

FRIDAY, 31 MARCH 2006

Committee met at 2.28 pm

CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I declare the hearing on the Sir David Longland Correctional Centre open. Thank you for your interest and for your attendance here today. The committee has advised the public of the inquiry by advertising in the print media and also by writing directly to a number of individuals, organisations and government departments.

The terms of reference for the inquiry are to examine the Sir David Longland Correctional Centre and report to the parliament with particular reference to the purpose of the work; the suitability of the work for its purpose; the necessity for, and the advisability of, the work; value for money likely to be achieved by the work; the cost and recurrent costs of the work; the public value of the work, including the impact of the work on the community, economy and environment; procurement methods for the work; the balance of public and private sector involvement in the work; and the performance of the constructing authority and the consultants and contractors for the work.

Before proceeding further, I would like to introduce the members of the committee present today: the Hon. Kevin Lingard, the member for Beaudesert and deputy chair of the committee; Mr Ted Malone, the member for Mirani; and Barbara Stone, the member for Springwood. My name is Don Livingstone and I am the chair of the committee.

The Public Works Committee is a committee of the Queensland parliament and, as such, represents the parliament. It is an all-party committee and adopts a non-partisan approach to its inquiries. Although the committee is not swearing in witnesses, I remind all witnesses that these hearings are a formal process of the parliament and, as such, any person intentionally misleading the committee is committing a serious offence. I also remind witnesses that Hansard will be providing a transcript of the hearing. I therefore ask witnesses to identify themselves when they first speak and to speak clearly and at a reasonable pace.

It is important to note that the committee's role is one of scrutinising the government's Capital Works Program and services to ascertain whether the Queensland public is getting value for the money being spent. The committee does not have the power to stop or approve projects or programs. Finally, the findings of the committee will be the subject of a report to the parliament. The committee may make recommendations about the issues it deals with. A copy of the transcript will be forwarded to all witnesses. I now call the first witnesses.

ALEXANDER, Ms Matilda, Project Worker, State INcorrections Network

BOTHMANN, Ms Susan, Coordinator Prisoners' Legal Service, State INcorrections Network

HAMBURGER, Mr Keith, Director Knowledge Consulting, State INcorrections Network

CHAIR: Matilda, would you like to make an opening statement?

Ms Alexander: Yes. The State INcorrections Network is a coalition of organisations and we work together around issues of decarceration with police for the benefit and safety of the whole community. The network arose out of a series of forums that were conducted last year throughout the state. The network forums were attended by approximately 700 persons comprised of individuals, community organisations and government workers including workers at correctional centres the majority of whom indicated that they wanted to keep being involved in an ongoing way with the issues raised which then kicked off our network. So that is the origin of our network. It comprises many different legal, church, community groups including Uniting Care, Queensland Alliance, BoysTown, QCOSS, Prisoners' Legal Service, ACRO, ATSILS, Sisters Inside and other organisations.

With me here today is Susan Bothmann, the coordinator of the Prisoners' Legal Service, and we have engaged Mr Keith Hamburger, a former director of the Department of Corrective Services, to prepare our presentation based on our submission on the Sir David Longland Correctional Centre project.

I am sure that Mr Hamburger will explain further how our submission applies. Without further ado, I will hand over.

Mr Hamburger: Thanks, Matilda. If it is okay with the committee, I will speak from the rostrum and work through the PowerPoint presentation. I think you all have a copy of my slides. As Matilda has said, the State INcorrections Network asked Knowledge Consulting to have a look at its submission and this presentation is a summary of that.

What we would like to do in the brief time available is to propose a way forward for the Sir David Longland Correctional Centre. As you will see, we believe the refurbishment should go ahead but we would like to see a different tack taken with the additional cells, and we think we have come up with a more cost-effective approach which will lead to better correctional outcomes, less stress in the SDL situation and provide regional employment opportunities.

The issue is significant because the actual cells at Sir David Longland plus other proposals for additional cells presupposes a pretty quickly growing prison population. Those figures are pretty telling in the sense that Queensland's imprisonment rate is roughly double that of Victoria's and it is above the Australian average. The average daily prison population in Queensland—on 2004-05 figures taken from the Corrective Services reports in relation to cost per prisoner—should be dropped back to the Victorian figures because Queensland is paying about \$124 million extra because our imprisonment rate is almost double that of Victoria's. We think there could be better priorities for that money.

Things will get worse because a recent statement by the minister indicates that the prediction is that the prison numbers in Queensland could rise to about 7,300 by 2015. We estimate about another \$136 million in operating costs including capital costs. The significant proportion of people who go to jail are in that 18- to 24-year-old age group, which means that in 2015, working back, they are roughly in the nine- to 15-year-old age group at the moment. I think it is a real social tragedy for our community that we are looking at that prediction. We are needing bigger prisons to house these people. I visited a number of them in the United States back in the early 1990s and we looked at this very same problem. There were some states over there where their corrections budget equalled their education budget. I think that is a terrible situation to be heading towards.

The Australian Institute of Criminology has indicated those costs for crime to Australia, which translates roughly to about \$6 billion per annum to Queensland. They have taken into account a whole range of costs from insurance to victims' costs, courts, police and all of that sort of thing, and we really need to start planning to deal with that. We believe that the Queensland government has made a commendable effort to reduce crime. There are a whole range of initiatives that have been taken across the state and that are continuing to be funded, but we would argue that there needs to be a better integration of this approach and we need to focus on the No. 1 causes of crime in specific regions and specific communities.

We believe we need a business planning approach. Unless something is done, there will be 7,300 people in Queensland prisons by 2015. They are not contributing to our economy. In fact, they are taking money from the bottom line of our budget, as well as all of the grief and everything else that they cause. As we say, there are potential savings of up to \$124 million just in corrective services costs if our imprisonment rate, for example, is the same as Victoria's. So we really think that with those sorts of dollars around we really have to get serious about developing and implementing a business plan.

With the sort of information that we all know is around in terms of local prison numbers and increased crime et cetera, if we look out to the year 2015 I want to pose a couple of questions. Did we see this train wreck coming? What did we do about it? Basically, it does require some intellectual thought, energy and resources to address the underlying causes of this horrendous social problem. As pointed out in the INCorrections paper, good social development policy is the best criminal policy, and that was taken from a statement in Finland, where they developed, as a number of other northern European countries have, a completely different approach to dealing with the causes of crime and reducing the number of people who come to jail.

When people come to prison at age 18 they just did not decide to become a criminal at age 18. If you look back at their case files and look at their history—and I was a member of the Parole Board in Queensland for many years—this all started at a young age and mainly they came from dysfunctional and disadvantaged families. These causal factors could be identified right back at preschool and through primary and high school. So when we are looking at the issues underpinning the business plan, these are

all critical things. The policies that we implement today in Queensland that impact on socially disadvantaged and economically disadvantaged families will predetermine the prison numbers 15 to 20 years out, as the policies back in the eighties have carried through to what we have today, and that is something about the Victorian situation that I can talk about later.

Prison authorities can identify by postcode the regions and communities from which the majority of offenders come. It is possible to identify the causal factors on a community-by-community or region-by-region basis. Likewise, the cost of crime can be identified that way, and it is possible to set targets for reduction of the costs of crime on a community-by-community and region-by-region basis. This is all in the business planning approach. In Queensland we are fortunate that we have some of the best thinkers in the world on this particular topic. Practitioners and academics and people who have made statements over the years about these things and done research, and many of them are associated with the INCorrections Network.

If you look around the world there are a range of good practices that have been developed, particularly in northern Europe and now starting to emerge in America, to deal with the underlying causes of social breakdown that leads to crime and higher imprisonment rates. We have benchmarks in Victoria and northern Europe that we can use, and I have already shown you one in relation to imprisonment rates which shows that we do not shape up too well. In Queensland there are enormous community resources available to be engaged in community and individual capacity-building programs. I mentioned service clubs. Rotary is one that has a range of programs, particularly the Rotary youth leadership awards scheme, which could be easily adapted to develop young leaders in disadvantaged communities. There are numerous other community organisations that could help with these sorts of projects.

The Queensland government can harness the enthusiasm of the community or assist in achieving a safer and a better community. We need some visionary leadership about where we are going with this thing. We need some challenging and inclusive goals, and we need a plan to reduce our crime and imprisonment rate to world's best practice over the next 15 years. We have picked 15 years deliberately, because of that age span I was talking about. You do not make these sorts of social changes in one year or three years. I have talked to a criminologist in Europe, Dr Christian Pfeiffer, who has worked on these sorts of plans, who says that a 15-year window is a pretty good one to work with, and it makes a lot of sense. But that is not to say that you wait 15 years. There will be incremental good improvement over that period of time.

I take Innisfail as an example of what can happen when you have a major physical disaster that hits. What is happening up there is we have political leadership, we have local leadership, courage, enthusiasm, planning and funds, all targeted to demand and the community effort is driven by a real sense of urgency. We believe that community and social disasters in Queensland can be solved the same way. It does require political leadership and empowerment of local leaders and action driven by a sense of urgency that engages and resources the local community to implement best practice initiatives. It is not a one-size-fits-all. There are different needs in different communities across this state, and they need to be specially targeted and the local people need to identify and have this sense of urgency. Government can play a major role—in fact, a determining role—in facilitating that happening.

We would urge the Queensland government to create and resource with a sense of urgency a visionary integrated community and individual capacity-building program which results, as we believe, in saving hundreds of millions of dollars, a safer community and the need for fewer prison cells. I guess that brings us to the SDL expansion component of this project that the committee is looking at at the moment. We believe that the expansion component and indeed other proposals that are around, particularly for building another large prison in south-east Queensland or in Queensland, are not the way to go. We think it takes a pessimistic approach that Queensland is doomed to have an imprisonment rate double Victoria's for the next 30 years. We think that is planning for social failure.

We believe it represents corrections worst practice in leading towards larger institutions where prisoners and staff become institutionalised, safety is at risk, it is difficult to contain costs, and effective rehabilitation is compromised. We would suggest that best practice in the correctional centre design to support offender rehabilitation requires smaller correctional centres—perhaps in the 50- to 100-bed size—located in regional centres where there is appropriate support and infrastructure. If you get large institutions with 1,000 up to 4,000 prisoners that have been talked about—and I think Sir David Longland is going to go well over 500 if in fact this proposal goes ahead to expand it—it becomes a very impersonal and difficult institution. Rehabilitation requires a lot of one-on-one work. If you take large

institutions and the amount of time available in a day, by the time you get through all of the institutional issues that have to be managed the time for rehabilitation is very limited and there is not a personal relationship in relation to staff and inmates.

Each of these smaller centres should have a specific core program and treatment focus—substance abuse, sex offending and behavioural problems and other types of criminogenic issues that need to be addressed. The staffing models need to have an appropriate balance between rehabilitation and security needs. The smaller correctional centre has many advantages—better rehabilitative outcomes, more humane and safer living conditions for prisoners, greatly improved safer working conditions for staff, greater improved prisoner/staff interaction, they can be constructed very quickly to meet needs as they emerge, and indeed over time if this did work you could then scale out some of the bigger institutions as prison numbers come down. It does not create the institutional ghetto situation like the whole Wacol precinct, where we had a whole range of community issues that arose when we put so many prisoners in the one spot. It creates regional employment and is more cost effective than the large institutional model, in our view.

We pose a number of recommendations. We believe that the Queensland government should commission a task force with appropriate public sector and external representation to develop a strategy for an integrated and focused attack on the underlying causes of crime in specific regions and communities. This strategy should be able to be developed into a business plan that takes account of costs and benefits, assesses performance milestones and promotes local leadership and community engagement and best practice. In fact, if you look at this over a 15-year time line and you look at the sorts of costs that I talked about before escalating, if you put some money up-front and actually worked this on a business planning process with savings in prisons and all of the other savings, you will actually get a line where it crosses and in fact we start to make profit and spend less on crime and so forth. But we have never really taken an integrated business planning approach to this problem in Queensland in the past, and I think we need to do that. That is what that recommendation is about.

The second recommendation is that the Department of Corrective Services be requested to prepare for consideration by the Cabinet Budget Review Committee a cost-benefit analysis of a proposal for future corrections building programs to rely less on the large institutional infrastructure and move progressively towards a range of purpose-built, program-oriented small institutions located in regional areas.

We think the refurbishment, as proposed, at SDL should go ahead, except for the funds for the 216-bed expansion. That decision should be held in abeyance and reconsidered in light of the cost-benefit analysis that I spoke about in recommendation 2. Should that cost-benefit analysis support our contention that the small regional centres are most cost effective or more cost effective than large Brisbane based ones, the funds appropriated for the additional 216 cells should be reallocated to build two small regional correctional centres to pilot study best correctional practice. We thank you very much for the opportunity to come and say those few words. As I said, I have left you with a copy of that presentation. Matilda, Susan or I will be happy to take any questions.

Mr LINGARD: It is probably easy to say that we need regional centres. The choice of them is always more difficult. How do you find suitable places for these regional centres?

Mr Hamburger: I understand the question. It can be a contentious question. I read in the media only last week that there are communities in the gulf, for example, calling for the opportunity to have immigration detention centres established because of the economic benefit. If we build on that and look at the experience that Queensland Corrections has had over many years now with the western outreach work camps, we see that those camps are very well accepted in the community. Indeed, any thought of taking them away would cause outrage in the sense of economic benefit. When we were looking at work camps years ago, the closer we came to Brisbane the harder it was. Moving out into the regional areas, providing there is a local hospital, a TAFE college or education facilities where you can actually get professionals to support your programs, I think you would find that a number of shires would be very keen to see these, provided they were not really big ones.

Mr LINGARD: Have you ever done a study to find out what is the cost of holding people within their own home situations rather than holding them in prisons, especially for crimes that are not things for which they need to be taken away from society?

Mr Hamburger: All the figures prove that that is certainly the most cost-effective outcome. That

gets back to other questions of who should be in jail, when they should be phased out and how they should be supported. Things like community hostels, home detention, release-to-work programs—all those things are extremely cost effective not only in terms of housing the inmates but also in getting them back into a law-abiding lifestyle and reducing recidivism, which is another reason prison numbers are growing. The whole system needs that integrated, phased-release approach.

Mr MALONE: Were you envisaging that the small community type facilities would be for low-grade criminals, or would they have the whole range?

Mr Hamburger: They would have the whole range. Some time ago—early 1997 it was—I had a think about this because we just had the new Woodford 600-bed facility, as it then was, built. I was starting to get concerned as director-general about the impact of these large institutions and the management of them. I looked at whether or not, for example, for the price of the 600-bed facility we could build twelve 50-bed facilities, just as a notional figure. Without going into a lot of detail, it seemed at the time that the capital and operating costs of the twelve 50-bed facilities was in the ballpark of the large institution. On that basis, I would argue that some of those could well be high-security facilities for particular classes of offender in a regional location and some could well be medium and some could be low. In fact, our western outreach camps are already in place and they are low security. There is certainly no reason, in my view, why you could not have some high- and medium-security facilities.

Ms Bothmann: If I could perhaps just add to that, if there were a combination of facilities like this, there would be greater facility to resolve some of the current difficulties where there are a very large number of prisoners who are currently being held in secure facilities even though they are on a low classification. In terms of the programs for then bringing them back into the community on parole or some other form of supervision, the difficulty is, of course, they leave immediately from a very secure situation and go into the community. This model would allow for greater flexibility in ensuring that integration process began whilst they were still in custody.

Mr LINGARD: In the late 1990s the fine defaulter centre was built at Palen Creek. Was it successful?

Mr Hamburger: I left Corrections in 1997, so I am not aware of what has happened since then.

Ms Bothmann: Unfortunately, I have been in Queensland for only two years, so I am not in a position to answer that, either. It does seem that the process of no longer locking people up for fine default has had a number of positive spin-offs in this state. I understand that is something that has been only relatively recent here whereas it is a more long-term situation in New South Wales. There is some quite important data from New South Wales that we could look at if that were of interest.

CHAIR: Have members of your committee been consulted with in relation to the redevelopment of Sir David Longland?

Ms Alexander: Yes, the core members of the network have been authors of the presentation you have seen today.

Mr Hamburger: Has Corrective Services consulted with the network?

Ms Alexander: Sorry, no. I do not think so.

Ms Bothmann: No, we have been involved in the process that has been taking place in relation to the new legislation and there has been a consultation process involving the development of that act. But, of course, we would take the view in terms of the whole network that we could have been able to input far better if the consultation program had been rather more extensive. We have only just seen the bill. A lot of the issues that we are raising here, of course, also relate to the kinds of things that we would have to say about that new legislation.

Mr LINGARD: You made a comparison between Queensland numbers and Victorian numbers. What is the real reason? What is the difference in the system that allows Victoria to have a smaller number?

Mr Hamburger: Corrective Services might have more current information, but I am not aware of any detailed research on that topic. I can say for myself that back in the late eighties I spoke to a researcher in Victoria about this very problem. This has gone on for many years now—Victoria traditionally having half of our prison population and lower than most other states. His thesis on this was—it sits pretty well with me—that if we go back to the early seventies, when the Whitlam government

was in power and they were in a debate with various state governments about a whole range of issues, Whitlam decided to bypass the states and created a thing called the Australian assistance plan. He was wanting to use that to fund directly into local authorities—bypass funding arrangements through the states. You might recall that at that time there was a huge furore over that. Queensland was certainly deadset against that at that time, but the then Victorian government decided to allow that to happen. Millions of dollars went into social infrastructure in Victoria in depressed areas, particularly into sporting clubs and a whole range of social support systems for young people in disadvantaged regions.

Through the seventies we saw that, whilst children were growing up in difficult circumstances, they had a chance to interact particularly in team sports and had role models in a whole range of people in the community and got involved in constructive pursuits at that time. That has carried forward. Indeed, Victoria has a very well-resourced regional network of social infrastructure for young people. This person who was speaking to me and giving me this thesis believes that that has made a major impact on that whole cohort moving through—remember the 15- to-20-year time frame of young people—and that has impacted on their situation.

That evidence is supported by what I found when my then minister, Glen Milliner, and I visited Europe. We went to northern Europe and looked at best practice, low-imprisonment rates. The very same thing was happening over there. They were targeting regions—putting money into regions in a specific way to support young people who might not have had the best circumstances at home, and giving them situations where they had support systems in schools. These children got a different focus on education, a more practical approach and a more nurturing approach, if you like, to help them through those situations. They got into sporting organisations and that sort of thing. That is one of the things that has to be developed. In our situation here in Queensland, with those sorts of models in some of the regions that all of us are well aware of, we could go out there and take some of these sorts of initiatives.

There was a very good initiative in Western Australia going back some years which was called the detached youth work program. It was a peer group mentoring program, where young people in existing sporting clubs—whether it be a surf club, a football club or whatever—were allocated a young person who was in a bit of trouble. The mentor would go to his home and help with homework and get him indoctrinated into the sporting club. It was peer group association—getting into a positive peer group rather than a negative peer group. A whole range of those targeted activities need to be developed. It is a long-winded answer to your question, but that is what Victoria did starting back in the early seventies.

Ms Alexander: Some of that has continued today, with things like the better pathways document, where they are working on providing bail support work with the judiciary, with lawyers, community corrections and tactical support to people who are being released on community based orders. That is a program that is focusing specifically on reducing the number of women in prisons in Victoria. They have had a lot of success with things like providing housing. There is a very specific group of people that they provide housing for. Only 15 per cent of those women reoffend as compared to 50 per cent of those who had not received that housing.

CHAIR: I would like to thank you for your submission and for appearing before us today. I am sure the information that you have given us will be of benefit to our committee. Thank you very much.

I now call the next group of witnesses from the Department of Corrective Services and from Project Services, within the department of public works.

FORSTER, Mr John, Director, Facilities Management Branch, Department of Corrective Services

WHITTAKER, Mr Neil, Deputy Director-General, Department of Corrective Services

ANSTEE, Mr Mike, Acting Director, Project Services, Department of Public Works

Mr Whittaker: My particular area of responsibility within the Department of Corrective Services deals with corporate services in the strategic part of the department. On my right is John Forster. John is our director of facilities and the principal person within the department who is managing this process. On my left is Mike Anstee. Mike is from the Department of Public Works, Project Services, and is the director of health, TAFE, and law and order within Project Services. You met both these gentlemen this morning on the inspection of the site.

As you saw this morning, we are in the early stages of the project. We have decommissioned the former prison in December last year and planning work is well advanced. Certainly the work that we are doing in corrections is not only constructing cells to incarcerate people. We are doing a considerable amount of policy work, particularly in the community corrections area, to ensure that only those people who should be incarcerated actually end up in cells. We are working, in particular, with the judiciary to increase their confidence in our ability to supervise offenders in the community rather than have them imprisoned.

I would like to return to the purpose of the meeting this afternoon, and that is to look at the capital works part of our multipronged approach to managing offenders that the department is responsible for. At the moment the project at Sir David Longland's is at the schematic design phase and we have appointed a preferred tenderer in Bovis Lend Lease. It has submitted to us a guaranteed contract sum for the project, or a GCS. At the moment that GCS is being evaluated by the Department of Public Works, which will make a recommendation to the department on whether we should accept or reject that proposition.

We are utilising consultants engaged by Project Services to do the design development work, and that work continues at this stage. The decision to move in the direction we are going at Sir David Longland's followed a report. The report indicated to us that we had a considerable growth in the number of remand prisoners in south-east Queensland over recent years, to the point where Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre could no longer accommodate both remand and reception prisoners. Indeed, a lot of remand prisoners were scattered around through other centres. The report proposed that we then turn Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre into a purely remand centre and that we convert Sir David Longland's into a reception centre at the same time. Hence, that is where the project started from.

The second need that we have is for increasing populations of offenders, and our department's projection on recent trends is that over the next 10 years we will have a 90 per cent increase in the number of offenders. That is built off projections of population increase in Queensland as well as the current incarceration rate. Sir David Longland's, when it was constructed, had a focus on industry and not on looking after reception prisoners. When we reopen it, its main purpose will be reception prisoners. However, we have industry there in the form of a laundry which is well equipped, as you probably saw this morning. We have contracts in place with a number of hospitals to undertake that laundry, and we would like to continue those contracts to provide the opportunity for our prisoners to be gainfully employed. So we are looking at having a number of sentence prisoners as well as the reception prisoners.

The other work that we would like to have our sentence prisoners work on is the preparation of food for all prisoners in the centre and the other activities that are normally carried out in a centre like grounds maintenance and the like. The proposal is a net increase in cells of some 216, and that would be as a result of demolition of 84 cells that you saw this morning and the building on that same site of six blocks of 50-cell units.

The accommodation will eliminate six 14-man cell blocks and return those with six 50-man cell blocks. This allows us to get some efficiency in the way we utilise our employees and to retain the cost of accommodation within reasonable limits. When we closed Sir David Longland's, the cost per prisoner per day was up around \$166. On our current staffing projections and our costs, we expect that cost to fall to some \$130 per day on the reopening of the centre.

The reconfiguration of Sir David Longland's is part of the process of delivering value for money to Corrective Services in Queensland through a combination of good design and good operational practices.

I am happy to answer any questions at this juncture that the committee may wish to raise, as are my colleagues.

CHAIR: What extension of time will the redevelopment provide for the department's needs to construct additional new correctional centres?

Mr Whittaker: We are projecting over the next 10 years there will be a significant increase in the number of beds we require. Currently in north Queensland we are at or above capacity in the two major centres we have up there. In south Queensland, excluding Sir David Longland, we have limited capacity in our existing centres at Maryborough, where we have about 100 beds free, and Woodford, where we have 100 beds free. On our current projections, by the time we reopen Sir David Longland late next year those beds would be close to being fully occupied. So we will bring Sir David Longland back on with about 540 beds. That will accommodate the growth for a couple of years, but we will have to be back into planning for additional accommodation not long after that.

CHAIR: Is the description of the work in the design brief complete and up to date? If not, what has changed?

Mr Forster: The description of the work is very much as shown in that design brief. The changes that we have experienced on that site related more to developing the design brief and developing the schematic design. What we set out to do was to work Sir David Longland from roughly a 320-cell industrial prison to a 540-bed reception prison and that is, indeed, what we are still doing. There are some issues related to disability access and services which we had not anticipated at the start. It is issues like that. Those are the only real changes that we have made since the project inception.

CHAIR: There appears to be some work associated with the redevelopment that has been undertaken as a separate project. For example, page 10 of the submission notes that perimeter security would be upgraded to a later standard during the redevelopment process but not from within the redevelopment funding.

Mr Forster: Indeed, there are a number of projects on that site at the one time. The reason it has been done like that is that (inaudible) so it is a capital project in it's own right and that is the statewide perimeter upgrade. In that rollout (inaudible) we had the advantage of the fact that there were no prisoners and staff on that site so we were able to upgrade all the perimeter security systems in one hit and reinstate them up to the newer standard. So that was the Sir David Longland project (inaudible). Another project that we are taking the opportunity to roll out at that site is occurring at the moment. We are going through and doing some catch-up maintenance on that facility. You may have seen evidence of that in your inspection tour today.

CHAIR: What are the expected costs of the work that is associated with the redevelopment but not included in the redevelopment project?

Mr Forster: The costs of the perimeter upgrade?

CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Forster: It has not been fully costed at this stage. It will not be rolled out until 2007. It is estimated that that work will cost about \$4 million.

CHAIR: I assume from what you have said that the associated work was never looked at when you looked at the overall costing of it.

Mr Forster: We did not include it in the brief because it was already a program that was rolling and we did not include it in the cost of the redevelopment. It was a cost that was attributed to that centre whether it had been redeveloped or not.

Mr Whittaker: From the previous financial year to the announcement of the redevelopment of Sir David Longland the government announced a \$30 million perimeter upgrade for all of our secure centres in the state. This is part of that perimeter upgrade. We have made it coincide with Sir David Longland at the time that we have the prison unoccupied.

CHAIR: What are the functional requirements of the redeveloped centre, and how are they different from what exists now?

Mr Forster: The difference is that the centre at this stage is basically an industrial prison accommodating sentence prisoners who are on parole or working in other programs. The change would be that the prisoner numbers are around 250, and that will increase over time. We have a system where the reception prisoners are straight out of court and they have special needs. They have assessments that need to be undertaken on them and they have to have a plan implemented for their transition to the

correctional system. These people are not available all the time to undertake work in the centre. So that is why we are able to reduce the industry areas.

CHAIR: What types of cell block sizes and configuration will be included in the redeveloped centre?

Mr Forster: The cell blocks will range from a maximum size of 50 down to 24. In two instances the 24 can be broken down to groups of eight. There is quite a wide range of accommodation options on that site.

CHAIR: Why is it important to offer a wide variety of cell block sizes and configurations?

Mr Forster: Basically, we accommodate the varying types of physical setting up required for prisoners who need protection from each other or have specific needs that cannot be addressed in large blocks.

CHAIR: How will the facilities for the supervision of the prisoners in the new cell blocks be better than the previous centre designs?

Mr Forster: You may have noticed on the way around that the current cell blocks have got the officers basically trapped behind glass boxes. The new cell blocks will have officers in a face-to-face contact with prisoners. Prisoner interaction and the vision from the box is much better. For example, it enhances provision of direct access and direct view to the yards and the reception area. It is a much more open block in which to operate.

Mr LINGARD: We noticed in the new building that you have suicide reduction measures. What are you doing in the older blocks—the blocks that have been left there—for suicide reduction?

Mr Forster: What we are doing is going to happen to the older blocks. I might just point out to achieve this what we are doing to the original blocks in the main is that we are sealing those blocks and covering the bars. We are removing towel rails and hanging points within the cells. We are changing the tapware to suicide resistant type. Basically, we are going through and removing, as far as we are able, any of the hanging implements.

Mr LINGARD: How will the new videoconferencing facilities limit the number of people who have to be transported in the system?

Mr Whittaker: As the court system moves more and more towards videoconferencing, the number of prisoners who need to be transferred into courts will steadily reduce. We believe at the moment that transporting offenders backwards and forwards from prison is probably the weakest link in our security network. If we can effectively use videoconferencing—it is not our decision; it is the court's decision—that reduces that risk to the community substantially. So we are very supportive of it.

Mr LINGARD: In building the new centre surely some staff efficiency facilities should be put into the newer building. What sort of staff efficiency facilities are you putting into the new building?

Mr Whittaker: At the moment in that block that is destined for demolition we have one staff person supervising 14 cells or 14 prisoners in the new 50-man blocks. We have three staff per 100 prisoners. So you can see the ratios are reduced for the supervision of prisoners in their cells.

Mr LINGARD: What about workplace health and safety? What advantages are you taking in building the new building?

Mr Forster: All custodial staff are equipped with radios and are trained in response systems. All staff within the new designed blocks have got the opportunity to withdraw from units on site and have team leader positions elevated above the cell block floor. They have the capacity to withdraw to a secure area.

Mr LINGARD: What are you doing about those inmates who have disabilities? What are you doing to assist with disability problems?

Mr Forster: All new cell blocks built in Queensland since the mid-1990s have the capacity to house disabled prisoners. All access within those new centres is wheelchair height. In the case of Sir David Longland there are some issues with getting wheelchair access into all of the blocks. This is one of the issues that has arisen during the course of the schematic design and one of the reasons why the cost has escalated. We are ensuring that all of the blocks are wheelchair accessible.

Mr LINGARD: What are you doing about staff parking and general parking?

Mr Whittaker: The area of staff parking will be increased. Our belief is that the number of staff that

we used to have at SDL was about 265 full-time equivalents and that number will rise to slightly more than 300. So we are increasing the staff car parking accordingly.

Mr LINGARD: Has the department consulted with Legal Aid Queensland regarding the number and design of interview rooms and what changes will be made with interview rooms?

Mr Whittaker: We have not consulted with them and the interview rooms are not changed. They will stay the same. Because it is not an industry prison, we are going to extend the number of visit days to every day of the week. So we believe that visits can be scheduled to ensure that the current visitor capacity will cope with the number of offenders that we have in the centre.

Mr LINGARD: I noticed that because of the position of the maximum security prison people will have to be transported to that centre. Is there any more efficient way of dealing with visitors for top security people?

Mr Forster: Because the maximum security area has been constructed some distance from the front of the prison, it would be fair to say that it is not in the best possible location. Arthur Gorrie MSU is near the entry. While the one at Sir David Longland is within walking distance, you would have public walking through the correctional centre, so we elected to transport them up there. At this stage it is not proposed to change that and we will still put them in a vehicle and take them to the maximum security area.

Mr LINGARD: In respect to Arthur Gorrie, which you have just mentioned, why couldn't it have been expanded to accommodate the increasing reception prisoner numbers and the increasing remand prisoner numbers?

Mr Whittaker: We are actually expanding Arthur Gorrie by 180 beds to accommodate our projections of the remand prisoners. There would be no capacity beyond that for reception prisoners.

Mr LINGARD: So do you believe then that Sir David Longland will be suitable for its purpose and for how long will it be suitable for that purpose?

Mr Forster: It will be suitable for its purpose. For how long—it will be able to accommodate reception prisoners for as far out as our projections go. That is currently 10 years.

Mr LINGARD: The previous submission that we received spoke about regional centres. Will it be possible to build regional centres in the near future now that you have built a Sir David Longland's? Will there be any need for regional centres?

Mr Forster: As Mr Hamburger pointed out, we did considerable research on regional correctional centres—where they are practical and where they are possible. It is a matter of policy—whether that is what we want to do. Recent studies have indicated that smaller correctional centres would be more expensive than the very large correctional centres we are planning now. Of course it depends on what it is you want to build in the regional centre. If you want to provide cells behind double razor tape barriers, then smaller centres will be more expensive than one larger centre. If, on the other hand, you create a centre that is of a lesser security rating or some other lesser rating, then you may be able to achieve some economies in doing that. Whether the staff would be fewer I suggest would be dependent on the sort of prison that you build.

Mr LINGARD: Do we at present have a special prison for fine defaulters?

Mr Forster: We constructed a unit for fine defaulters at Palen Creek Correctional Centre. That was a demountable type of accommodation and we put a Gallagher protection system around it to separate them out from the mainstream prisoners. We do not have a fine defaulters' prison now because fine default is not a reason to go to jail, I understand. There are no fine defaulters.

Mr Whittaker: The SPER system has actually reduced our number of offenders over a period of three or four years because they were being pursued in other ways rather than being imprisoned. If you have a look at our plots, our graphs of our prisoner population, it went up to about the year 2000. Then it came down for two or three years and now it has started to go back up again as a result of the other growth catching up basically.

Mr LINGARD: What are you doing with that old building?

Mr Forster: It remained hidden for some time. It is now used as general accommodation.

Mr LINGARD: For prisoners?

Mr Forster: For prisoners.

Ms STONE: I am going to concentrate on costs, particularly page 14 of the submission. The submission states—

The scope of the work required to convert the existing Sir David Longland Correctional Centre into the new Brisbane Reception Centre was inadequate.

I would like you to expand on that statement and outline the changes of that work and why that was not probably recognised when initially the project started?

Mr Forster: The answer is in two parts. I might flick to Mike at some stage to answer the issues about why construction costs generally across Queensland are rising. Certainly, in terms of the project, budgets are usually set on a fairly minimal investigation of what you are actually going to do. So while we were able to provide a decent property brief to Public Works on what we wanted to do with the centre, the realities of what has happened is typical of what happens when we engaged a consultant team to go into that centre and investigate all of the issues that go to make up a project such as a redevelopment of an existing centre.

Some of the issues that were uncovered at that stage were that some of the ramps of the existing centre did not quite meet the standard. We were not able to open up every pit and explore every conduit on that site as part of the initial project. While there would have been allowances for this put in, I believe Mike could confirm that those sorts of numbers have increased. There is a range of those sorts of things. Probably a significant one was that, while we had intentions of being able to use that centre, we have had to come around to the side of those buildings to gain access. The original plan for those buildings we were in—we were going to meet the costs. We were originally going to go sideways. That turned out to be more expensive and not practical. There are those sorts of things. I am not sure what the number is that we spent, but it is a number in the millions of dollars. That sort of planning money really is not available at the start, so we have to take some guess at what it might be and in turn Public Works then have to take some guesstimate or estimate of what that translates to in the open market. I might just pass to Mike to discuss what the issues are because he was probably more involved on the construction side.

Mr Anstee: As my colleague John has indicated, the estimates that were prepared some 18 months ago are purely conceptual information. There was fairly brief information at that time. As time evolves, when we go through the number of investigations, particularly on what we call a brownfield site—this is not a greenfield site—there is a number of existing buildings there and lots of services buried in the ground. The location, the nature and the condition of those services of course will not be known until you get decent detailed investigations. As a result of that, there were several additional costs that were identified leading up from the original budget to where we are now.

Another issue that is quite major is the issue of escalation in the building industry right now, and I am sure most of you are aware of that. We are experiencing some quite unprecedented levels of price rises, particularly over the last three or four years. At the time that we were looking at this very early in the piece the industry predicted that the rate of escalation would actually plateau out at around this time of 2005 or 2006. That did not occur. In fact, it has continued up at the same rates as previous years. As I think we refer to in appendix 6 with regard to Turner and Townsend Rawlinsons, who are the quantity surveyors on the project, they cite the main reason for that is that costs for trades—in particular, the mechanical, electrical, fire protection services and steelwork—continue to rise because of a world supply shortage on those particular trades. We are also experiencing quite a shortage of properly skilled labour in the labour market right now, and contractors are saying that they have to pay more to attract the right people to the right trades and appropriately skilled workmen to the building trade. So a combination of those two factors has led to the rise that we have experienced.

Ms STONE: Also on page 14 there was a statement that it was critical that whatever proposal was put forward to government was rigorously tested against the criteria for an operational fit for the purpose of a correctional reception centre. What criteria are we talking about?

Mr Forster (Inaudible) are starting to (inaudible), particularly when the budget was injected fairly early on. As part of that the preferred tenderer was available (inaudible). Whether or not what we were going to deliver was going to be (inaudible).

Ms STONE: We heard some quotes before about \$166 a day for a prisoner, and that should come down to \$136, I think it was. How does that compare with other centres of maybe a similar size?

Mr Whittaker: Off the top of my head, the \$130 would be at the lower end of our operating costs for centres. The \$166 cost at Sir David Longland up until its closure was at the upper end. So I do not

think it will be the cheapest, but it will be at the lower end of the continuum of daily costs across the 13 centres across the state.

Ms STONE: There are a couple of things that the committee would like provided—that is, the project feasibility study, the business case for the project and the evaluation report. Is that possible?

Mr Forster: We could provide that in some form.

Ms STONE: Okay. We just had another presentation before this, but were there other options considered apart from what we are doing here?

Mr Forster: Other options?

Ms STONE: Yes.

Mr Forster: We explored whether or not we could expand Arthur Gorrie. We looked at expanding that to 1,100 or 1,200 initially and then higher again after that. I am not sure whether members have been to Arthur Gorrie, but there is not a lot of room on that site. We similarly looked at David Longland (inaudible).

Ms STONE: That was the only other option?

Mr Forster: That was the only other option we saw in terms of what facility could be expanded. The other option we looked at was constructing a new correctional facility. Obviously a new correctional facility would give us the best possible staff efficiency and tackle security issues et cetera. It is unlikely to be able to site a reception centre in Brisbane. We currently are in discussion with a number of local authorities in south-east Queensland about possible sites for a correctional centre. It is reasonably important that the reception centre be close to the court system. At this stage if we were to relocate the reception function it would be at least an hour out of Brisbane.

Ms STONE: What was the whole-of-life net present value of cost for the redevelopment option selected by the department and was it the lowest cost option?

Mr Whittaker: We will take that on notice if we can.

Mr Forster: I believe it was the lowest.

Ms STONE: Okay. That is it. Thank you.

Mr MALONE: Given the changes to the cost and the scope of the work, has the department revisited its initial options analysis? Have you actually gone back and had a look?

Mr Forster: The escalation in cost we are experiencing is very similar to the escalation that we are experiencing on all types of projects we are currently working on. Some of the delay that we are anticipating at this centre is the same across the gamut of capital projects. Construction inside an old jail has costs and penalties associated with it. On the other hand, we pick up (inaudible) and we pick up (inaudible). We pick up a whole range of things, so there is a balance there. To give you an example, we are constructing a 150-bed female centre in Townsville at the moment. The current cost estimate of that is about \$130 million. (Inaudible) As I say, at Arthur Gorrie it is not really practical for us to expand.

Mr MALONE: Have you recalculated the net present value of costs of the various options? If not, why not?

Mr Forster: We have not.

Mr MALONE: You have not. Okay. Did the department undertake analysis for the social impacts of the project?

Mr Forster: We did undertake a (inaudible) analysis. I think the impact is lessened by increasing the cell capacity of those at this centre than moving out of town to other sites.

Mr MALONE: Was consultation undertaken when planning the project?

Mr Whittaker: We certainly consulted with a number of government agencies—Public Works, Treasury, Department of the Premier and Cabinet and staff. There was considerable consultation with the staff at the actual centre who were displaced as a result of the decision to close it.

Mr MALONE: What about with, say, local government and councils or people in the area?

Mr Whittaker: We had until its closure last year a community advisory council committee, and they were certainly consulted during the process of closing. They were given an indication that we were remodelling and expanding the centre. Prior to the decision being announced, no, we did not consult with

the community at all.

Mr MALONE: So when you were consulting with the advisory group did they have any recommendations that were taken on board by Corrections?

Mr Whittaker: Not to my knowledge. I did not personally undertake that consultation.

Mr MALONE: What are the social impacts associated with the project, if any?

Mr Whittaker: I am not aware of any social impacts other than the existing social impacts of having a centre in Wacol amongst a number of other institutions. We have four jails out there—the youth detention centre is in the general facility and the forensic mental health unit is in the same general facility.

Mr MALONE: In going through the facilities, you were saying that you were going to allow visitors over a seven-day period. Was that a positive or a negative in terms of visitors? What impact is that having on people visiting the prison, for instance?

Mr Whittaker: I would think that that would have a positive impact on visitors. It gives them a range of options that they were not able to use before in that they can make their visiting arrangements to suit their own personal lifestyles instead of being constrained to the numbers of days that the prisoners were not working and, hence, concentrating the visits into a shorter time frame which would be more restrictive, I suppose, than having it every day.

Mr MALONE: Is that different to what is happening in prisons in other parts of Queensland? Is that a unique situation or not?

Mr Whittaker: Arthur Gorrie has seven-day visits. Most other centres have four-day visits: Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. But it depends—I have to be very careful here—on the style of the centre. When you go to regional centres like Rockhampton and Townsville, they are multipurpose centres. They take remand prisoners, reception prisoners and sentence prisoners. Down in south-east Queensland, where you have a larger population, you tend to get your specialised centres. So you have different arrangements in your specialised centres from your more generalised—

Mr MALONE: That is very well understood. What impact will that work that is being done there have on the economy of that area? In relation to the contractors, are you looking at local buy options—those sorts of things? How is that going to move forward?

Mr Anstee: We are. As part of the tender evaluation process in selecting the managing contractor for this project there is a part of the evaluation which deals with their contribution to local industry in terms of suppliers, subcontractors and other trades or other aspects of the area that may be able to contribute to the construction of the remodelled facilities. The contractors are also required as they go to present a report to the contract administrator on exactly who they are engaging in the construction process and how that contributes to local participation.

Mr MALONE: The company again that is the preferred contractor?

Mr Anstee: It is Bovis Lend Lease.

Mr MALONE: I can recollect when the prison was built out of Maryborough, some subcontractors were concerned that interstate people were moving in. From Public Works and Housing, how do you oversight that, except for the report that you obviously get?

Mr Anstee: The actual procurement of subcontractors really rests with the managing contractor. They supply us with a list of tenderers that they would be going to the market on various trades. We have an opportunity there to review that list of tenderers to determine whether there are any opportunities or missed opportunities in terms of local industry. We have a consultant on board who also is consulting with the managing contractor. They are specialists in determining those local industries and suppliers for Queensland, in particular, this area of Queensland. They are getting enough advice, review and encouragement to ensure that they keep it as local as possible.

Mr MALONE: Can the department supply the committee with the local industry participation plan? Do you have such an animal?

Mr Anstee: The local industry participation plan—John, I am not sure if I have been given one from the contractor.

Mr Forster: We are developing that at the moment. We are happy to provide a copy of the plan as developed to date.

Mr MALONE: How does the project comply with the government's 10 per cent training policy?

Mr Anstee: The requirement for the 10 per cent training policy is included within the contract

conditions. The contractor is required to submit regular updates and reports on how that compliance is being met. The contractor that we are dealing with now has had a very good record in that in previous and past projects. We do not expect that to be missed at all. We think they are an encouragement.

Mr MALONE: Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Was a formal environmental analysis undertaken for the project? If so, in what form and by whom?

Mr Forster: We did not undertake a separate environmental analysis for this project. The impact on that site was minimal because basically we had a prison and we used it as a prison. Certainly issues that arise as part of the construction will be addressed as the project proceeds.

CHAIR: Was anyone else required to prepare an environmental management plan for the construction phase of the project?

Mr Forster: Yes, they were.

CHAIR: What approach does the department take to ensure environmentally sustainable design as part of its capital works program?

Mr Forster: Environmentally sustainable design—in corrections we have to balance environmentally sustainable design with the needs of security. We do not always score very well in some respects. However, wherever possible our designs try to take advantage of that. I suppose, in a strange twist, we shade our buildings so that we lower our air-conditioning loads. So in that sense we do certainly take account, but we air-condition our buildings to provide security. Before the mid-nineties, we were very much into orientation and louvre windows to get flow-through design but, of course, following the deaths in custody inquiry, bars became very bad. While we still need bars for security we need to shield those bars so we can limit that sort of impact. When we are talking about environmental design, certainly where we are able to implement the benefits of environmental design we do. Subject to the requirements in corrections.

Mr LINGARD: I have to say again that the Corrective Services Department has to be the most destructive in terms of its effects on the environment by knocking down trees. When Abbott went over the fence, obviously your answer was to clear more trees.

Mr Forster: The answer that we were provided with was to clear more trees. We cleared 70 metres around all of our correctional centres across the state.

Mr LINGARD: Yet once again, there is not a tree in sight.

Mr Forster: However, I might just add that the only example I can give in our defence, I guess, is that at Maryborough we did clear 70 metres around the centre but we did then plant 176,000 plants on that site to at least try to make up for it. I think it is important that we provide the staff with a safe environment in which to work. Certainly we would not want to have trees right up to the perimeter, given some of the experiences, particularly in terms of escapes.

Mr LINGARD: I still think one of the answers generally is that it is easier for the contractors to build on a site when it is completely cleared. Unfortunately, the education department sometimes has that thought, and I am sure Corrective Services does it in a lot of the things I see. I really do. Once again today there is not a tree in sight. Surely a couple of trees can be left outside the front or something like that.

Mr Whittaker: Inside the centre, line of sight is a very important aspect of security. You cannot have little pockets where you cannot see within the centre, and that really is a lot of the reason for taking away trees. Indeed, if we plant shrubs, we like to keep them a certain height so you can see over them to make sure no misbehaviour is going on, if you like, behind the trees.

Mr LINGARD: I do not think I am ever going to see a tree on a prison site in Queensland.

Mr Forster: We plant trees within correctional centres, I just might point out. I suppose as a last-ditch defence I would also point out that we do have a landscaping consultant engaged on all projects.

Mr LINGARD: Has the department considered delivery of the project through a public-private partnership and, if not, why not? Was a PPP considered?

Mr Whittaker: No. We actually sought and were granted an exemption from a PPP. The reason we did that is this is a brownfield site where some of the existing buildings will be maintained and others will be built. If it was a greenfield site where we had lots of trees to start with before we cleared it, we would certainly be heading down the value-for-money framework, which is a whole series of decision processes

leading to a decision by government on whether they want to go public-private partnership or procure it by traditional means. But in this case we did not consider it because we did not think it was appropriate on a site where, if you like, the department already owns most of the buildings. The new buildings are the only ones that we are procuring, so we did not do it on this site.

Ms STONE: On page 22 you have construction—local authority—\$200,000 to be undertaken by the public sector. What is that work? Is the council paying for it, or what is it?

Mr Forster: A local authority on government sites is Project Services. Michael might be able to answer that.

Mr Anstee: No, that is to do with our Building Act compliance, I would have thought. So that is a service that we undertake on state government projects.

Ms STONE: How are we going for completion time? Is it on track, or what do you think will happen with the completion time?

Mr Forster: This project is currently on target for completion on the nominated date. We are experiencing what might be a short delay as we go back to seek additional funds on the basis that we received advice from Department of Works. Within the normal operational cycle process, we will remain on program.

Ms STONE: And by the sound of that thunder you might be having a few more delays. With regard to the site plans, are you able to provide us with the existing correctional centre site plan and also the redeveloped high definition PDF files?

Mr Forster: Yes.

Ms STONE: With regard to the renaming to the Brisbane Reception Centre; how did that come about? Was there any other ideas with that?

Mr Whittaker: The idea was to try to give the centre a new identity when it is reopened. I am not certain whether that is an official name at this point in time. That is our proposal.

Ms STONE: Okay, it is your project name.

Mr Whittaker: Whether the minister has actually signed off formally on that at this stage, I am not certain. I will hold back on that if I can.

Ms STONE: Okay, because someone has suggested perhaps people might want to have a wedding at a reception centre.

Mr Whittaker: That comment has been made to me, too. I do not think I would want to go there for a wedding reception.

Ms STONE: No, I think I have ruled it out. Thank you.

CHAIR: Given the intended increase in prison numbers at the site, what provision has been made for additional visitor parking?

Mr Forster: We have not increased the visitor parking as we have not increased the actual visiting area. What we have done is we have asked how the management of times at visitor centres should be spread out for a longer period. On that basis there should be no need for additional car parks. The car park is suited to the size of the visits area. The visits area is not increasing thus neither should the carpark.

Ms STONE: I just have a general question. I do not know if you are the right people to ask, but I was thinking about the presentation before, and I have heard those numbers before about the population growth in prisons and so forth. But the population obviously is growing in the state. I would imagine that the prisoner to general population ratio is obviously going to increase if we have an increase in population. Are they the same sorts of figures we have now? Obviously it would be nice to be able to say that we could bring that down, but I am after a comparison.

Mr Whittaker: There are probably multiple causes of increasing prisoner population. One of those is the population increase of the state, but there is also increasing capability in the police force to actually detect and prosecute offenders. The use of DNA technology is now solving a lot of crimes that in the past probably would not have been solved. So there is a multiple set of reasons as to why our numbers are increasing—increased population, increased capability of the police force to detect crimes and increasing sentences. With regard to the provisions that the courts hand down now, some of those have increased and you have people detained for longer periods of time. So all of those things are adding to the growing

number of prisoners that we have to manage. There are probably three or four main causes; all of them I think I have run across.

We are at the receiving end here. Before the prisoners come to us they go through the criminal justice system—the police or the courts—and then they come to us. We deal with the people we get. We provide feedback to the judiciary and to the justice department on how many we have and what the patterns are looking like. But it is really a policy issue for government about what sentences they want to impose and things like that.

Ms STONE: With regard to people who have been taken from Sir David Longland for the redevelopment; have they been promised to go back there? What criteria—

Mr Whittaker: Is this staff or prisoners?

Ms STONE: No, this is prisoners, because obviously some would have families down here that—

Mr Whittaker: Yes. We moved prisoners to multiple places when we closed Sir David Longland. We increased the capacity of Maryborough by approximately 200 prisoners and we increased the capacity of Woodford by approximately 200 prisoners. Woodford had already had approval to increase by 60 or 70, so the numbers all equalled out. But it does not mean that all of the prisoners from SDL went to either Woodford or Maryborough. You might have found some prisoners moved from Sir David Longland to Arthur Gorrie or to Borallon or indeed out to farms. The general increase in populations occurred at both Maryborough and Woodford, but some of those might be second- and third-hand moves.

With staff, we have given some undertakings to staff. We had put in a considerable amount of effort to ensure that we managed the staff into new positions or, in some cases, they wanted to leave. But we have given some undertakings to staff that made them move to either Maryborough or Woodford that they have priority to come back to the Wacol precinct for any vacancies that occur, and the Wacol precinct for us is Sir David Longland, Wolston and Brisbane Women's Correctional Centre. So those staff, if you like, have got first choice to come back. As we get vacancies they will be brought back steadily and then we will recruit, so those who have not got back by the time we start to recruit in the second half of next year will probably be the first people to come back to the precinct.

CHAIR: I would like to thank you for attending today's public hearing. The committee has gathered valuable information that will assist it with its inquiries. I want to formally place on record the committee's appreciation of the assistance all of those involved in the inquiry have provided. Thank you.

Ms STONE: I move—

That pursuant to section 50(2) (a) of the Parliament of Queensland Act the committee authorise for publication the evidence given here before it this day.

CHAIR: I now declare the hearing closed.

Committee adjourned at 3.59 pm