45,000 was going to this purpose and that these funds formed part of the item headed 'Miscellaneous Minor New Works' (page 99 of the CWP).[39] The Committee questioned the officials about the extent of public consultation on this proposed expenditure.

Social Policy Branch of the Chief Minister's Division (Program 2-Corporate Management)

73. The PDIC queried officials about the adequacy of the proposed Tuggeranong Youth Resource Centre (page 16 of the CWP) in light of the growth of Tuggeranong . The Committee was informed that the proposed facility 'is the same as Woden with the exception of the large hall at Woden'.[40] The Committee requested further information on the possibilities of expanding the facility should the need arise, and this information was subsequently provided. The PDIC also requested information on the whole of life cost of the facility.

74. The Committee would be concerned if the Youth Resource Centre proved inadequate to meet the growing population of young people in Tuggeranong.

Recommendation 18: That all steps be taken to expedite the construction of Tuggeranong Youth Resource Centre and that the adequacy of the Centre (once in operation) be closely monitored to ensure it meets the needs of the young people of Tuggeranong.

[37] Transcript page 271
[38] Transcript page 270
[39] Transcript page 280
[40] Transcript page 296

75. The Committee questioned officials about the progress being made on planning for social facilities in Gungahlin. The Committee is aware of the social dislocation caused when these projects are delayed in new areas. The Committee was pleased to learn that the Department is closely consulting the Gungahlin community in the development of proposals for the area. The Committee's earlier recommendation (Number 16) is relevant to this issue.

76. In relation to the provision of an Aboriginal Keeping Place (page 18 of the CWP), the Committee notes that this was the Committee's highest priority project in it's Report on *Possible Uses of the Casino Premium.* The Committee notesthat it may take some time for the project to work though all stages of the Aboriginal consultative process. The PDIC requests that it be kept informed of progress on this project.

Environment, Culture and Sport Division of the Department of the Environment, Land and Planning (Programs 6-Environment and Conservation; 9-Arts; and 10-Sport and Recreation)

77. The PDIC noted the absence of whole of life costings for the items headed 'City Parks Depot Refurbishment' (page 19 of the CWP) and 'Mitchell City Parks Depot' (page 20 of the CWP), though the proposed expenditure in each case is over $1m. The Committee requested - and received - supplementary information on these items.

78. The Committee asked the departmental officials to provide advice on the value of the depots. The officials were unable to do so, though it was noted that the move to accrual accounting in the ACT service will mean that this information will become available in the future. The Committee does not consider this response is good enough.

79. The Committee is particularly concerned about the suggestion in the documentation that the sale of facilities (for example, the City Parks depots) or land (in the case of DELP programs) in itself justifies further capital works. The Committee cannot stress enough that it needs to be confident that each particular item in the CWP is justified on its own merits rather than on the basis of expected income from sales. On the basis of the information contained on pages 19 and 20 of the CWP - that is, on the basis of the original information provided - the members of the Committee were unable to so satisfy themselves. However, the response of officials to the Committee's questions, together with the supplementary information provided by the Department, has clarified this matter.

80. The Committee reminded departmental representatives that it could initiate an inquiry into any particular expenditure or item if it became concerned that money was not being well spent; in which case, the department would be required to furnish detailed justifications and records on why any particular proposal was included in the CWP. It seems to the Committee that it is in an agency's interest to provide this information in the initial documentation provided in the CWP. It is this conviction that backs up all of the recommendations of this Report.

81. The PDIC asked for supplementary information on the type of expenditure likely to be incurred under headings like 'Canberra Urban Areas Urgent Landscape Works' (page 26 of the CWP) and 'Minor New Works' (page 29 of the CWP).

82. In considering the item headed 'Replace Air Conditioning - Canberra Theatre Centre' (page 49 of the CWP), the Committee noted the absence of whole of life costings. The PDIC also considered the assessment summary inadequate (on page 50 of the CWP). The wording of the recurrent budget implications was met with incredulity- the Committee expresses surprise that a capital works expenditure of $2.1m will produce recurrent savings of only $3,000 per annum but is even more surprised to learn that even this saving will not be realised - due to the fact that 'the additional cost of the increased area to be air conditioned will offset these savings'! (See page 50 of the CWP.)

83. Notwithstanding the poor documentation, the Committee was concerned to learn of the safety ramifications noted in the assessment summary. The Committee requested supplementary information on whether the Theatre would have to close while the work is being done and how long the work was likely to take. The Committee notes that the documentation of this item is another example of inadequate attention to the justification for the project.

84. In relation to the Sport and Recreation Program, the Committee noted that whole of life costings for Conder/Gordon district playing fields was not provided although the proposed expenditure is $1.850m (page 52 of the CWP). In making this comment the Committee does not wish to raise the slightest doubt about the desirability of the project; but it should be possible for agencies to estimate the recurrent costs of the proposals they put forward. This is essential information in gaining an accurate appreciation of the CWP.

CONCLUSION

85. The PDIC expects that this Report will generate some re-examination of the present capital works process in the ACT, including the quality of documentation provided to the Executive in the first instance and then to the Committee. The Committee notes that departments and agencies have made improvements in recent years and that the preparation of their capital works documentation is only one of a great number of competing demands upon their resources. The Committee was impressed by the capacity of agencies to provide the supplementary information sought by the Committee at short notice. This means that the information is existent in the agencies but simply was overlooked in the preparation of the CWP. The Committee believes that the job should be properly done in the first place if the Executive and the Canberra community are to have confidence that public funds are being allocated efficiently and purposefully.

David Lamont MLA
Chairman

20 August 1993

APPENDIX A: WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

ACT Right to Life Association (dated 26 July 1993

Association of Parents and Friends of ACT Schools Inc. (dated 25 July 1993)

Conservation Council of the South-East Region & Canberra (Inc.) (dated 19 July 1993)

Gungahlin Community Council (dated 3 August 1993 and 10 August 1993)

Master Builders' Association of the ACT (dated 28 July 1993) and letter from the same organisation dated 22 March 1993

Minders of Tuggeranong Homestead (dated 20 July 1993);

North Duffy/Holder Residents Action Group (dated 19 July 1993 and 10 August 1993)

Watson Community Association (dated 9 July 1993 and 6 August 1993)

Dr C L Watson (dated 18 July 1993)

APPENDIX B: DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND AUTHORISED FOR PUBLICATION

Letter from the Chief Minister Ms Follett MLA enclosing the 1993-1994 New Capital Works Program (dated 17 June 1993)

Letter from Ms R Follett MLA, Chief Minister (dated 3 August 1993), regarding Palmerston Primary and Preschool

Letter from Mr T Connolly MLA, Attorney General, providing additional information of the refurbishment of Quamby Juvenile Justice Centre (dated 2 July 1993)

Letter from Mr Bill Wood MLA, Minister for the Environment, Land and Planning (dated 12 July 1993)

Letter from Mr J Flutter, A/Secretary, Department of Urban Services (dated 15 June 1993), enclosing a report by DUS in consultation with Treasury on issues raised in the Committee's Report on the 1992-1993 Capital Works Program and also attaching the response of DUS to the Report of the Auditor-General on the Management of Capital Works Projects (No.1 -1993)

Letter from the ACT Treasury (dated 12 July 1993) providing information requested by the Committee on Gungahlin Drive to Nicholls and Ngunnawal, North Watson Stage 1 and North Duffy/North Holder Stage 1, and Conder Group Centre, Heidelberg Street and Hydraulic Services

Letter from the ACT Treasury (dated 15 July 1993) providing information sought by the Committee on Lake Tuggeranong Aquatic Planting, Weston Park Landscape Development Stage 1, Playground Safety, Murrumbidgee River Corridor, Canberra Theatre air conditioning

Letter from the ACT Treasury (dated 21 July 1993) providing information sought by the Committee on City Parks Depot Restructuring and Minor New Works in fire stations

Letter from the ACT Treasury (dated 29 July 1993) providing information requested by the Committee on the new capital works program for the Attorney-General's Department, the refurbishment of playground equipment by the Department of Education & Training, and Ginninderra Drive bridges

Memo from the ACT Treasury (dated 2 August 1993) enclosing information on bridges over Ginninderra Creek

Memo from the Canberra Institute of Technology (dated 30 July 1993) listing minor new works requirements for 1993-1994

Letter from the Land Development Branch of DELP (dated 10 August 1993) providing additional information on Gungahlin Bulk Provision, Minor New Works, Neighbourhood Landscaping, and Flood Protection Works of Low Lying Land

Papers from the National Exhibition Centre (received 10 August 1993) enclosing a summary of its Capital Development Program

Memo from the Social Policy Branch of the Chief Minister's Division (dated 10 August 1993) providing further information on the Tuggeranong Youth Resource Centre

Memo from the Department of Education & Training (received 9 August 1993) providing additional information on Palmerston Primary School, Lanyon High School, Minor New Works, and Playground Equipment

Letter from ACT Health (dated 10 August 1993) providing further information on Minor New Works

Letter from the ACT Treasury (dated 10 August 1993) providing information on estimated public and private sector construction expenditure in the ACT in 1993-1994 (as requested by the Committee)

Memo from the Department of Urban Services (dated 10 August 1993) providing information requested by the Committee on whole of life costings, the Transport Capital Works Programming Needs Assessment Manual, the Roads Maintenance Evaluation Study - Comprehensive Technical Reports and Executive Summary, the (draft) Public Consultation Strategy for Traffic Works, timing and costing details on the Hospital Redevelopment Project, the indicative employment effects of construction works, supplementary information on Public Transport, supplementary information on City Services, a response to Ms Szuty's questions on Greenway Fire Station, supplementary information on NATEX, and information on funds expended on projects in 1992-1993 that have not been previously identified in the New Capital Works Program

Letter from the Environment, Culture and Sport Division of DELP (dated 12 August 1993) providing information to written questions by Ms Szuty

Letter from the Land Division of DELP (dated 12 August 1993) providing comment on suggested pre-development costing of the proposed North Duffy/Holder development by the Duffy/Holder Resident Action Group

Letter from the Land Division of DELP (dated 13 August 1993) providing a response to matters raised by the Gungahlin Community Council

Memo from the Department of Urban Services (dated 18 August 1993) providing a response to matters raised by the Gungahlin Community Council

APPENDIX C: LIST OF WITNESSES

Government Agencies

ACT Health: Ms G Biscoe (Chief Executive), Mr J Ayling (General Manager, Resources) and Ms H Ramsay (General Manager, Community Health);

ACT Treasury: Dr D Rosalky (Under Treasurer), Mr N Morgan (Assistant Under Treasurer, Budget Management Branch), Mr G Britt (Director, Urban Services, Capital Works, Land & Planning Section, Budget Management Branch);

Attorney-General's Department: Mr R Musgrove (Director, Projects,).

Canberra Institute of Technology: Mr W Dixon (General Manager, Corporate Services) and Mr B Agius (Manager, Facilities).

Chief Minister's Division, Social Policy Branch: Corporate Management Program: Ms R Walsh (Assistant Secretary) and Mr G Powell (Director, Youth Affairs).

Department of Education & Training: Government Schooling program: Mr T Wheeler (Executive Director, Budget & Facilities) and Mr J Lebang (Director, Facilities Planning & Projects).

Department of the Environment, Land and Planning - Environment, Culture & Sport: Mr G Fraser (Director), Mr J Thwaite (General Manager, Parks & Conservation), Ms D Jackson (Manager, Budget Management), Mr J Meyer (A/g General Manager, Culture, Heritage & Sport), Mr M Rand (assistant Manager, Facilities), Ms K Cowie (Deputy General Manager, Canberra Theatre Trust).

Department of the Environment, Land & Planning: Land Development Branch: Dr C Adrian (Assistant Secretary) and Mr H Chambers (A/g Manager, Estate Development Section).

Department of Urban Services: Mr J Turner (Secretary), Mr J Flutter (Director, Public Works & Services Group), Mr G Davidson (General Manager, Roads & Traffic Branch), Mr M Wadsworth (Chief Executive, ACTION), Mr T Gill (Supervising Engineer, Traffic, Roads & Traffic Branch), Mr M Sallecchia (Supervising Engineer, Roads & Bridges Management, Roads & Traffic Branch), Mr D Hyde (Manager, Stormwater Section), Mr P Mylrea (General Manager, City Operations Branch), Mr G Gaskill (Director, Fire & Emergency Services Group), Ms S Birtles (General Manager, Estate Management), Mr W Lawrence (Chairman, NATEX), Mr C Scollay (General Manager, NATEX), , Mr K Bone (NATEX Board member, and General Manager, Strategy, Development & Review Branch, Corporate Development Group, DUS);

Housing & Community Services: Mr K Horsham (General Manager), Ms H Briggs (Executive Director, Community Programs Branch), Mr B Corley (Director, Community Grants Management), Mr J Richards (Manager, Community Facilities), Ms E Worthington (Director, Children's Day Care Services).

Non-Government

ACT Right to Life Association: Ms K Woolf (senior Vice President) and Mr J Stuparich (Vice President);

Association of Parents and Friends of ACT Schools Inc.: Dr L Woolf and Mr J Collins.

Belconnen Community Council: Dr C Watson and Mr K O'Connor.

Conservation Council of the South-East Region & Canberra: Mr R Falconer (Director).

Gungahlin Community Council: Mr R Roenstraus, Mrs R Hosking, Ms J Stone.

Mr D Hannan (of Hannan & Associates Pty Ltd, value management consultants).

Master Builders Association (ACT): Mr B Bryant (Executive Director), Mr P Murphy (Treasurer, and a Peak Councillor) and Mr P Copping (institute of Quantity Surveyors, and a Peak Councillor).

North Duffy/Holder Residents Action Group: Mr and Mrs Lyovic, Ms J Johnstone, Mr L Pennetta, Mr C Miller.

Watson Community Association: Mr M Dunstone and Ms J Smith.