What reports, studies or other investigations have been conducted by or on behalf of the Museum or Government in relation to the relocation of the museum's collection from Ultimo to Parramatta? What risks to the collection do they identify?

As part of the Preliminary Business Case, work was conducted to provide initial estimates of costs, staffing needs, timelines, as well as identified risks and mitigations associated with the relocation of the Museum’s Collection from Ultimo. The content of the Preliminary Business Case is Cabinet in Confidence.

Work is presently underway on the Final Business Case, which as part of its work develops plans for the relocation of the Collection, and includes appropriate measures regarding logistics, movement, risk mitigation and associated tracking, resource planning and documentation. This work is part of reports for Cabinet, and is also Cabinet in Confidence.

What reports, studies or other investigations have been conducted by or on behalf of the Museum or Government in relation to the hydrology of the Parramatta site?

As part of the Preliminary Business Case, work was conducted across a range of planning considerations including flooding, impacts this would have on the design and mitigation measures this would require, and the costs and time associated with those measures. The content of the Preliminary Business Case is Cabinet in Confidence.

Work is presently underway on the Final Business Case, which as part of due diligence explores a range of planning matters including, but not limited to, flooding and geotechnical issues. This work is part of reports for Cabinet, and is also Cabinet in Confidence.

With the new museum proposed to be built on a site with a known flood risk, how can the protection and proper conservation of the collection be guaranteed?

Museums across the world are built in locations which are considered ‘at risk’. For example, New Zealand’s National Museum, Te Papa, located on the Wellington waterfront, is designed to survive earthquakes as well as associated tsunamis. 2011 flooding in Brisbane showed the riverside Gallery of Modern Art and the Queensland State Library were adequately designed to manage flood events without endangering their collections.
Flood issues are certainly present on the Riverbank site, but appropriate design and engineering measures can ensure protection and conservation of the Museum collection.

Comment on other evidence

The Museum wishes to provide comment on aspects of evidence provided by two other witnesses.

Dr Lindsay Sharp

In his evidence to the Inquiry on 6 September 2016 Dr Lindsay Sharp said that from his reading of the Board of Trustees Minutes released under a GIPA application, that the Board of Trustees had received advice that the cost of constructing the new Museum would be in the order of $450 to $500 million.

This is incorrect. At its July 2015 meeting the Board of Trustees was advised:

‘It was NOTED that whilst a funding envelope of $450-500 million has been estimated in initial quantity surveys, it was not possible to nominate the overall project cost until site selection and a full Business Case have been completed.’

The estimates that have been provided to Management and Trust have been those developed as part of the Preliminary Business Case, and as noted, they are initial, and incomplete due to the site not having been selected at that point. The Final Business Case work will develop these estimates further now the site has been identified.

Dr Nicholas Pappas

Dr Nicholas Pappas gave evidence to the Inquiry on 6 September that the Board of Trustees abdicated its responsibility, under the MAAS Act to deliberate on the proposed relocation, and as a statutory Trust, exercise its responsibility to act independently of Government.

The Board of Trustees has deliberated on the proposed relocation at every meeting held since the release of the State Infrastructure Strategy. The Board has also convened on several occasions out of session to discuss matters pertaining to the proposed relocation and to provide guidance and advice to management.

As noted by the President of the Board of Trustees in evidence to the Inquiry on 5 September:

‘The board of trustees supports the move to Parramatta. However, as the trustees of the collection we believe it is our responsibility to ensure that in that move a number of things are taken account of.

One of them is that the site is fit for purpose and appropriate to the construction of the museum, as the Premier and the New South Wales Government have indicated.

Secondly, we need to ensure that the capital funding required to build the iconic museum that the Government has referred to and the operational funding that is required to operate the museum into the future are appropriate to the vision that we have for the museum in Parramatta.'
Finally, we need to ensure that the remit of the museum to provide access to the collection for the long-term is achievable.

The Board of Trustees is not independent of Government. Whilst the Trust does have responsibilities under the Act, it does not independently exercise them.

The Act 3(1) states in part ‘There shall be appointed nine trustees… who, subject to the control and direction of the Minister, shall carry into effect the objects and purposes of this Act…’

and

3 (3) ‘the trustees shall not sell… or otherwise dispose of any real property without the approval of the Governor’
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