

Questions On Notice:

Glenorchy War Memorial Pool and responses from Glenorchy City Council meetings – January 2024

Council Meeting – 29 January 2024

Response to previous public questions taken on notice

Question without notice – Leanne Rose, Glenorchy

Q2: Where specifically in the 50 metre pool was it leaking 300,000 (sic) litres of water a day (e.g., the lining, the mastic seal, the pipes or the pump) and where was the water running to?

A: [Mayor] I am sure this question has been answered before. The question was taken on notice.

Response: When it was operational, the pool needed to be continually filled to ensure it had sufficient water volume. Water metering showed that this amounted to 35,000 litres a day, which is significantly more than could be attributed to water loss through evaporation or splashing.

The exact location of leaks has not been determined, however the reports received state that the excessively wide joints are prone to failure. The water had been leaking into the water table and surrounding environment.

Public Question Time

Question on notice – Bradley McDougall, Claremont (received Wednesday 10 January 2024)

Q1: Were councillors instructed to read the Lacus Report in its entirety and had every councillor read the report in its entirety before voting to close and not repair the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool.

Response:

The Lacus Report was Attachment 1 to a Council officer's report about the pool, provided to elected members as part of the agenda papers for the Council meeting on 31 July 2023.

The Council also received a briefing from consultants, KnowLedge Asset Management Services, at a Council workshop on 3 July 2023 on the implications of the pool condition assessment.

The 31 July 2023 Council Officer's report indicated that the General Manager had made the decision on 4 July 2023, in his capacity as "person controlling the business or undertaking (PCBU)" under the Work Health and Safety Act 2012, that the Glenorchy Pool not reopen for the coming pool season and that the pool remain closed until further notice. The recommendation endorsed by the Council was to note the report and General Managers decision.

Question on notice – Natalie Larter, Montrose (received Monday, 15 January 2024)

Q1: What is the cost of the feasibility study being undertaken by MI Global Partners, to assess options for 2a Anfield Street?

Response:

Council received a \$200,00 grant from the State Government to fund the feasibility study. The contractual terms with the consultant are commercial in confidence.

Question on notice – Karen Forster, Montrose (received Sunday, 21 January 2024)

In the tender document for feasibility study of the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool site it stated: "While the site is not presently listed on the Local or Tasmanian Heritage registers, it holds historical and sociocultural heritage value. This recognition stems from its identification as a potential candidate for local listing during the Municipal Heritage Study conducted by Ian Terry and Paul Davies in 2004/2005." The tender document further states: "to further inform future site options, the Client has initiated a separate project/contract to commission an independent site-specific heritage assessment". Questions in the interests of transparency: At the time of writing of the tender document it was stated that a separate project/contract to commission an independent site specific heritage assessment.

Q1: To whom has this contract been awarded?

Response:

Brad Williams, Praxis Environment.

Q2: Can ratepayers have an assurance this assessment is NOT being undertaken by the GCCs own Heritage Officer, who although eminently qualified, is not independent?

Response:

Yes.

Q3: Why hasn't the Glenorchy Municipality History Group been consulted about this matter especially considering two Aldermen are members of said group?

Response:

The work commissioned was a technical assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified cultural heritage practitioner.

Question on notice – Nicole Vout (received Sunday 21 January 2024)

Q1: GCC has dismissed the option to repair the Glenorchy Pool based on a noninvasive site inspection that did not call for permanent closure and demolition (Lacus, page 4) therefore I wish to ask again, for you Mayor, and all the Alderman, to move a motion to vote, to do further testing and assessment of the pool and to include in MI Global Partners scope the option to repair the pool, given other Councils have successfully repaired and refurbished their pools (eg. Western Australia's Geraldton pool) for amounts a lot less than what the GCC have estimated?

Response:

Glenorchy City Council has appointed a consultant, MI Global Partners, to investigate options for the pool site, including the redevelopment of the pool facility. These options will then be presented to council for consideration.

Given this is occurring, Council will await the findings of the MI Global investigation into options before making any further decisions on the future of the pool site.

Q2: Mayor, It's our understanding you have recently met with the Assistant Minister for Infrastructure, Senator Carol Brown and been made aware of the THRIVING SUBURBS PROGRAM, making available \$200 Million to Council's to address shortfalls in PRIORITY COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE in Urban and Suburban Communities. Can you assure the Ratepayers of Glenorchy you will be applying for this funding in relation to the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool. And, Mayor, can you guarantee the Community that If via the MI Global Consultancy there is a desire from the Community to retain, repair, or refurbish our pool, or better still acquire a new Aquatic Facility, that you will honour that wish by the Community and as Mayor will seek this funding from the Federal Government's Thriving Suburbs Program which is now available to repair or replace our pool with a new Aquatic Facility?

Response:

The Thriving Suburbs Program was announced by the Federal Government in May last year, committing \$200 million over two years for locally-driven urban and suburban infrastructure and community projects.

Program guidelines, eligibility criteria and applications have not yet been released. However, it is noted this program is a national program, and a redeveloped pool would likely require anything up to 25 per cent of the program's total available funding.

Council is not ruling out any avenue for financial support in relation to the future of the pool site. Council has already applied for funding from the Federal Government as part of its budget process. To this point, those requests have not been successful.

Council has also included a redeveloped facility in its funding priorities document, which has been submitted to the State and Federal Governments for consideration in their 2024-25 budget preparation and will be provided to parties and candidates for consideration prior to the next state election.

Council will need to consider the findings of the MI Global investigation into options for the future of the pool site before it can determine the purpose and amount of any specific funding request and identify appropriate grant programs.

Q3: Mayor, will you apply for any round of funding that will enable Glenorchy to retain an Aquatic Facility, if via the MI Global Consultancy there is a desire from the Community to retain, repair or refurbish our pool or better still acquire a new Aquatic Facility?

Response:

Council will need to consider the findings of the MI Global investigation into options for the future of the pool site before it can determine the purpose and amount of any specific funding request and identify appropriate grant programs.

Council is not ruling out any avenue for financial support in relation to the future of the pool site. Council has already sought funding from the Federal Government as part of its budget process. To this point, those requests have not been successful.

Council has also included a redeveloped facility in its funding priorities document, which will be provided to parties and candidates for consideration prior to the next state election.

Q4: Mayor, can you please advise why in a Public Forum Alderman Jan Dunsby made the comment our pool is, 'beyond repair'?

Response:

What an individual elected member states is a matter for the elected member, however, it is well-established that the pool facility has reached a point in its operational life where it either requires replacement or redevelopment.

The pool does not currently meet a number of modern standards, including disability access and appropriate privacy screening in bathroom and changeroom areas. In addition, the facilities have a number of safety hazards which pose a risk to public and staff safety. As has been stated previously, any short-term repairs would see the pool closed for this season and next season, and only add another few years of operational life before consideration of redevelopment or replacement would again be required. Council does not consider this to be a cost-effective solution, which is why it is instead exploring longer term options now.

Q5: Mayor, can you please advise the Community of details of the 'additional' briefings given to Aldermen by Marcus Lightfoot of Lacus and Michael McCosker of Knowledge Asset Version: 1, Version Date: 22/01/2024 Document Set ID: 3336642 Management that led to the above statement by Alderman Jan Dunsby, that would lead Aldermen to believe our pool is 'beyond repair', contrary to what the Lacus says, the report that Council used Ratepayer money to commission?

Response:

The Council received a briefing on the implications of the pool condition assessment from the consultants that commissioned the Lacus Report at a council workshop on 3 July 2023. The details of this briefing are publicly available in the powerpoint presentation published on Council's website, via this link <https://www.gcc.tas.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Glenorchy-PoolPresentation-Client-Final-ELT-Final.pdf>

Q6: Mayor, can you please advise the Community of details of the 'additional' briefings by GCC staff as stated by Alderman Dunsby, that led Alderman Dunsby and possibly other Aldermen to believe our pool is 'beyond repair', contrary to what the Lacus says, the report that Council used Ratepayer money to commission?

Response:

The Council received a briefing on the implications of the pool condition assessment from the consultants that commissioned the Lacus Report at a Council workshop on 3 July 2023. The details of this briefing are publicly available in the powerpoint presentation published on Council's website, via this link <https://www.gcc.tas.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/GlenorchyPool-Presentation-Client-Final-ELT-Final.pdf>

Q7: Mayor, will you overturn the vote to close and not repair our pool on the 18/12/2023 as it appears some Aldermen have not understood and are confused regarding information included in the Lacus and in briefings by Consultants and GCC staff, to reach conclusions our pool is 'beyond repair'?

Response:

The briefing from the consultants clearly articulated "The need to comprehensively review return on investment using a life cycle model is essential in making a medium to long term financial decision" in relation to the major overhaul and renewal option and "Elected members will need to inform themselves with a Life Cycle Cost Model to determine future costs and upkeep" in relation to a complete replacement option (see pp 20 & 21 of powerpoint presentation).

Therefore, it is in the best interests of the community to await the findings of the MI Global investigation into options before making any further decisions on the future of the pool site.

Q8: Mayor, why have all Aldermen not read the Lacus report in full? How can Aldermen make informed decisions and vote to close and not repair our pool if they have not,

therefore making their vote invalid, as it is not a fully informed vote on such an important matter?

Response:

Council is provided with information in a range of mediums in order to provide for all levels of comprehension, which is critical to ensuring an inclusive environment for democratically elected members.

How elected members consume information and ensure they make fully informed decisions is a matter for each individual elected member.

Q9: Mayor, why does Alderman Alderton state to retain a pool in Glenorchy all of Community have to want one? Why does this particular Asset require ALL of Community support when other assets such as MAC, bike trails, skateparks etc do not have to receive such scrutiny?

Response:

What an individual elected member states is a matter for the elected member.

Council has engaged MI Global to investigate options for the future of the pool site, including redevelopment of the pool and alternative options. Community consultation is a cornerstone of this project, to inform Council on the views of the broader community.

The project will also provide detailed information on the lifecycle cost of a replacement facility.

At an estimated cost of \$30 million (much greater than other Council owned assets), Council wants to understand the financial viability and sustainability of a replacement facility, to help inform decision making.

Council also wants to ensure the initial and ongoing cost to ratepayers is provided as information to help inform community feedback on a replacement facility. Given the significant cost, it is only fair that ratepayers understand what the cost implications would be for them, so they can provide an informed view on what they want and are prepared to pay for a replacement facility.

Q10: Mayor, from what Official Document does Alderman Alderton ascertain that only 2% of the Community want a pool in the Glenorchy Municipality as Council have failed to canvas the Community on this subject or provide a Public Meeting on this subject?

Response:

What an individual elected member states is a matter for the elected member.

Council has engaged MI Global to investigate options for the future of the pool site, including redevelopment of the pool and alternative options. Community consultation is a cornerstone of this project, to inform Council on the views of the broader community.

Council held a Community Yarn on 17 October 2023, a public forum in which the pool was the main focus, including a presentation from the Mayor on the pool and a question and answer session, with more than 60 community members in attendance.

Q11: Mayor, why was the Future Directions Survey extended from a closing date of Friday 15th December to Sunday 17th December, therefore reducing the time available for staff and Aldermen and General Manager to collate, review and consider the responses before the December Council Meeting on Monday 18th December, where the vote to close and not repair our pool was taken without consideration or mention of said responses, many of which I believe would've requested to retain, repair our pool?

Response:

The Future Directions Survey aims to help inform the development of Council's annual budget. The results are presented and discussed at budget workshops and council meetings as appropriate, to help inform decisions on the annual budget.

The closing date was extended to enable more residents and ratepayers a chance to have their say on the priorities for Council's annual budget.

Q12: Mayor, considering Future Direction Survey responses were not reported on at the 18th December 2023 meeting, if yourself, staff and Aldermen are not going to consider and analyse Community responses, prior to voting on such an important issue of closing and not repairing our pool, what is the point of funding a Future Directions Survey?

Response:

The Future Directions Survey aims to help inform the development of Council's annual budget. The results are presented and discussed at budget workshops and council meetings as appropriate, to help inform decisions on the annual budget.

Question without notice – Janiece Bryan, Montrose

Q1: Has the Council applied for pool funding grants?

A: [Mayor]:

Council has lobbied the federal and state governments and continues to lobby the federal and state governments for funding to redevelop the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool site. We have not yet applied for specific grant program funding because there is no grant program funding available that would provide for an amount of funding that we know is required to replace or redevelop the pool facility. We will await the findings of the MI Global consultation before we have clearer direction on what exactly we will be applying for when it comes to redevelopment of that site and what the specific cost will be. Typically grant programs

require projects to be shovel ready. We don't have a shovel ready project to be applying for funding through a grants program.

Q2: The Lacus report did not recommend the closure of the pool and believed testing was an essential requirement before Council and Aldermen made decisions about the future of the pool. That's testing of the pool shell and the concrete. Why didn't the Council authorise a chemical analysis of the concrete and pool shell to determine its true life expectancy as this was strongly recommended in the Lacus report, page 46? Why did this occur?

A: [Mayor]: This question was taken on notice.

Question without notice – Leeanne Rose, Glenorchy

Q1: In the bid for funding of the Pool and Tolosa Street Master Plan (where councils asked federal government for \$39 million i.e \$26 million for pool and \$13 million for Tolosa park) the council said and I quote 'Both these projects would provide a massive boost for our community infrastructure'. They support people in our community to be active and engaged. They provide spaces for residents and families to congregate and enjoy recreational opportunities. Overall they add to the liveability of our city for decades to come'. All council representatives, what has changed? why have you now blatantly and without good reason changed your mind about the "live-ability of our city' and the importance of a pool for Glenorchy its citizens, and people further afield who need to use our pool and why are you now dismissing and minimizing ratepayers opinions and concerns by continually speaking against the people on this subject during General Council meetings about our beloved pool, when only approx 6 months ago we were on the same page?

A: [Mayor]:

Council continues to lobby state and federal governments for funding for both the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool redevelopment and for Tolosa Park. We've just released a Priority Projects Investment document, which is available on our website and includes, like last year, a request for funding for both of those projects.

Q2: In the Project Outline Investigation into Pool Redevelopment and Other Options, 2A Anfield Street, Glenorchy, Tony McMullen, 23 August 2023. Options considered. To date, consultants engaged to assess the condition of the current pool facility and have identified a range of options:

- Permanent closure
- Remediation of current issues, involving multi-million dollar repairs resulting in pool closure while repairs are undertaken to gain a limit additional asset life.
- Redevelopment
- Arrangements for community use of alternative swimming pool facilities at the Hobart Aquatic Centre or at Clarence.

Q2a: The limited asset life statement above, what is the evidence behind this statement please? Response: Based on the evidence obtained through their technical assessment of

the age and condition of the pool assets, the consultants determined that repairs will result in limited additional asset life.

Q2b: Taking into consider my statement above (please include in minutes); If you were a member of the 'Save the Glenorchy Pool community what would you think? How would you feel about these strategically bias documents that directs MI Global Partners to lean strongly towards discussions of alternative options (not pool or aquatic center) for the land in the center of Glenorchy (Pool Site)? If you disagree with this observation, why are 'alternative options' listed so widely in these document?

A: [Mayor]:

Council committed to exploring all options for the future of the site and wants to ensure in any decision making the financial viability and sustainability of a replacement asset on the site. The project brief clearly articulates that the work to be undertaken is to include analysis, concept designs and costings for a redeveloped pool on the site, so that certainly is within the scope of the project. It is not being excluded, that will be explored as part of the project and will be a really significant part of the consultation with the community. I do not believe the documents are biased.

Question without notice – Andrew Beven, Glenorchy

Q1: Earlier in January, Alderman Dunsby informed us via social media, that a verbal briefing to Elected Members on Lacus report was far more extensive and closing the pool immediately was the only option. Seeing the Lacus report provided many options, would you provide us with the minutes of that meeting so we can see what further information was provided in that meeting outside of the Lacus report?

A: [Mayor]:

Council doesn't keep minutes from workshops, so there are no minutes available to be provided. What I will say though, is the PowerPoint presentation that was provided to Elected Members in preparation for that workshop and that formed the basis for the discussion at that workshop is published on Council's website. It is publicly available.

Question without notice – Deannie Gillie/Shaw, Granton

Q2: Do you think MI Global should use a Facebook group to review investigating the other options in the tender process? Will you be using MI Global with your Facebook group?

A:

Council expects to receive the communication engagement plan from MI Global today. We will see in that engagement plan how in MI Global plan to consult with the community and we will be providing details of that to the community once we have that information.

Council Meeting – 26 February 2024

Announcements by the Chair

It gives me great pleasure to announce that over the weekend, both the Labor and Liberal parties announced \$5 million in funding for the Glenorchy pool. These election commitments are to allow for the pool to be repaired and reopened.

In announcing this, I acknowledge the role the community advocacy has played in achieving this funding, which will allow us to have the pool reopened while we continue to work on the long-term future of the pool facility.

The General Manager advises me that he will make comment and a further recommendation for elected members' consideration in relation to council's response to the election commitments at agenda item 9.

It is critical the work to explore options for the long-term future of the facility continues, and community consultation to help inform that future commences this week, with our consultant, MI Global Partners, undertaking a number of sessions for people to have input into what they would like to see happen at the pool site in the longer term.

I encourage all interested community members to participate in the consultation process to have their say on the long-term future of the pool.

Response to previous public questions taken on notice

Question on notice – Leanne Rose, Glenorchy (received Wednesday, 24 January)

Q1: In the 'Consultant Commission Brief (CCB 953), Contract 953' why do Councils expectations/actions emphasized through-out this document state, 'alternative options' over and over for the pool site, even going as far as stating '(not just aquatic users)' the broader community etc., i.e. under headings: 'Enhanced recreational opportunities' 'Identification and analysis of multiple options to optimize recreational outcomes, (not just aquatic users) the broader community etc. Comprehensive Cost Benefit Analysis' 'analysis and evaluation of the whole-of-life costs and benefits of 'different alternatives' to ensure that the financial implications of each are clearly understood'.

Response:

The brief is clear that the scope of works includes consideration of both pool redevelopment, and alternative options. It is important that a potential investment of this scale is fully evaluated to ensure the costs, benefits and implications are clearly understood and supported by the community. A new aquatic facility will be evaluated in this process. It is possible that some in the community may wish for alternative options, and these should also be considered.

Q2: As per Mayor's previous interview (re. State Governments \$200,000 life line) with ABC's Lucy Breadan why isn't the Mayor sticking with State Fundings original purpose which was to use funding to investigate a 'Pool Recreation Precinct' in Glenorchy? Shouldn't that be the emphasis in all these abovenamed documents?

Response:

The State Government funding has been provided to undertake a study into the Glenorchy pool recreation precinct (i.e. 2A Anfield Street). This is consistent with the project that is being undertaken - "Investigation into Pool Redevelopment and Alternative Options - 2A Anfield Street Glenorchy".

Question on notice – Andrew Beven, Glenorchy (Received Monday, 29 January 2024)

Q1: Derwent Valley Mayor Michelle Dracoulis, says she has written to you to offer access to the local facility this summer. I have not seen anything from Glenorchy Council advising residents of the offer of access to the New Norfolk pool. I may have missed it, but have you made any announcements/publications re this and what was the offer?

Response:

Council has not received any correspondence from the Derwent Valley Mayor or Council offering access to the New Norfolk pool.

There are a range of public aquatic facilities available in the region open to the general public, including Glenorchy residents, with associated standard entry fees.

The operators of each of these aquatic facilities have been supportive of helping to absorb potentially increased numbers of Glenorchy residents.

Question on notice – Morris Malone, Glenorchy (Received Monday, 5 February 2024)

Q2: Because the Lacus report is based on assumptions which involved a noninvasive visual inspection not conducted by a qualified Quantity Surveyor, can Council provide any details about the scope of inquiry for the next-phase consultancy that is anticipated to undertake further examination of the pool?

Response:

The pool inspections were undertaken by aquatic engineering specialists Lacus Consulting. The current study, to Investigate Pool Redevelopment and Alternative Options at 2A Anfield Street Glenorchy, includes provisions for a qualified quantity surveyor to ensure that there is a reasonable level of confidence in the cost estimates of concepts that are considered, including a redeveloped aquatic facility.

Public Question Time

Question without notice – Karen Forster, Montrose

Q1: Praxis Environment is owned by Mr Brad Williams, a former employee of Glenorchy City Council. Is that truly independent and transparent?

A: [General Manager] Brad Williams is experienced and eminently qualified and left his employment in July 2009, 14 years ago, so there is quite a long separation between his employment with Council and this commission.

Q2: Will you defer the passing of the Praxis environment report until the true history of the land encompassed within the pool precinct is more comprehensively researched and will you as a Council acknowledge the contribution of the Mollineux family and especially Mr Bertie Mollineux, a WW1 veteran who was injured twice on the Western Front and was a land holder with extensive holdings within the City?

A: [General Manager] The recommendation tonight is to receive and note the Praxis Report and I believe the reply back to Ms Forster was that we would welcome further contributions in relation to this and other pool related matters as part of the process. So, my understanding is that there is some work being undertaken more generally in relation to local heritage listings to be brought forward to the GPA at a future date as part of the planning scheme. There is certainly the opportunity to bring that information to bear and have a more fulsome picture.

[Mayor] We welcome you providing that information. It's not too late for it to be included as part of this broader project that MI Global are undertaking. Thank you for bringing it to our attention.

Question without notice –Janiece Bryan, Montrose

Q2: The Pool Investigation is linked to returning a profit on investment. Why isn't the Government funding this major preventative health care and essential community facility and asset that they are legally responsible for providing and will the widespread preventative health savins for the medical, hospital, mental disability services and allied health budgets including physiotherapy be costed into the return on investment for the pool calculations, and if not, the methodology being used is fatally flawed?

A: [General Manager] MI Global as part of the project, will be looking at cost benefit analysis for the pool project. I don't know precisely whether they'll be taking into account non-financial costs and benefits, but we're certainly happy to make that inquiry and come back with the result.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] The cost benefit analysis may not show a profit because of the ongoing operating costs would have to be funded by ratepayers, but we would have to wait until we actually get that cost benefit analysis to determine whether there is a surplus or deficit.

[Mayor] Do you know if it will include non-pecuniary benefits, like non-financial benefits in terms of preventative health measures?

[Director Infrastructure and Works] MI Global will be considering some nonasset type benefits that would contribute, once again that is hard to quantify.

[Mayor] The consultation process that kicks off this week is the perfect opportunity to ask MI Global some of those questions about the methodology that they'll be using. They will be extremely interested to hear from community members and be able to provide community members with assurances to the methodology that they use. I encourage you to ask that of MI Global in the opportunities being provided this week.

[Ms Bryan] I would like Council to speak to MI Global or advise them that it has to be part of that benefit analysis and that there needs to be costing. It is a financial thing, I know you say it is not, but it is a financial thing for the budgets and the struggling health system.

Question without notice – Leanne Rose, Glenorchy

Q1: In the project outline investigating full redevelopment and other options, on page 8 it details a reference group comprising representative of KGV precinct, ratepayers and community members. Could you please advise us who are the members of these reference groups?

A: [Director Infrastructure and Works] That was the part of the original options scope, just after the pool closed. When the tender documents went out that governance structure changed slightly. There is still a reference group, but it is more of a stakeholder group which still involves specific stakeholders like sporting clubs in the KGV precinct and its occupiers. They will be liaised with by MI Global and they will report back to Council with information that they provide back to MI Global.

[Mayor] To add to that, MI Global's approach has been to engage with the community more fully and broadly through the extensive consultation sessions that are being held this week, including the meeting tomorrow night was the way, as I have asked the same question, and my understanding was MI Global thought that meeting the group tomorrow night at KGV is a more effective way to ensure more people can have a say in that targeted way.

Q2: How did you (Mayor) and the Aldermen make the decision to close and then empty the pool permanently, which was contrary to the Lacus engineer report that was paid for by ratepayers, putting the lining and mastic seals at further risk, without even knowing the cost of the full repairs? So how and why did you make that decision without having that knowledge prior?

A: [Mayor] [Mayor] I feel like we have answered this previously. The decision to close the pool was a decision made by the General Manager in his capacity as a person conducting a business or undertaking given the significant health and safety risks posed by the condition of the pool assets as outlined in the report. So that was a decision taken by the General

Manager to protect public safety. In terms of emptying the pool the Director might be able to provide more detail. But my understanding again was that was in response to concerns about the water stagnating and not being able to run a pump to be able to filter the water given the safety risks posed by our switchboard system.

[Director Infrastructure and Works] That is accurate, the switchboard is condemned and so it shouldn't be operated, which means we can't turn on pumps or the filtration system. We can't circulate the water. It will stagnate. There are also safety concerns with the pool being unoccupied and unused, that if people got in, there's a safety risk of people falling in. So that decision was made to empty the pool for those factors.

[Mrs Rose] With that in mind, we have got the \$5 million offer from both governments, will you fill the pool up until that money is provided. The Lacus report says that if you don't fill it up, basically the lining will dry out and crack, so will you take precautions so that doesn't happen?

[Mayor] I think the General Manager and Director may have a bit more to say on this when we get to agenda item 9. I ask if you hold that over and we will ensure if it's not answered then, we will answer it in writing.

Question without notice – Tracey Smith, Glenorchy

Q1: If the \$5 million promise from the major parties actually does eventuate and we do know that it's an election promise, so it may never ever turn up, do we have the support from other Council Alderman to repair the pool?

A: [Mayor] I clarify that, certainly, whilst I welcomed the announcement of the election commitments over the weekend, I as one elected member can't make the decision to accept funding or make a captain's call to repair the pool. That will be a decision that will be subject to the full Council. I'll just ask again that you wait for agenda item 9 where we will be considering Council's response to the election commitments.

Q2: In the tender document that was awarded to MI Global, whose decision was it to include the exploration of the alternate options for the pool site? Did that come from Council or was that written in the document by someone else?

A: [Mayor] The General Manager prepared a project brief in terms of exploring options for the future of 2a Anfield Street, including pool redevelopment and alternative options. That was a project proposal put together by the General Manager for the purpose of procuring a consultancy to undertake that work and that report was put to Council for receipt and noting, rather than for endorsement. But, I expect, had Elected Members had an issue with what was included in the content of the report, they would have sought to have the brief amended or moved an alternative motion, and that didn't happen. So I guess the General Manager, by way of Council receiving and noting the project brief as it was, had the support of Council in investigating all options for the future of the site, recognising that, whilst, as I've said a

number of times, most of us, I think around the table and certainly myself, want a pool just as much as everyone else in the community, but we can't send the community broke doing it. So the important thing is that we explore all options and have a full picture of costs and benefits and a full analysis before we are to make an informed decision about the future of the site.

Petitions/Deputations

The General Manager reported that there were no petitions or deputations, however agenda Item 9, deals with a petition tabled at the January meeting seeking a public meeting to discuss pool related concerns and seeking urgent repair and reopening of the pool.

Council Meeting – 25 March 2024

Announcements by the Chair

MI Global project update

MI Global report they are in the final stages of the first engagement phase, with community engagement strong and key stakeholders consulted with. A specific survey of schools is also in field.

MI Global expects to close phase 1 of the engagement prior to Easter.

The stakeholder engagement report will capture all insights from the surveys and interviews and will be issued to Council and be published online for community review and comment.

MI will consolidate all information into an Options Assessment Presentation to assist with the second phase of engagement. This will include a Public Insights Session, in person, 2 -3 online workshops with key stakeholders. Dates for these engagement opportunities will be advised in due course.

Preservation of current pool shell

Council has had aquatic engineering specialist, Lacus, inspect the pool in recent weeks in preparation for the repair works to be undertaken with the recent \$5M State election funding commitments.

As part of this inspection, Council sought advice on whether the pool shell needed to be filled with water to protect its structural integrity.

The advice received is that the risk associated with an empty shell is that ground water may build-up underneath, which could subsequently push the floor of the pool shell up (without the weight of the pool water to hold it down) and cause cracking.

However, rather than refill the pool, the advice from Lacus is to install a series of Hydrostatic Relief Valves on the floor of the pool. These valves will open if there is an excessive build-up of water pressure underneath the pool shell whilst it is empty, to mitigate any risk of cracking.

The technical specification for the installation of the relief valves is currently being prepared, and the installation works will be undertaken ASAP, using Council funds.

The relief valves will also provide ongoing benefits for the pool, given it needs to stay empty during the planned repair works, and will be emptied each year for maintenance.

Public Question Time

Question on notice – Clare Lond-Caulk, Collinsvale (Received Monday, 19 February 2024)

Could Council please update us on the water situation at the pool, including:

Q1: When you drained the pool did you also turn off the isolating valve at the site?

Response:

Yes, the water has been turned off at the isolating valve.

Q2: What has been the meter reading since then?

Response:

As the isolating valve has been turned off, there has been no change in the meter.

Q3: What were the pipe works undertaken in early December?

Response:

The works undertaken in December were unrelated to the pool. These were repairs to the main Anfield Street water line that runs under the footpath.

Q4: Has this led to any further conclusions on potential leaks at the pool?

Response:

No, as per above, these works were unrelated to the pool.

Question on notice – Bradley McDougall, Claremont (Received Saturday, 24 February 2024)

Q1: In light of recent State Political party commitments of 5 million dollars by both Liberal and Labor majority Government to repair and re open our War Memorial Pool, will the Mayor and every sitting Alderman who voted unanimously for the pools indefinite closure make a public commitment to keep the pool at its current site location?

Response:

Council voted unanimously at its meeting on 26 February 2024 (item 9, subclause 5) as follows: “In light of the bipartisan election commitments of \$5m funding, DIRECT the General Manager to identify priority works required and start planning to safely repair and reopen the Glenorchy War Memorial Pool, while long-term solutions are being explored”.

Q2: Will Council now abandon the MI Global consultation process immediately?

Response:

Council is firmly committed to a long-term solution for the pool. The funding promised during the election allows the pool to be repaired and made safe for public use in the shorter-term and reopened to the public while a long-term strategy is developed.

Even with the repair work, it will only provide a relatively short-term solution for the pool, so it is important that Council continue to look for a longer-term outcome for the community.

The report prepared by MI Global will form the basis for understanding what the community wants to see at the site, as well as providing a business case for the significant funding that will be needed.

Therefore, the MI Global project will continue so that we have a long-term solution for the site that is informed by community wants and needs.

Q3a: As the General Manager chose to close the pool indefinitely, can he provide the page number or paragraph of Council's commissioned Lacus Report where it recommended closure as an option?

Response:

The General Manager decided in his capacity as a person conducting a business or undertaking (PCBU) under the Work Health and Safety Act 2012 that the pool not reopen for the foreseeable future based on the findings of the condition assessment conducted by Know-Ledge Asset Management and Lacus (refer to 31 July Council report). This decision was made to protect workers and public safety.

Q3b: Furthermore, will the General Manager resign his position for taking such a drastic position when repair was an option outlined in the same report?

Response:

No.

Question without notice – Deanne Gillie/Shaw, Granton

Q1: Will MI Global be using the pool action groups as part of your focus tool for community engagement with the pool discussion outcomes?

A: [Manager Property, Environment and Waste] My understanding is that they have every intention of consulting with those groups and I believe that all are openly invited to attend the public meeting, they are open to speak to any of the representative of those groups. Everyone from the community is able to provide their input, complete the surveys and attend the meetings. There are no focus groups as part of the project.

Q2: Did Council provide the Let's Talk handout brochures and do you agree it looks to be like a Council controlled manipulation with the whole survey process?

A: [Manager Property, Environment and Waste] The Let's Talk handouts were specifically given to the consultants to have at the table because there was the potential that people would come to those tables to talk about things other than the pool. If there were other questions asked that were unrelated to the pool, the handouts could be provided.

[Mayor] Council and MI Global are trying to consult with as many people in the community as possible. We have heard loud and clear through the process over the last nine months that the pool is used by people from across greater Hobart, which is why we are opening it up, not just to residents, but to all users. We welcome the feedback from a broad user group and people in the community who are interested in the project. Council remains completely open minded to the future and to receiving the feedback and to hearing from people as to what they want to see in the future of the site. As you know, we are committed to the repair with the \$5M election commitment. Council has no control or influence over any of those Save the Pool groups. We weren't involved in the startup or establishment of those groups, I want to make that clear and on the record.

Question without notice – Leeanne Rose, Glenorchy

Q1: Will you acknowledge and thank Dr Shane Gould and will you advertise the public meeting so that we get a lot of people to come along?

A: [Mayor] The meeting has been advertised on the Council website. We certainly welcome the submission from Dr Shane Gould on the night and we will be there to participate in the meeting. The meeting is being facilitated by an independent facilitator.

Q2: Can you ask the independent facilitator to contact me?

A: [Mayor] Yes, we will do.