

**Supplementary
Submission
No 148v**

**INQUIRY INTO INQUIRY INTO MUSEUMS AND
GALLERIES**

Name: Dr Lindsay Sharp

Date Received: 13 February 2019

The Hon Robert Borsak MLC
Committee Chair,
General Purpose Standing Committee No. 4,
Legislative Council
Parliament House
Sydney NSW 2000

10 February, 2019

Upper House Inquiry into museums and galleries No. 4

Submission by Dr Lindsay Sharp in respect of:

PART II 'POWERHOUSE PRECINCT AT PARRAMATTA, INTERNATIONAL DESIGN COMPETITION, SEARCH STATEMENT' document released by Government, 24 January, 2019.

(12 02 2019/ or 02 12 2019, if you are in the USA)

Some questions which might be asked of the Government, the Minister and Mr Limkin in due course at another Inquiry:

Some potential questions for Government/Minister/Mr Craig Limkin:

The seven key issues underpinning these questions are:

- a) Cost blow out, from \$200 million [2015] to at least \$1.5 billion [2018] - see most recent Powerhouse Museum Alliance submissions
- b) The new Riverbank located museum will be less than half the size of the Powerhouse Museum; it will face flooding possibly up to 12 metres by 2100; the site is complex, inaccessible for large objects most of which will be placed in store; it will be far smaller than the vast Powerhouse Museum; the Premier and Minister have misled the people of NSW
- c) The 'Extended Final Business Case' appears s a fiscal and financial mess; amateur, inaccurate, inconsistent and incompetent; clearly the Minister misled Cabinet and taxpayers; it fails, even on its own figures, Treasury's determining 'Benefit Cost Ratio'. Cabinet should never have approved the project.

- d) Consultation of the two million people living in western Sydney has not occurred in any meaningful way; consequently the Business Case is flawed beyond measure; the late addition of a Planetarium adds another financial black hole for the future split museum
- e) The likely heritage destruction of Willowgrove/ St George's Terrace on Riverbank and much of the great Powerhouse Museum buildings in Ultimo, plus the extreme risk to collections given the unnecessary/under-resourced collections move, puts the State's heritage and world-class collections under dire threat
- f) The Business Case process, much vaunted by the previous Premier and present Minister, is a sham. This Minister has repeatedly failed to look at other much better, less wasteful and less expensive options such as the opportunity presented by NSW's finest remaining heritage site- Cumberland Hospital/Female Factory- only about 800 metres from the Riverbank site and far more appropriate/less risky than that
- g) The only reasonable explanation for Government's folly in pursuing this runt of a submarine museum project is developer greed and kow-towing to the big end of both cities- Sydney and Parramatta. The last thing it can be described as is reflective of local communities and what they really want
- h) The release of the 'Powerhouse Precinct at Parramatta, International Design Competition, Search Document' on 24 January, 2019 which is profoundly suboptimal, inaccurate, misleading and faulted]

Craig Limkin: Personal and Professional Background:

- 1) Mr Limkin very briefly what was your professional experience prior to taking up your current duties, say over the last eight years?
- 2) What was the largest capital cultural project you managed in terms of dollar amount before taking up your present role?
- 3) Did you deliver these projects on time, on budget and to a quality which met both the Brief and the client's satisfaction?
- 4) How do these projects compare with the present Powerhouse Museum Project in scale, complexity and cost?
- 5) What is the succinct and precise definition of your current role?
- 6) What museological training and experience did you possess when you took up your role as chief planner for this project?
- 7) Are you involved in other major cultural capital works projects at present?
- 8) Do you advise the Minister directly or through your superiors about any and all aspects relating to the Powerhouse Museum project? If not which specific aspects are covered?
- 9) How many staff, consultants or contractors report to you?

- 10) What personal cultural interests or hobbies do you enjoy or follow outside of work?
- 11) Do these have any relationship to the Lyric Theatre proposal for the Ultimo Powerhouse Museum site?

We will now refer you to various documents which form the core basis for Government's claimed project motivation, history, costing and schedule/program to date:

- 12) Are you familiar with the late 2014 MAAS/Board/Hiscock Final Business Case for regeneration of the existing Powerhouse Museum facilities at Ultimo?
- 13) Having heard the submissions by recent previous witnesses today, or having read their written submissions from 30 January 2019 and August 2018, do you maintain that the approximately \$350 million requested in the Hiscock Business case were appropriate, reasonable and based on properly Quantity Surveyed calculations?
- 14) Have you forensically analysed this Final Business Case?
- 15) Are you aware that the figure quoted for restoration of the current buildings in this document was in the region of \$36.3 million and that this figure evolved as a result of demands by the then Director that all figures be egregiously maximised?
- 16) Are you aware that the Minister to whom you report has claimed this capital envelope at approximately \$30 million to be woefully inadequate to this Inquiry and that he has quoted the figure for the whole project at over \$350 million as restoration costs even though this inflated figure includes a massive new building programme?
- 17) Have you given the Minister advice along the lines and costings stated above?
- 18) Do you agree that this advice, from whatever quarter, is entirely misleading?
- 19) Are you aware that a figure of \$500 million was leaked to the Daily Telegraph last year before the Summary Final Extended Business Case was released? :

'Sydney's Daily Telegraph (Wed 18 April 2018) launched a barrage of criticism of the Powerhouse Museum as debate about the Baird plan heated up. Quoting extensively from 'a secret report' – as it turns out, the flawed and misleading MAAS [Hiscock] 2014 FBCRPM – the Daily Telegraph asserted that the government has said the 2014 \$350m renewal plan would now cost \$500m.'

- 20) Did you leak this entirely erroneous information? If not do you know who did? Did the leak come from the Minister's office?

21) Are you aware that the most pertinent comment regarding this key matter comes from the NSW Government's own report commissioned by Infrastructure NSW in June 2012: NSW Infrastructure Recreation and Arts Baseline Report, by PricewaterhouseCoopers Australia in June 2012 which identified that:

'The Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences has an estimated backlog maintenance of \$1.8m. The average condition of the facilities of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences built assets and infrastructure was ranked as good with moderate deterioration.' [p35].

22) Do you/did you advise the Minister on this matter? If not why not? Did you advise him that his public statements were false and misleading?

23) Do you maintain that the current buildings are never going to be fit for purpose except with expenditure in excess of \$350 million?

24) Are you aware that the built assets of the present Museum in Ultimo exceed a true sunk value of over \$350 million and that this value is not included as a cost in Government's Final Extended Business case cost statement – a report which was forcibly required to be tabled last year by this Inquiry?

25) Are you aware of many other museum buildings internationally which date from centuries past around the world (e.g. British Museum; Louvre; Science Museum London etc.) which are continuously being upgraded in line with professional requirements? If so how is it that the present Powerhouse Museum facilities which were purpose-fit recycled only 30 years ago not be cost effectively and successfully upgraded?

26) If older buildings cannot be made fit-for-museum purposes why is it that the Minister has approved the future upgrading of the Hyde Park Barracks at a cost of approximately \$17 million? Are you also in charge of that project?

27) Having heard testimony by professional museologists Sanders, Glendenning, Grant, Winkworth, Baker, Sharp and others that the existing buildings are easy to upgrade to meet current and predicted professional criteria do you disagree with those statements which were made on the record? If so on what evidential basis?

28) Having heard and or read the testimony of these and other professionals which comprehensively and reliably demolish the accuracy, clarity, reliability and professionalism of the documents constituting the Final Extended Business Case do you still maintain it is a high quality set of well integrated reports which provide reliable guidance and good value for money to the taxpayers of NSW?

We will now turn to a number of the documents which constitute the so-called Extended Final Business Case tabled last year in the Parliament:

29) Were you in overall charge of assembling this documentation, overseeing and briefing the various consultants employed in their preparation?

30) Not including the original \$10 million for consultants what was the additional cost of all the consultant work covered by project planning up to the date of the release of the International Design Competition Search on 24 January 2019?

31) If you were in charge of this inchoate, massive raft of documentation is it true you have personal and professional responsibility for its contents, their factual accuracy and their coordination?

32) If not, who does?

33) To your knowledge did the Minister read all the key documents prior to their presentation by him to Cabinet?

34) Did you take him through scope, costings, challenges, problems and unresolved issues?

A) Hirst Projects Review of MAAS Collection move

[See further questions under 'F' later]

35) Did Hirst Projects really review the fundamental assumptions underpinning this project and the collections move?

36) Why was no expert in moving very large sensitive objects present at the Hirst review meetings in October, 2017?

37) Movement of large, iconic objects to Parramatta? Hirst says most will be moved there- is this practical, wise and feasible? Is it likely?

38) Risks due to potential flooding? Did Hirst projects address this subject?

39) How many skilled object expert handlers, conservators, and related staff are required to move the objects? [Hint- at least 190- few of which are available in Australia]

40) Is the estimate of costs- around \$50 million- reliable or reasonable? Was this figure reduced? If so by how much? Can the reduction be justified? [Hint- cut without justification by at least \$15 million at the stroke of a pen]

41) In particular the thirty or so large objects represent some of this country's most significant transport and engineering artefacts one of which may be worth hundreds of millions of dollars (Boulton and Watt engine) – how has the risk and cost of moving and reconstructing these been undertaken and what evidence is there that this is estimation accurate and safe?

42) Are they all going to be on display in Parramatta?

43) If not why not and where will they be located?

- 44) Is the estimate of 400,000 objects to be moved within three years reliable or reasonable?
 - 45) Is a leased temporary store for redundant very large objects contemplated? Costs both in construction and in movement thereto? Accessible to the public? As good as the existing Powerhouse Museum?
 - 46) Waste of existing Harwood building facilities? Unnecessary? Value of this asset's wastage?
 - 47) Is there enough storage space at Castle Hill?
 - 48) Cost of the Castle Hill new storage facilities? 800 M2 short even after new construction?
 - 49) Has a full, accurate cost benefit/ risk analysis of the move been undertaken?
 - 50) Additional costs for the transport etc. between Castle Hill, Parramatta and the Observatory over 30 years [Net Present Value] - have they been calculated and added to the Total Project Cost?
 - 51) What experience has Deloitte got in collection move logistics? [Hirst Projects relied on an unreleased Deloitte report on this subject]
 - 52) What contingency has been allowed for in the collection move costing? In the overall project contingency? Should such a contingency not be included given Hirst Projects' stated reservations and cautions?
 - 53) What damage to the Powerhouse Museum heritage buildings will be required to 'move' the very large objects and what are the risks/costs attached to same?
 - 54) Does it appear that Hirst Projects have written the report to limit their professional responsibility in the event of major disasters, cost blow outs and unforeseen results?
 - 52) Does it appear that Hirst Projects have written their report to garner further consulting engagement and income?
 - 55) As far as you can tell have all the appropriate headings such as insurance costs of the move, security costs and so on been fully included in original costings and this Review?
 - 56) What specific recommendations did Hirst Projects [or other consultants] make in respect of the priceless Bolton and Watt beam engine, the Catalina, other aircraft, Locomotive Number 1 and linked rolling stock, further rail items, and other irreplaceable steamed engines?
 - 57) Did Hirst Projects [or other consultants] provide guidance as to the risks associated with the deconstruction, removal and reconstruction of these iconic objects? What were their conclusions?
- B) Flood Study by Taylor, Thomson, Whitling Pty Ltd, November 2016

- 58) Have further studies on flood risk/sea level rise at the Parramatta Riverbank site been undertaken with respect to this project since November 2016? If not why not? If so who has undertaken it, what did it cost and what were the conclusions- especially what were the risks?
- 59) What are the possible maximum flood height levels which might be experienced at Riverbank by 2120?
- 60) Have there been recent scientific papers released relating to global sea level rise? If so what risks did they outline?
- 61) Have other jurisdictions in western Sydney, Australia and overseas taken these and river flooding risks fully into account?
- 62) Has there been evidence in Australia of recent cultural project inundations? If so are you aware of the damage caused and has this been fully taken into account with this project?
- 63) Are you aware of the Government of NSW's reluctance to release data on the impact of sea level rise more broadly? Why is this the case? Is it because of global climate change denial and possible Government liability due to this and planning inaction?
- 64) Has there been evidence overseas of recent cultural project inundations? If so are you aware of the damage caused and has this been fully taken into account with this project?
- 65) Are you aware of other museums which are taking potential flood and sea level rise risks into account? If not why not?
- 66) What are the additional risks and costs associated with those risks of developing the new museum on the Riverbank site?
- 67) How are you handling the increased risk to the very large objects to be moved to Riverbank since these will have to be on the museum's main/ground floor?
- 68) How will you deal with flood risk to the museum objects on display especially since the Riverbank site is likely to present major challenges due to this and more difficult physical access than the present Powerhouse Museum?
- 69) Have you modelled all potential risk elements and profiles under worst case flooding/sea rise circumstances at the Riverbank site? If not, why not?
- 70) Have you undertaken a risk-benefit analysis of keeping the Powerhouse Museum very large objects where they are versus moving them to Parramatta and other locations?
- 71) Have you undertaken a risk-benefit analysis of keeping the Powerhouse Museum stored/displayed collections where they are versus moving them to Parramatta and other locations?
- 72) Are you aware of recent damage to the collections in the Harwood Building owing to senior museum staff incompetence and to gross underfunding of museum maintenance because of real cuts caused by the so-called efficiency dividend? Are you aware that similar underfunding led to the fire at the National Museum of Brazil last week in which over twenty million artefacts were lost?

C) Questions related to five documents:

[Numbers derived from Powerhouse Museum Alliance website 'Extended Final Business Case' document ordering]

5. Vision Statement: New Western Sydney Museum 5 Vision Statement

(2016/17? (does not include Ultimo), Johnstaff, 'Attachment A' for No 4 above – or 'A' for No 1 above, 11pp.)

6. Project Definition New Western Sydney Museum: New Western Sydney Museum 6 Project Definition (Undated, Johnstaff, 'Attachment C' for No 1 above, 10pp)

7. Rationale: New Western Sydney Museum: 7 Rationale (14 Feb, 2017; Johnstaff, 'Attachment BB' for No 1 above, 98pp)

10c. Development Options Assessment – Super Towers Options: New Western Sydney Museum 10c Development Options Assessment – Super Towers Options

(21 July 2017, Fender K)

24. Museum Benchmarking and Precedent Analysis: New Western Sydney Museum 24 Museum Benchmarking and Precedent Analysis

(Undated, 2017? Fender Katsalidis Mirams Architects, for Johnstaff; analysis of 5 other museums, 99 pp.)Katsalidis Mirams Architects, for Johnstaff, 15pp)

22. Willingness to Pay Study: New Western Sydney Museum/

(Sept 2017, CaPPRe Pty Ltd, for Johnstaff, 'Attachment H' to No 1 above, 21pp)]

QUESTIONS CONTINUED:

73) Who selected the museum facilities featured in the 'Museum Benchmark' document? What were the key criteria?

74) Why was the Powerhouse Museum itself, with its massive cubic volumes, not included as a Benchmark?

75) Why was Seattle's Museum of Flight not included? Or the Smithsonian's Air and Space Museum?

76) Why has the Minister maintained that the new museum at Riverbank is the same size as the present Powerhouse Museum? [It is half that size with much smaller permanent galleries and enormous temporary galleries see notes at the end of this document, plus a financial black-hole Planetarium]

- 77) What is the cubic volume of the new museum? How does that compare with the present Powerhouse Museum?
- 78) Where and what is the Business Plan for the proposed Planetarium?
- 79) Where and what is the evidence/business plan/costing in current Australian \$s for the comparative Benchmark 'Rose Planetarium' from New York?
- 80) Why does the Benchmark document claim that the Rose Planetarium is at 'the Met' [Metropolitan Museum of Art] when it is part of New York's American Museum of Natural History?
- 81) Who fact checked the documents?
- 82) How was this blatant error and many others not picked up in the so-called 'Deep Dive' by Government's analysts, Treasury and the planners concerned?
- 83) What is the completed value of the three unit towers outlined in the 'Super Towers Options' paper on the Riverbank site in Parramatta and what will the sites be sold for?
- 84) How do these proposals square with Parramatta City Council's decision to keep residential towers from the core CBD which is devoted to commercial/business enhancing construction?
- 85) What is the completed value of the four plus unit towers outlined for the demolished Powerhouse Museum building footprints in Ultimo and what will the sites be sold for?
- 86) What is the value of the wastage of the current museum buildings?
- 87) Why did Government not include the 2014 MAAS redevelopment plan, in the 'Extended Final Business Case' documents, which had almost passed through the treasury Gateway process before being recalled?
- 88) What evidence for long term socio-economic community benefit has Government established in regard to the Riverbank project in comparative cultural developments such as the Bilbao Guggenheim Museum or Toronto's Royal Ontario Museum 'Crystal' building project?

D) Questions related to 'Final Business Case (Supplement): The New Museum in Western Sydney' [the key summary document for Cabinet Members at the decision point to proceed]

Mr Limkin would here be representing the Department and his Minister if they were unavailable. These questions therefore are directed through him to the Minister:

- 89) Does the Minister agree with the previous Premier, Mr Baird that correct Business Planning procedure starts with an announcement of a project then goes into a business planning phase to try to prove up its viability?
- 90) Does the Minister agree that is what happened with the so-called Powerhouse Museum 'move' as announced by Mr Baird in 2015?

- 91) Does the Minister agree that a full range of options for appropriate sites in Parramatta and a full range of options for Ultimo and retention of the existing museum there was not analysed?
- 92) Or did Government, as stated in the documents released, simply preclude all other options than those which were originally announced by then Premier Baird, in contravention of Treasury policy?
- 93) Does the Minister recall that at that announcement Premier Baird stated the cost of the project would be paid for from sale of the Ultimo site at \$200 million and any excess funds would be applied to cultural activities in Parramatta?
- 94) Does the Minister accept that this keystone document deliberately understates the Total Project Cost by at least \$400 million? Viz- not \$825 million but at least \$1.25 billion, plus wastage of in excess of \$300 million of fit for purpose facilities at Ultimo?
- 95) Does the Minister acknowledge that even on his own figures of \$825 million there has already been a blow out of in excess of 400% compared to Baird's announcement of 2015?
- 96) Does the Minister claim that this project submission to Cabinet has included all appropriate cost headings and inflation/contingency provision including site acquisition at \$140 million; that the Total Project Cost was truly presented to Cabinet; that undocumented price estimate reductions have been flagged up; and that he has justified these to Cabinet at the presentation of the project?
- 97) Can the Minister explain why the uncosted extra \$385 million for a 'cultural presence' at Ultimo [Lyric Theatre/ museum of design, fashion, and architecture] was not included in the costs presented to Cabinet as part of the Total Project Cost/capital allocation requested of Cabinet??
- 98) Does the Minister acknowledge that the classic way to reduce Total Project Cost is to break out and hide various cost headings while swamping decision makers with a massive pile of paperwork summarised by a misleading executive document like this one?
- 99) Does the Minister acknowledge that this document states there will be no increase in Consolidated Revenue at the beginning but seeks a review of same at the end? Why is this?
- 100) Does the Minister accept that operating five sites will cost a great deal more in Consolidated Revenue than operating three? [Riverbank; expanded Castle Hill with most of back of house and object storage ; Museum presence in Ultimo; redundant large objects store; Observatory; versus three: Ultimo Powerhouse Museum; Castle Hill; Observatory]
- 101) Does the Minister understand that claims the new Museum will vastly increase the educational reach of MAAS and that there will be a massive expansion of temporary exhibition space at Riverbank plus more venues to run makes the likelihood there will be no increase in Consolidated Revenue costs appear ludicrous?
- 102) Does the Minister understand that inclusion of all these costs treated [including those to be calculated through Net Present Value] makes the Treasury's Benefit Cost Ratio requirement impossible for this project to meet?

- 103) Does the Minister recall telling Mr Shoebridge and Mr Secord that Government utilised Business Case data to approve projects and only such approval takes a project from 'in principle' to actual when the BCR is achieved?
- 104) Does the Minister agree The line item marked 'Targeted savings' is also highly questionable? [Such methods are widely utilised but to rely on them at this premature stage is high in risk. The sole reason for redaction therefore appears to be to continue to mislead, not only Cabinet who were bamboozled by the figures, and Treasury-BCR- but now also the Parliament and the public who cannot interrogate them].
- 105) Does the Minister agree his project costing, if fully and properly comprehensive, means this project will never meet such a BCR requirement?
- 106) On that basis does the Minister accept he misled Cabinet and this Inquiry?
- 107) Did the Minister mislead the people of NSW in claiming that this Museum will be as large as the present Powerhouse Museum [it will be approximately half the size- see notes at end]?
- 75) Did the current Premier do likewise?
- 76) Does the Minister agree that the previous Premier [Baird] misled this Inquiry when he claimed that Parramatta was not getting second best in the Riverbank/new museum project?
- 77) Does the Minister agree that this summary document misled Cabinet when it claimed that the new Museum Project would 'relocate' the functions of the Powerhouse Museum (PhM) to Parramatta since most of the back-of-house functions are to be split off and relocated to Castle Hill- insofar as they are maintained?
- 108) Does the Minister agree that the prime reason for this project is: 'the potential for large scale commercial development on the [Parramatta and Ultimo] site [s]'?
- 109) Does the Minister still maintain after the commercial fiasco of the MAAS Fashion Ball that the fiscal future of MAAS will be ensured by 'developing a sustainable MAAS operating model that enables revenue raising and commercial opportunities'? Really?
- 110) What evidence, if any, can the Minister adduce as to the successful commercial and fund raising abilities of this MAAS Board and their senior executives?
- 111) Does the Minister seriously maintain that the projected visitor expenditure figures are reliable, fully researched and 'bankable'?
- 112) If these visitor spending figures prove a fantasy can the Minister reassure this Inquiry that the future Museum operating budget will be sustainable and that additional operating costs will be offset by earned income and not by increased Consolidated Revenue provision in the future?

F: General Questions arising from these documents:

- 133) Minister how if the move of the PHM was first justified on the grounds that the PHM was not in a cultural precinct and was remote from other attractions, is it now proposed to put a lyric theatre in the shell of the PHM and leave a remnant fashion and display at Ultimo? What's changed?
- 114) What is the 'Ultimo Service Needs Analysis 2017' (so-called) what were the detailed criteria, brief, market research, community/institutional consultation, Sydney City consultation, questions asked, etc.?
- 115) Who carried this work out and at what cost?
- 116) Why was it not tabled along with the other EFBC documents?
- 117) On what basis does it maintain that the facilities provided by the Powerhouse Museum are not needed in the CBD?
- 118) Was the Minister lying to the Inquiry last June when he said all options were on the table when there was effectively only three variants of one option addressed in the EFBC? Did Mr Limkin fully and correctly investigate a much wider range of options than presented therein?
- 119) Does the Minister agree with the present Premier that it is possible to 'move' the Powerhouse Museum which is centred on the historic Ultimo Power station because the name 'Powerhouse Museum' is 'just a brand'?
- 120) Does the Minister agree that viable, workable museum projects in various formats have been presented to him which are centred on the Cumberland Hospital site and the Female Factory?
- 121) Does the Minister acknowledge that this site is of world heritage quality and the last such site in NSW?
- 122) Does the Minister claim that, following Treasury procedures for Business Case planning, the less expensive, far more appropriate Cumberland Hospital site was explored in the Business Case planning process along with other sites more viable and not flood prone like the Riverbank site?
- 123) Does the Minister acknowledge that over 12,000 local citizens signed a petition seeking to preserve the heritage sites of Willowgrove and St George's Terrace at Riverbank and that his preferred plans will lead to their demolition?
- 124) Does the Minister acknowledge that if Government appropriately keeps these heritage buildings the number of 'Super Towers' will have to be reduced, in accordance also with MAAS Trustees' wishes, and that the remaining land footprint will make any new museum developed there far smaller than Option 3 and unable to be adequately developed or to operate successfully?
- 125) If he disagrees with that statement what planning has been done to find solutions and why were the resulting documents not tabled as part of the 'Extended Final Business Case'?

- 126) Did the Minister flag up to Cabinet that heritage buildings were to be destroyed on the Riverbank site and the political, economic and fiscal risks which would thereby eventuate?
- 127) Did the Minister provide an alternate Business Case benefit/cost analysis if these buildings are retained and does that meet Treasury guidelines?
- 128) Can the Minister confidently state to this Inquiry that the resulting changed project can deal with the massively heightened flood risk in its resulting changed configuration?
- 129) What financial undertakings has the Minister indicated to Cabinet may be required to obtain willing Super Tower site purchasers as a result of the massively increased flood risk?
- 130) Why are not all the large exhibits going into the new museum? Does this suggest access or display constraints? If so, what are they? (Refer Johnstaff Collections Relocations and Logistics Report)
- 131) Has a recent independent assessment been made of the extraordinary claim that the current PHM buildings are "reaching the end of its useful life and no longer fit-for-purpose"? (Final Summary Business Case p.4). What reliable information is available?
- 132) What are the plans for the Boulton & Watt beam engine, the centrepiece of the PHM collection? If it is planned to move it, was a prior cost benefit analysis carried out? If so, what assumptions underpinned that analysis? What independent expertise was sought?
- 133) What schedule float is built into the project timeline to account for inevitable delays? What contingencies have been identified?
- 134) Has the likely availability of suitably qualified and trained personnel been assessed for the MAAS Collection Relocation project?
- 135) What assumptions were made for costing of large object transportation, handling and installation?
- 136) What assumptions were made about access and installation requirements for large objects on the Riverbank site?
- 137) What static and dynamic floor loading limits and floor to ceiling height assumptions were made for the costing of the new museum building to accommodate the movement and installation of large, heavy exhibits?
- 138) What consideration has been given to the provision and costing of internal structures in the new museum building such as exposed trusses and steel beams to facilitate the movement and installation of large heavy exhibits, especially where other means are impractical?
- 139) What consideration has been given in the new museum building for emergency access to safely remove large, vulnerable exhibits in a disaster planning scenario?
- 140) What consideration was given to addressing the competing requirements of the elevated floor heights required for flood proofing measures for the new museum building with level access requirements for installing objects? How was this resolved?

General Questions for Mr Limkin/Ministerial representative:

141) What is your view of the cumulative effects of the efficiency dividend on MAAS planning, curatorial and management capacities, especially in the context of planning new cultural infrastructure in Greater Western Sydney?

142) What is your view of evidence given at this Inquiry by MAAS representatives to date?

143) What is your view of evidence given at this Inquiry by Government and consultant representatives to date?

144) To what extent do you believe Ms Havilah, the recently installed new Chief Executive, meets the core criteria of the official Job Description?

145) To what extent was she the choice of the Board of Trustees of MAAS and its President as opposed to that of the Minister?

146) Specifically how did she demonstrate mastery of 'STEM' subjects as required?

147) Specifically how did she demonstrate a deep, relevant experience and knowledge of Museums; Museum management; huge, broad-based, international class collections in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics [STEM] and historic decorative arts?

148) Specifically, how did she demonstrate deep, relevant, essential experience and knowledge of design, planning, project management and construction of the new [A \$1.6 billion] Museum in Parramatta, the upgrade to the Museum Discovery Centre, the move of the collection to new facilities and the changes at the Ultimo site?

149) To your knowledge what is her demonstrated experience in respect of project and construction planning, oversight and delivery of museum facilities in terms of scale, complexity and budget?

150) To your knowledge what is her demonstrated experience in respect of the size of staffing in the organisations she has directed previously?

151) To your knowledge what is her demonstrated experience in respect of the size of operational budget in the organisations she has directed previously?

152) To your knowledge what is her demonstrated experience in respect of the collections size, subject breadth and complexity especially in regards to logistics and movement of same?

153) Do you agree MAAS has suffered from inexperienced leadership at Board and Director level in the last three Directors and Presidents, along with Trustee representation [with a couple of notable exceptions?] and now at Senior Staff levels?