

# MEMORANDUM

<b>PROJECT:</b>	New Wanaka Pool		
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Report on Design, Procurement and Cost for LTP Meeting	<b>DATE:</b>	09 June 2015
<b>FROM:</b>	James Bremner	<i>File Ref:</i>	10048SL_6.0
<b>TO/CC</b>	<b>ATTENTION:</b>	<b>COMPANY:</b>	
<b>TO</b>	Marc Bretherton	QLDC	

Dear Marc

The purpose of this memo is to report back to QLDC on the New Wanaka Pool project and provide an update of the status of the current design, cost estimates and to discuss procurement strategies for the project going forward.

## Design

Resolution was granted in the February 2015 Council Meeting to enable the design team to progress the Wanaka Pool design from the Concept Design phase through to the completion of the Preliminary Design by the end of June 2015. The Concept approved by council in the February 2015 meeting was to progress with an 8 Lane Lap Pool and a Learn to Swim Pool which is to be constructed in Wanaka Sports Facility site at Three Parks, Wanaka.

QLDC in consultation with pool consultants Watershed developed recommendations and set parameters for the pool design to ensure that the facility is fit-for purpose with these being conveyed to the design team at the end of March. Consultation with the community has also been undertaken through a meeting in early April to better understand how the community might best use the facility and provide further direction and clarity to the design team.

The latest design iteration has accommodated, where possible, many of these recommendations and suggestions. Watershed has undertaken a Peer Review of this design and we note that many of their recommendations have been incorporated in the continuing development of the design.

Attached with this memo is a copy of the latest Preliminary Design documentation and visual.

## Cost Estimate

In September 2014 RLB reported an anticipated cost estimate to construct an 8 Lane Lap Pool and Learn to Swim Pool of \$11.8 Million based off the Concept Design drawings and a Ground Floor Area of 1,885m<sup>2</sup>.

RLB have since updated their cost estimate for the New Wanaka Pool and report their current estimate as being \$12.28 Million which is an estimated increase of \$480,000. The factors affecting this increase are summarised below and discussed in the attached RLB cost report.

- 1) Through the above mentioned recommendations and community consultation adjustments to the design scope were incorporated to ensure the building is fit-for purpose and functional with these being:
  - Increase in size of the Learn To Swim Pool (17980mm x 7900mm to 20000mm x 10000mm)
    - Increase in Floor Area for the pool and an increase in plant area.
  - Introduction of a 15 Person Spa Pool
    - Increase in Floor Area for the pool and an increase in plant area.
  - Increase in Storage Area
- 2) Estimated abortive works to the adjoining Wanaka Sports Facility of \$150,000 were not included in the September 2014 estimate. As the Wanaka Sports Facility was still in the Preliminary Design phase and the Wanaka Pool was in the Concept Design phase the value of abortive works could not be accurately assessed and were therefore excluded.
- 3) The estimate for professional fees has increased by \$150,000 which is a direct reflection of the additional scope of works and programme of works.

RLB has assessed that the true cost of the above factors is circa \$650,000 - \$800,000, however; the estimates for other items in the project have reduced, offsetting the overall cost increase.

RCP is confident that the increase in cost can be reduced through implementing effective programme management, procurement, design management and value management strategies.

## **Procurement Strategies**

---

QLDC will need to consider the following options when deciding how the New Wanaka Pool is to be procured:

### **Option - A**

Progress the design of the New Wanaka Pool from 1 July 2015 and negotiate with the main contractor that has been appointed for the Wanaka Sports Facility –Dry Facility.

#### Completion Date

- 1 April 2017

#### Benefits

- Earliest date for completion.
- Potential cost savings of \$400,000 to \$500,000 through efficient programming.
- Proceeding with the same main contractor for the Wanaka Sports Facility and New Wanaka Pool eliminates potential:
  - Health and Safety Risks
  - Contractual Risks
  - Insurance Risks
  - Warranty Risks
  - Compliance Risks
  - Logistical Constraints

Compared to a scenario where two separate main contractors may be operating concurrently on the same site.

- Unlikely that costs will be incurred to upgrade the existing pool at Plantation Road.

#### Risks

- Potential for a Judicial Challenge from aggrieved bidders excluded from the tendering process.
- Potential for a lack of competitive tension.

#### Risk Mitigation Strategy

- A negotiated tender may be run on a P&G (Preliminary and General) and Margin basis with the sub-trades being let competitively. This would ensure a competitive tension is gained through the sub-trades. Competitive tension in negotiation of the main contract works could be assumed as P&G and Margin rates would reflect the rates submitted on the Wanaka Sports Facility which was competitively tendered.

### **Option - B**

Progress the design of the New Wanaka Pool from 1 July 2015 and competitively tender the main contract.

#### Completion Date

- 1 July 2017 - 1 September 2017

#### Benefits

- Probity - Open tender process.
- Potential cost savings of \$50,000 to \$200,000 depending on main contractor appointment.
- Unlikely that costs will be incurred to upgrade the existing pool at Plantation Road.

#### Risks

- Potential to run a competitive tender process and have a lack of interest from the market due to a perceived advantage to the incumbent Wanaka Sports Facility main contractor.
- Potential for the tender process to lead to the same main contractor that would be procured through Option – A.
- Reduction in cost saving benefits through reduced overlap with the Wanaka Sports Facility Works.

- Potential for the following significant risks:

- Health and Safety Risks
- Contractual Risks
- Insurance Risks
- Warranty Risks
- Compliance Risks
- Logistical Constraints

If two separate main contractors are operating concurrently on the same site.

- Increased administrative and consultant costs for administering two separate contracts simultaneously on the same site.

#### Risk Mitigation Strategy

- Enter into an EOI Process prior to issuing a competitive tender to gauge main contractor interest.
- Delay the start of the New Wanaka Pool works until the Wanaka Sports Facility Works are complete to mitigate the risks generated by two main contractors being on site simultaneously. This may also reduce the risk of a lack of interest in tendering from the market. It must be noted that delaying the start of works to mitigate risk will negate any cost benefits that may be achieved through efficient programming, and also mean a later completion date.

#### **Option - C**

Defer the design of the New Wanaka Pool until the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter of 2016 to complete construction in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter of 2018.

#### Completion Date

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2018

#### Benefits

- LTP funding would not need to be bought forward ahead of what the forecast LTP budget.

#### Risks

- The Plantation Road pool may need to be closed to undertake upgrade and maintenance works before the deferred New Wanaka Pool is completed and could leave Wanaka without public aquatic facilities for an indeterminate period of time.
- Likely costs will be incurred in maintaining and upgrading the existing Plantation Road pool.
- Potential construction cost escalation estimated in the order of \$600,000 to \$1,000,000. These figures are based on the BERL Economics Indices and RLB's Forecast as noted in the attached "WSF Pool - Inflationary Indices Summary (June 2015)" document provided by RLB.

#### Risk Mitigation Strategy

- Risk around the cost escalation and upgrades required to the existing Plantation Road pool may be mitigated by aligning and bringing forward the construction of the New Wanaka Pool with the dates that the Plantation Road pool works are required to be undertaken.

RCP and RLB have not commented on specific costs or programme implications on how the construction of the New Wanaka Pool will be effected by upgrades required at the Plantation Road pool as the costs and timeframes reported by council on this matter varies.

RLB has evaluated an expected cash flow for Option – A, Option – B and Option – C, against RCP's programme estimates to provide QLDC with expectant timeframes and costs for the New Wanaka Pool which is attached in the supporting documents.

#### **Summary of Procurement Strategies**

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Option – A: | Provides QLDC with the greatest cost and programme efficiencies with a minimal risk profile.   |
| Option – B: | Does not achieve the same cost or programme efficiencies as Option – A however the competitive tender process mitigates any probity risks. |

Option – C: There are significant risks around cost escalation, the cost of upgrades to the existing pool at Plantation Road and the potential for the Wanaka Community to lack access to a pool should QLDC have a preference to defer the construction of the pool to enable expenditure to align with what is currently allowed for in the LTP budget.

## Factors Outside CapEx Scope

---

RCP is aware that there are factors outside of the capital expenditure scope that must be considered by QLDC when evaluating how to proceed with procuring the New Wanaka Pool, such as Public Submissions, Funding, Operating Expenses and the above mentioned issues relating to the Plantation Road Pool. QLDC must consider these factors when evaluating how to proceed with procuring the New Wanaka Pool.

Regards,  
RCP



**James Bremner**  
**Project Manager**

<i>Copies to</i>	QLDC	<i>Attn</i>	Marie Attridge
	RLB	<i>Attn</i>	Tony Tudor
	RCP	<i>Attn</i>	Ant Beale
<i>Attached</i>	RCP	<i>.docx</i>	WSF Pool LTP Procurement Options_20150609 (Revised)
	RCP & RLB	<i>.xlsx</i>	WSF Pool - Procurement Options Programme Cashflow 9.06.15 (Revised)
	RLB	<i>.pdf</i>	WSF Pool Facility - RLB Memo (Rev B) 9.06.15 (Revised)
	RLB	<i>.pdf</i>	QLDC Wanaka Sports Facility (Pool) - RLB PD Cost Estimate 5.06.15
	RLB	<i>.pdf</i>	QLDC Wanaka Sports Facility (Pool) - Appendix A
	RLB	<i>.pdf</i>	WSF Pool - Inflationary Indices Summary (June 2015)
	RLB	<i>.pdf</i>	rlb-forecast-75-first-quarter-2015
	W&M	<i>.pdf</i>	7379_Formal_Issue001
	W&M	<i>.jpeg</i>	7379_WanakaPool_Cam03 (2)

# Memorandum

To:	<u>Ant Beale/James Bremner</u>	Company:	<u>RCP</u>
CC:	<u>Marc Bretherton</u>	Company:	<u>QLDC</u>
	<u>Chris Haines</u>		<u>RLB (internal)</u>
From:	<u>Tony Tudor</u>	Email:	<u>tony.tudor@nz.rlb.com</u>
Date:	<u>9th June 2015</u>	Our ref:	<u>Q8659</u>
Subject:	<u><b>Wanaka Sports Facility, Pool Facility Only – Procurement Cost Options (Revision B)</b></u>		

The following report has been drafted on the back of discussions with RCP and Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) around potential procurement strategies and possible timing of construction of the new pool facility at Three Parks, Wanaka. Pending timing of the works (governed by QLDC) and procurement strategy adopted, the capital cost impact to QLDC will differ accordingly. As such, this report outlines what this potential capital cost impact is likely to be to assist QLDC going forward.

We note that this report does not consider operational expenditure and funding costs. Therefore, this report needs to be considered and balanced with these other points so that QLDC is making an informed decision in totality.

All figures quoted within this report are GST exclusive.

## History from September 2014 to June 2015

Before we outline the various options to QLDC, we believe it is important to revisit QLDC's cost position at September 2014 at which point QLDC sought public consultation versus the current cost position at the beginning of June 2015.

Estimated capital expenditure (CAPEX) is summarised as follows:-

- September 2014    \$11,800,000
- June 2015            \$12,280,000

**Cost Increase                    \$480,000**

Both CAPEX estimates reflect a new build pool facility with an 8 lane (25m) lap pool, learn to swim pool and change facilities as well as additional car parking, both catering for an additional 90 (approximately) spaces.

The primary reason's for the cost increase from September 2014 to June 2015 has come about following a peer review process (pool specialist - Watershed) and feedback from the community. We believe RCP should expand on these changes further as RLB have not been across all points of discussion. Notwithstanding the above, the facts for this cost increase from September 2014 to June 2015 can be summarised as follows:-

- i) Learn to swim pool increased in size – additional 58m2 in area.
- ii) A new spa pool introduced into the pool facility. We understand this spa will be sized to accommodate between 10 to 15 people (final sizing to be confirmed).

- iii) Because of the larger 'learn to swim' pool and need to provide space to accommodate a new spa the building footprint has increased in size. In tandem with making the pool larger and introduction of a spa the plant space has increased in size. Finally there has been an increase in floor area to the storage space(s) and change facilities. The impact on floor area has meant an increase to the overall gross floor area of the building of 115m<sup>2</sup>.
- iv) Abortive/modification works to the dry facility to accommodate the pool. These costs were previously excluded in our September 2014 report and flagged accordingly. These costs are now included.

In addition to the above changes professional fee costs have also increased to that outlined in our September 2014 estimate by circa \$150,000. This cost increase is a direct reflection of the additional scope of works, proposed current programme and further definition of works and roles from the Design Team.

The value of all the above changes we have calculated to be in the region of \$650,000 to \$800,000, however, the overall capital expenditure impact to that of our September 2014 estimate is an increase of only \$480,000 as the project has made financial gains in other areas of the works mainly around infrastructure provision.

#### Timing/Procurement Strategy

As discussed with yourselves and QLDC there are a number of different options that could be adopted for the construction of the pool facility and depending on the timing of the works the CAPEX impact does vary.

The options discussed to date include:-

- Option A – progress the design of the pool (July 2015 onwards) and negotiate with the main contractor who has been appointed for the sports hall.
- Option B - progress the design of the pool (July 2015 onwards) and seek tenders by way of an 'open' tender process.
- Option C – design occurring in 2016 with construction starting in 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2017. Completion 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2018.

Note – none of the above options would be considered or adopted until an outcome is determined from QLDC's Long Term Plan meetings held in late June/early July 2015.

From purely a CAPEX perspective, we believe that there are potential financial gains to be made with adopting Option A over Option C and a greater financial gain to that of Option B. Because the Three Parks site is due to start construction for the new sports hall there is an opportunity for QLDC to overlap the construction phases of both the sports hall and the pool as efficiencies could be achieved by staging the works into design packages, 'letting' the works accordingly and commence construction on the likes of the sub-structure whilst design work continues on the finishes etc.

The CAPEX gains to QLDC with adopting Option A would primarily be attributable to the main contractor's (Cook Brothers) preliminary and general costs (P&G) i.e. management costs, the omission of potential abortive/modification work currently included within RLB's estimate, reduced professional fees and finally a reduction in main contractor margin to that currently declared in our current 50% Preliminary Design estimate as our estimate reflects seeking pricing from the market at a point in time in the future. These cost efficiencies based on RCP's programme (issued 4<sup>th</sup> June 2015) highlighting the extent of overlap and overall timeline reduction could achieve a saving in the order of \$400,000 to \$500,000 (approximately) to that currently stated in our 50% Preliminary Design estimate dated 5<sup>th</sup> June 2015.

Option B would also allow the opportunity to overlap the construction of the sports hall and the pool, however, we understand from talking to yourselves and RCP's programme (issued 4<sup>th</sup> June 2015) that the extent of overlap would be considerable less than Option A as the design would need to be complete, works tendered and evaluated/approved accordingly. The cost efficiencies for Option B could achieve a saving in the order of \$50,000 to \$200,000 (approximately) to that currently stated in our 50% Preliminary Design estimate dated 5<sup>th</sup> June 2015.

With Option C having a deferred construction start of 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2017 due consideration is necessary around CAPEX escalation. This additional CAPEX will need to be balanced and considered against any potential funding and operational cost gains by deferring the works.

We believe RCP should advise QLDC with the pro's and con's of each option in terms of programme and other non CAPEX considerations especially around Options A & B and how this would work operationally from a construction perspective.

Should you have any queries with the above, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully,

**RIDER LEVETT BUCKNALL OTAGO**



**Tony Tudor**

Associate Director/Otago Manager

BSc (Hons), MRICS, MNZIQS

[tony.tudor@nz.rlb.com](mailto:tony.tudor@nz.rlb.com)

**QLDC - WSF POOL FACILITY ONLY**  
**OPTIONS A, B & C PROCUREMENT STRATEGIES**

**Project Budget Cashflows**

				Financial Year 14-15			Financial Year 15-16											
Item	Option A	RLB Estimate @ 5.06.15	Comments	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15	Oct-15	Nov-15	Dec-15	Jan-16	Feb-16	Mar-16	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16
	<b>OPTION A</b>																	
	a) Capital Expenditure Only	\$ 12,280,000	As per RLB Report dated 5th June 2015.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,000	\$ 209,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 284,800	\$ 50,000	\$ 556,667	\$ 801,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667
	b) Cost Efficiency Saving	(\$ 450,000)	Note - Actual efficiency saving presented in RLB reports is by way of a cost range i.e. \$400k to \$500k. However, for purposes of cashflow only this cost saving is presented at mid point saving. This saving should not be treated as finite and is rough 'order of cost' saving only.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CASHFLOW TOTAL (EXCLUSIVE OF GST)		\$ 11,830,000		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,000	\$ 209,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 284,800	\$ 50,000	\$ 556,667	\$ 801,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667
Item	Option B	RLB Estimate @ 5.06.15	Comments	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15	Oct-15	Nov-15	Dec-15	Jan-16	Feb-16	Mar-16	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16
	<b>OPTION B</b>																	
	a) Capital Expenditure Only	\$ 12,280,000	As per RLB Report dated 5th June 2015.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,000	\$ 209,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 249,800	\$ 40,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 551,667	\$ 801,667	\$ 1,051,667
	b) Cost Efficiency Saving	(\$ 125,000)	Note - Actual efficiency saving presented in RLB reports is by way of a cost range i.e. \$50k to \$200k. However, for purposes of cashflow only this cost saving is presented at mid point saving. This saving should not be treated as finite and is rough 'order of cost' saving only.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CASHFLOW TOTAL (EXCLUSIVE OF GST)		\$ 12,155,000		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,000	\$ 209,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 234,800	\$ 249,800	\$ 40,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 551,667	\$ 801,667	\$ 1,051,667
Item	Option C	RLB Estimate @ 5.06.15	Comments	Apr-15	May-15	Jun-15	Jul-15	Aug-15	Sep-15	Oct-15	Nov-15	Dec-15	Jan-16	Feb-16	Mar-16	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16
	<b>OPTION C</b>																	
	a) Capital Expenditure Only	\$ 12,280,000	As per RLB Report dated 5th June 2015.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
	b) Cost Efficiency Saving	N/A		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CASHFLOW TOTAL (EXCLUSIVE OF GST)		\$ 12,280,000		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000



Financial Year 16-17												Financial Year 17-18												Financial Year 18-19				
Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17	Apr-17	May-17	Jun-17	Jul-17	Aug-17	Sep-17	Oct-17	Nov-17	Dec-17	Jan-18	Feb-18	Mar-18	Apr-18	Aug-18	Apr-19	Total				
\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 600,167	\$ 600,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 615,167	\$ 368,500												\$ 100,000			\$ 12,280,000				
(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)	(\$ 45,000)												\$ -			(\$ 450,000)				
\$ 455,167	\$ 455,167	\$ 555,167	\$ 555,167	\$ 455,167	\$ 455,167	\$ 455,167	\$ 455,167	\$ 570,167	\$ 323,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,830,000				
																						Check		\$ 11,830,000				
Financial Year 16-17												Financial Year 17-18												Financial Year 18-19				
Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17	Apr-17	May-17	Jun-17	Jul-17	Aug-17	Sep-17	Oct-17	Nov-17	Dec-17	Jan-18	Feb-18	Mar-18	Apr-18	Aug-18	Apr-19	Total				
\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 600,167	\$ 600,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 615,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 368,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000		\$ 12,280,000				
\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	(\$ 15,000)	(\$ 15,000)	(\$ 15,000)	(\$ 15,000)	(\$ 15,000)	(\$ 10,000)	(\$ 10,000)	(\$ 10,000)	(\$ 10,000)	(\$ 10,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		(\$ 125,000)				
\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 485,167	\$ 485,167	\$ 485,167	\$ 485,167	\$ 585,167	\$ 590,167	\$ 490,167	\$ 605,167	\$ 490,167	\$ 358,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 12,155,000				
																						Check		\$ 12,155,000				
Financial Year 16-17												Financial Year 17-18												Financial Year 18-19				
Jul-16	Aug-16	Sep-16	Oct-16	Nov-16	Dec-16	Jan-17	Feb-17	Mar-17	Apr-17	May-17	Jun-17	Jul-17	Aug-17	Sep-17	Oct-17	Nov-17	Dec-17	Jan-18	Feb-18	Mar-18	Apr-18	Aug-18	Apr-19	Total				
\$ 244,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 551,667	\$ 801,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 600,167	\$ 600,167	\$ 615,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 348,500	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 12,280,000				
\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -				
\$ 244,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 551,667	\$ 801,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 1,051,667	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 600,167	\$ 600,167	\$ 615,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 500,167	\$ 348,500	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 12,280,000				
																						Check		\$ 12,280,000				

- 1) **All figures noted within this document are GST exclusive.**
- 2) Timelines reflect programme durations noted on separate Excel worksheet attached to this Excel workbook
- 3) Cashflow timelines reflect month of actual payment by QLDC, not month of value claimed by Consultant/Contractor.
- 4) All exclusions, assumptions, clarifications and risks noted in RLB Report, Memo and Estimate dated 5th June 2015 apply to the above.
- 5) The above excludes any escalation costs as noted in RLB reports.

