



# AGENDA

## ROADS INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

23<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2021

9:00am

**Bill Hemsley Park Community Centre (Verandah Area)  
&  
Council Chambers  
Nabawa**

**Committee Members will gather at the Bill Hemsley Park Community Centre (Verandah Area) at 9:00am at which time the site inspection will commence.**

**The Meeting will be formally opened at the Nabawa Chambers after, or any time during, site inspections.**

**The Meeting can then be adjourned and reconvened as required as sites inspections are undertaken or determined as necessary on the day.**

### Committee Purpose & Delegations

Undertake an annual review the following:

- Road Works Program
- Road Hierarchy
- Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permit Roads
- Any other works infrastructure item referred to the Committee by Council
- Review the plant replacement program

Delegation – Nil

**The Road Infrastructure Committee is comprised of:**

**All Councillors**

<b>Chief Executive Officer</b>	<b>(Observer)</b>
<b>Deputy CEO</b>	<b>(Observer)</b>
<b>Manager Works &amp; Services</b>	<b>(Observer)</b>
<b>Works Leading Hand</b>	<b>(Observer)</b>

# DISCLAIMER



SHIRE OF

## Chapman Valley

*love the rural life!*

No responsibility whatsoever is implied or accepted by the Shire of Chapman Valley for any act, omission or statement or intimation occurring during Council Meeting. The Shire of Chapman Valley disclaims any liability for any loss whatsoever and howsoever caused arising out of reliance by any person or legal entity on any such act, omission or statement or intimation occurring during Council or Committee Meetings.

Any person or legal entity who acts or fails to act in reliance upon any statement, act or omission made in a Council Meeting does so at that person's or legal entity's own risk.

The Shire of Chapman Valley warns that anyone who has any application or request with the Shire of Chapman Valley must obtain and should rely on WRITTEN CONFIRMATION of the outcome of the application or request of the decision made by the Shire of Chapman Valley.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Battilana'.

**Maurice Battilana**  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**9.00AM – 23<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2021**  
**BILL HEMSLEY PARK COMMUNITY CENTRE (VERANDAH AREA) &**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS, NABAWA**

---

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

- 1.0 Presiding Member (President)**
- 2.0 Declaration of Opening / Announcements of Visitors**
- 3.0 Announcements from the Presiding Member (President)**
- 4.0 Record of Attendance**
  - 4.1 Present
  - 4.2 Apologies
- 5.0 Disclosure of Interest**

Members should fill in Disclosure of Interest forms for items in which they have a financial, proximity or impartiality interest and forward these to the Presiding Member before the meeting commences.

Section 5.60A:

*“a person has a **financial interest** in a matter if it is reasonable to expect that the matter will, if dealt with by the local government, or an employee or committee of the local government or member of the council of the local government, in a particular way, result in a financial gain, loss, benefit or detriment for the person.”*

Section 5.60B:

*“a person has a **proximity interest** in a matter if the matter concerns –  
(a) a proposed change to a planning scheme affecting land that adjoins the person’s land; or  
(b) a proposed change to the zoning or use of land that adjoins the person’s land; or  
(c) a proposed development (as defined in section 5.63(5)) of land that adjoins the person’s land.”*

Regulation 34C (Impartiality):

*“**interest** means an interest that could, or could reasonably be perceived to, adversely affect the **impartiality** of the person having the interest and includes an interest arising from kinship, friendship or membership of an association.”*

- 6.0 Petitions / Deputations / Presentations**
- 7.0 Confirmation of Minutes from previous meetings**

Road Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on the 26<sup>th</sup> February 2020

Recommend that the Minutes of the Road Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on the 26th February 2020 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings. **(Supplied under separate cover)**

- 8.0 Items to be dealt with En Bloc**

## **9.0 Agenda Items**

- 9.1 Review of Shire Road Hierarchy
- 9.2 Proposed 2021/2022 Road Works Program & Review of Ten-Year Road Works Program
- 9.3 Review Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permit Roads
- 9.4 Review Plant Replacement Program

<b>DISCUSSION ITEM:</b>	<b>9.1</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>REVIEW OF SHIRE ROAD HIERARCHY</b>
<b>PROPONENT:</b>	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER &amp; MANAGER WORKS &amp; SERVICES</b>
<b>SITE:</b>	<b>WHOLE SHIRE</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>1002</b>
<b>PREVIOUS REFERENCE:</b>	<b>MINUTE REFERENCE 03/20-3</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2021</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>MAURICE BATTILANA, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</b>

#### SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Ref	Title	Attached to Report	Under Separate Cover
9.1(a)	Road Hierarchy Procedure (IMP-025)		✓

#### BACKGROUND

The purpose of this Item is to present the Committee the current endorsed *Road Hierarchy Management Procedure (IMP-025)* for discussion and review.

Council dealt with the Road Hierarchy Procedure (IMP-025) in isolation with the following being resolved the following at the March 2020 OCM:

*“Minute Reference RIC 02/20-2  
The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the Road Hierarchy Procedure (IMP-025) as presented without change.”*

Since then the Mid West Regional Road Group has endorsed the following Roads as a Significant Route, therefore this route has been included as part of the Category A (Main Arterial Roads) under the *Road Hierarchy Procedure (IMP-025)*:

- Durawah Road;
- Station Road (between Durawah & Station Valentine Rd Junctions); and
- Station Valentine Road.

#### COMMENT

The existing *Road Hierarchy Procedure (IMP-025)* has all the roads within the Shire of Chapman Valley the local government is responsible for place into the following categories:

- Main Arterial Roads (Significant Roads and approved by the RRG only);
- Main Feeder Roads;
- Minor Feeder Roads;
- Major Access Roads; and
- Minor Access Roads

A copy of the *Road Hierarchy Procedure (IMP-025)* is provided as **Attachment 9.1(a)** under separate cover.

In addition to the aforementioned Procedure Council has also adopted the following Management Procedure (IMP-017) regarding the *Road Funding Allocation Process*:

<b>MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE No.</b>	<b>IMP-017</b>
<b>MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE</b>	<b>ROAD WORK FUNDING ALLOCATION PROCESS</b>
<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICER</b>	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</b>
<b>PREVIOUS POLICY/PROCEDURE No.</b>	<b>15.220</b>

## RELEVANT DELEGATIONS

### OBJECTIVES:

To set guidelines and procedures for categorising road hierarchy network and funding allocation priorities

### MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE STATEMENT/S:

1. Council review existing Road Hierarchy List based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
2. Council review existing Regional Road Group priorities based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
3. Council reviews other grant programs (e.g. Black Spot, R2R) based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
4. Taking into account the delegations under Infrastructure Policy IMP-022, Council review existing Heavy Haulage Roads.
5. Council review existing Program of Road Works based Councillor(s) submissions and upon staff recommendation(s).
6. Councillors retain the right to present, and justify, changes to any of the above either via Chief Executive Officer's report or directly to the meeting.
7. No changes to be made to any of the above unless fully endorsed by Council.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Road Works remains the largest expenditure component of the Shires operations, which makes it important to ensure the limited resources made available by grants and those allocated by Council to this function are maximised.

#### Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP):

The intention is the endorsed *Road Hierarchy* will complement the *Road Works Programs*, which will complement the current Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) and Asset Management Plan (AMP). The LTFP is updated annually to reflect the endorsed Road Works Program.

### STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

It is imperative Council carefully considers where resources are allocated in future road works programs to ensure the higher priority roads are catered for. As previously mentioned, the Shire's Road Hierarchy identifies the priority roads into the following categories:

- A. Main Arterial Roads (Significant Roads and approved by the RRG only);
- B. Main Feeder Roads;
- C. Minor Feeder Roads;
- D. Major Access Roads; and
- E. Minor Access Roads

It is also important the process stipulated in *Corporate Management Procedure IMP-017* to amend the Road Hierarchy is adhered to. This will ensure the integrity of the *Road Hierarchy* list and therefore the integrity of how Council allocates its resources to road works within the Shire.

#### Strategic Community Plan/Corporate Business Plan:

1.3	Maintain and enhance safety and security for the community	Review safe roads and infrastructure	Continue annual review of Road Hierarchy, Road Works Program, Plant Replacement Program
-----	--	--------------------------------------	---

### CONSULTATION

The Chief Executive Officer consulted with the Manager Works & Services and Works Leading Hand when reviewing the Road Hierarchy presented to Council.

**RISK ASSESSMENT**

There is a risk the integrity of the Road Hierarchy may be compromised if the conditions listed in *Management Procedure IMP-017* to amend the Road Hierarchy are not adhered to. However, this risk is considered **insignificant**:

Measures of Consequence							
Rating (Level)	Health	Financial Impact	Service Interruption	Compliance	Reputational	Property	Environment
Insignificant (1)	Negligible injuries	Less than \$1,000	No material service interruption	No noticeable regulatory or statutory impact	Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or 'no news' item	Inconsequential or no damage.	Contained, reversible impact managed by on site response

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 1)**

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the *Road Hierarchy Procedure (IMP-025)* as presented at **Attachment 9.1(a)** without change.

- OR -

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 2)**

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the *Road Hierarchy Procedure (IMP-025)* as presented at **Attachment 9.1(a)** with the following Changes:

- 1.
- 2.

<b>DISCUSSION ITEM:</b>	9.2
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	PROPOSED 2021/2022 ROAD WORKS PROGRAM & REVIEW OF TEN YEAR ROAD WORKS PROGRAM
<b>PROPONENT:</b>	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER and MANAGER WORKS & SERVICES
<b>SITE:</b>	WHOLE SHIRE
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	1002
<b>PREVIOUS REFERENCE:</b>	MINUTE REFERENCE 03/20-3
<b>DATE:</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2021
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	MAURICE BATTILANA, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

#### SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Ref	Title	Attached to Report	Under Separate Cover
9.2(a)	Proposed 10 Year Road Works Program		✓
9.2(b)	Current 10 Year Road Works Program		✓

#### BACKGROUND

The purpose of this Item is to present Councillors with a proposed 2021/2022 & Ten-Year Road Works Programs for consideration.

Determination from the Road Infrastructure Committee will form a recommendation to Council for consideration and endorsement for allocation of funding and resources to the forthcoming Draft Budget.

#### COMMENT

Council resolved the following at the March 2020 OCM:

*Council receive the Road Infrastructure Committee Minutes and endorse the recommendations within i.e.*

*"Minute Reference RIC 02/20-5*

*The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorse the 10 Year Road Works Program 2020/21 to 2029/2030 as presented with the following changes and this Program be used as a basis for resource allocation into the Draft 2020/2021 Budget:*

1. *McCagh Rd – 250m Seal Extension.*
2. *Wandin & Wandana Rd (Own Resource Reseals) – Bring forward to Years 1,2 & 3.*
3. *BHPCC Overflow Carpark as a separate budget line item (not part of RW Program)"*

The following item(s) have been requested for discussions:

Requested by	Item	Staff Comments	Estimated Cost
CV Agric Society (in 2020)	McCagh Rd Extend seal 250m	The request from the CVAS is to extend the existing seal approx.. 250m to reduce dust over the Showgrounds. <i>(Note: Request resubmitted from previous year.)</i>	<b>\$35,00 (To be confirmed)</b> Based on average Unit Rate per KM only.
Cr Humphrey	Parkfalls Estate Roads/Shoulder Standard	As requested at the December 2020 OCM staff have obtained quotes to investigation standard of gravel roadworks within the Estate.	<b>Quotes range from approx.. \$10,000 to \$30,000 for test works.</b>



Cr Humphrey	Emails	<p><b>From:</b> Maurice Battilana  <b>Sent:</b> Friday, 22 January 2021 8:34 AM  <b>To:</b> Cr Peter Humphrey  <a href="mailto:crhumphrey@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">crhumphrey@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>; Cr Anthony Farrell  <a href="mailto:crfarrell@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">crfarrell@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>; Cr Beverley Davidson  <a href="mailto:crdavidson@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">crdavidson@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>; Cr Darrell Forth  <a href="mailto:crforth@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com">crforth@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com</a>; Cr  Kirrilee Warr <a href="mailto:crwarr@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">crwarr@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>; Cr Nicole  Batten <a href="mailto:crbatten@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com">crbatten@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com</a>;  Cr Trevor Royce <a href="mailto:croyce@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">croyce@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>; Darrell  Forth (<a href="mailto:dforth61@gmail.com">dforth61@gmail.com</a>) <a href="mailto:dforth61@gmail.com">dforth61@gmail.com</a>; Trevor  Royce (Private) <a href="mailto:tvroyce@bigpond.com">tvroyce@bigpond.com</a>  <b>Cc:</b> Esky Kelly <a href="mailto:works@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">works@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>; Simon  Lancaster <a href="mailto:dceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">dceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>; Anthony  Abbott <a href="mailto:building@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">building@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>; Marty Elks  <a href="mailto:lhworks@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au">lhworks@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au</a>  <b>Subject:</b> RE: Road Infrastructure &amp; Building Committee  Meetings</p> <p>Hi Peter</p> <p>Thanks for the response. I couple of issues you raised I have responded to below:</p> <p><b><u>Committee Meeting Venue</u></b>  The Road Infrastructure meetings have historically been held at the Nabawa offices as this is the administrative centre of the Shire and I have had no indication this needed to be changed. However; if there is a consensus from Councillors to hold the meeting at the BHPCC then I have no issues with this.</p> <p><b>Councillors – Can you please indicate (by a REPLY ALL email) if your preference to hold the meeting is Nabawa Offices or BHPCC.</b></p> <p><b><u>Roadworks Program</u></b>  The current Ten Year Roadworks Program is reviewed at part of the Road Infrastructure Committee’s annual role, which is again presented to Council for review and consideration of the Committee’s recommendation. It is again reviewed as part of the Budget Workshops and then at the time Council endorses the Annual Budgets. Therefore there is ample opportunity for Elected members and Staff to review the Program and set the direction for the forthcoming budget and the next ten years.</p> <p>In addition to this review process the Committee &amp; Council also reviews the Road Hierarchy list annually, which is considered at the time the Road Program is reviewed and set.</p> <p>Many years ago Council adopted a Corporate Management Procedure (IMP-017 see below) which set the review process to remove the situation of the “squeaky wheel approach” to road works projects. Again this Procedure is reviewed annually as part of the full review of all Policies/Procedures and included as part of the Road Infrastructure Committee Agenda.</p> <p>I will list you email as part of the Committee Agenda and you can present this to the Committee on the day.</p>	Not Costed
-------------	--------	---	------------

MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE No.	IMP-017
MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE	ROAD WORK FUNDING ALLOCATION PROCESS
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
PREVIOUS POLICY/PROCEDURE No.	15.220
RELEVANT DELEGATIONS	

**OBJECTIVES:**

To set guidelines and procedures for categorising road hierarchy network and funding allocation priorities

**MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE STATEMENT/S:**

1. Council review existing Road Hierarchy List based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
2. Council review existing Regional Road Group priorities based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
3. Council reviews other grant programs (e.g. Black Spot, R2R) based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
4. Taking into account the delegations under Infrastructure Policy IMP-022, Council review existing Heavy Haulage Roads.
5. Council review existing Program of Road Works based Councillor(s) submissions and upon staff recommendation(s).
6. Councillors retain the right to present, and justify, changes to any of the above either via Chief Executive Officer's report or directly to the meeting.
7. No changes to be made to any of the above unless fully endorsed by Council.

Kindest regards

**Maurice Battilana | CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**



Address 3270 Chapman Valley Road | Nabawa | WA | 6532  
Mailing Address PO Box 1 | Chapman Valley Road | Nabawa | WA | 6532  
[www.chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](http://www.chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au) | email  
[ceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:ceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)  
phone (08) 9920 5011 | fax (08) 9920 5155 | mobile 0429 205011

**From:** Cr Peter Humphrey  
<[crhumphrey@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crhumphrey@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 21 January 2021 2:37 PM  
**To:** Maurice Battilana <[ceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:ceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>; Cr Anthony Farrell <[crrfarrell@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crrfarrell@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>; Cr Beverley Davidson <[crrdavidson@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crrdavidson@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>; Cr Darrell Forth <[crrforth@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com](mailto:crrforth@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com)>; Cr Kirrilee Warr <[crrwarr@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crrwarr@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>; Cr Nicole Batten <[crrbatten@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com](mailto:crrbatten@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com)>; Cr Trevor Royce <[crrroyce@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crrroyce@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>; Darrell Forth ([dforth61@gmail.com](mailto:dforth61@gmail.com)) <[dforth61@gmail.com](mailto:dforth61@gmail.com)>; Trevor Royce (Private) <[crrroyce@bigpond.com](mailto:crrroyce@bigpond.com)>  
**Cc:** Esky Kelly <[crrworks@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crrworks@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>; Simon Lancaster <[crrceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crrceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>; Anthony Abbott <[crrbuilding@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crrbuilding@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>; Marty Elks <[crrlhworks@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au](mailto:crrlhworks@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au)>  
**Subject:** RE: Road Infrastructure & Building Committee Meetings

Hi Maurice

At the moment any of the dates mentioned will suit so I will go with the general consensus.

		<p>In relation to the agenda I believe that with the changing dynamics within the shire we should consider completely reviewing our Road Infrastructure / maintenance program and determine what best serves the needs of the ratepayers. This would mean changing the focus from the current plan and alter the priorities to what best suits our ever evolving population.</p> <p>With this thought in mind, and I'm sure councilors can all identify areas of concern of their own, but for me I would like to put forward that we visit several areas of Eliza Shaw Drive, the intersection of Eliza Shaw Drive and Redcliffe Concourse, Hester Avenue, Brown Lane and sections of the horse trails that run within the Parkfalls Estate.</p> <p>In relation to the Building Committee it was over twelve months ago when some councilors mentioned the need to consider future uses for the BHP meeting room since the PRA dissolved. I don't believe that it has been mentioned since so could it please be placed on the agenda.</p> <p>I noted that both of these meetings have been scheduled for council chambers but I am of the belief that most councilors and shire staff might be spending considerable time in Geraldton at this time of year so if no other roads of concern are identified maybe the location of the meeting/s could be changed to BHP.</p> <p>Thankyou</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Peter</p>	
Cr Royce	Coronation Beach Rd Review Reseal Priority List	Staff reviewed priority list and recommend an adjustment accordingly	\$280,800 (To Be Confirmed). Based on the average unit rate of \$5/square meter to reseal a road.
Cr Farrell	Cannon Whelara Rd – Realign S-Bends	The opportunity exist with the current landowner verbally agreeing to cede the land to realign an S-Bend on the Cannon Whelara Rd. This is not listed as a project in the Shire's current Ten-Year RW Program yet should be considered now the opportunity exists.	Estimate Costs to realign the S-Bend has not been undertaken as yet. Estimates will be undertaken if this project is endorsed for future Budget consideration
Cr Warr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Murphy Yetna</li> <li>• Nanson Howatharra</li> <li>• Nolba</li> <li>• Nolba Stock Route</li> </ul>	<p><u>Email Dated 02/02/21</u></p> <p>As a heads up some other roads I have been contacted about from rate payers include, Murphy Yetna, Nanson Howatharra, Nolba, Nolba Stock Route, and Urch. It may be prudent to visit these roads as well before we commence deliberation.</p>	Inspections requested

	• Urch		

### Proposed 2021/2022 Road Works Program

It is hoped all road projects scheduled for 2020/2021 should be completed; however, there is invariably slippages in the program of works estimated timeline, the recommended 2021/2022 Roadworks Program will always attempt to adhere to Council priorities i.e.

- *Priority 1 – Grant funded projects*
- *Priority 2 – Own resource projects (carried over & new)*
- *Priority 3 – Maintenance works*

It must be understood in reality road work maintenance issues at times will take precedence over other road works projects (e.g. own resource projects).

The Regional Road Group (RRG) projects have been approved by the Mid-West Regional Road Group and formal notification has been received from Main Roads WA advising of the projects the Shire will be funded for in 2021/2022. Therefore, these particular projects cannot be adjusted.

Mid West Regional Road Group (MWRRG) grant applications are lodged with Main Roads WA (MRWA) by the 31<sup>st</sup> August each year. The Shire of Chapman Valley submission in accordance with Council's approved Ten Year Road Works Program with the approved projects, estimated costs and score for 2021/2022 being as follows:

Road	Works Description	Score	Total Project Cost Estimate	MWRRG Grant	Shire Minimum Contrib
Valentine	3.00km x 7.2m seal continuation	102.40	\$449,000	\$299,667	\$149,333
Dartmoor	4.00km x 7.2m seal continuation	98.72	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$150,000
East Nabawa (West)	3.00km x 7.2m seal continuation	95.80	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$150,000
East Nabawa (East)	2.65km x 7.2m seal continuation & drainage	90.94	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$150,000
Northampton Nabawa	3.00km Drainage, Shoulder Upgrades & reseal	90.89	\$450,000	\$300,000	\$150,000
<b>Estimated Totals</b>			<b>\$2,249,000</b>	<b>\$1,499,667</b>	<b>\$749,333</b>

The MWRRG Policies and Procedures include the following restrictions:

- \$300,000 - Maximum allowable grant fund per individual project;
- 20% of Total Pool - Maximum total grant funds for an individual LGA in one year.

Based on the 2021/2022 total pool amount of \$7,507,465 the 20% maximum per LGA in 20/21 was \$1,501,493. Therefore the Shire of Chapman Valleys approved projects for 2021/2022 come within this threshold limitation (i.e. approved grant of \$1,499,667).

Below is a comparison of RRG grants received over past years:

14/15	\$573,333
15/16	\$371,000
16/17	\$1,083,334
17/18	\$1,162,000
18/19	\$1,170,666
19/20	\$1,140,333
20/21	\$1,200,000
21/22	\$1,499,667

It needs to be understood the Shire’s ability to attract similar MWRRG Grant Funds in future years is expected to diminish due to the recommendations to amend the grant fund allocation guidelines to provide more opportunity to those LGAs currently not being able to receive grants other than the minimum (i.e. \$140,000).

Roads to Recovery Grant (R2R) Funding received over the past five years is as follows:

16-17	17-18	18-19	19/20	20/21	Total Past Five Years	Average Past Five Years
\$734,746	\$240,000	\$235,444	\$328,620	\$328,620	\$1,867,430	\$373,486

The R2R Funding Program will continue for a further four years after 20/21 (i.e. the current Program ends in 2023/2024) at the anticipated current rate of \$328,620 per financial year.

The *Proposed 10 Year Road Works Program (2021/2022 to 2030/2031)* reflects the anticipated MWRRG & R2R grant funding. However, it must be understood this funding could vary as MWRRG grant funds are annually contestable and R2R grant funds are not guaranteed beyond 2023/2024.

Ten (10) Year Road Works Program

Attached is the **Current 10 Year Road Works Program (2020/2021 to 2029/2030)** (**Attachment 9.2(b)**) with the **Proposed 10 Year Road Works Program** adding the year 2030/2031 (**Attachment 9.2(a)**).

The CEO, Manager Works & Service (Esky Kelly) and the Works Leading Hand (Marty Elks) have reviewed the Program.

The *Proposed 10 Year Road Works Program* continues to reflect the following:

1. The opportunity to attract MWRRG grant funds for recognised Significant Roads within the Shire of Chapman Valley may diminish over the period of the ten-year program.
2. The opportunity to attract MWRRG grant funds for recognised Significant Roads within the Shire of Chapman Valley may gradually revert to reseal project, which are basically 100% external costs (materials & contract) and will not assist with supporting the Shire own internal costs (i.e. labour, plant, etc.).
3. As the MWRRG grant funds projects drop off, less external funds will be available and more internal own resource road works projects will be undertaken (e.g. Gravel Sheeting on roads not recognised as MWRRG Significant Roads).
4. The previously endorsed list of gravel sheeting roads from the Shire’s own resources has not been altered in order of priority from the current program.
5. The previously endorsed list of reseal program from grants and the Shire’s own resources has been altered to reflect the reseals of Wandana and Wandin Roads as part of the LRCIP Grant funding in 2020/2021, otherwise the balance of the program remains in the order of priority from the current program.
6. There has been an effort to spread the effect of less MWRRG grants across the whole 10-year period, rather than the alternative of a sudden loss of grant funds from this source.
7. The issue of external funds (e.g. grants, contributions) covering the contract and materials costs for the annual road works program also needed to be address. An average contract & materials component has been calculated using historical data for the type of works; however, this can fluctuate when a more detailed cost analysis is undertaken for each specific project.

Therefore, based on the historical data, the *Proposed 10 Year Road Works Program* has been continued to calculate the differential between Contracts & Materials – v – Grant/Contributions received. Again, the proposed program has attempted to ease the effect of grants being a source to fully cover contracts & materials and to supplement the Shire internal resource costs (labour, plant, etc.).

8. As in the previous program the current & proposed ten-year programs is the annual amount of \$275,000 listed as “Additional Employee Costs & Contract/Materials Contingency”. This pool of funds is made up of the following components:

- i. \$75,000 – Casuals and Guaranteed & Additional overtime paid to road works crew as required; and
- ii. \$200,000 – External contingency used to hire external contractors and purchase materials as required.

The proposed ten-year program continues to quarantine the \$75,000 for casuals and guaranteed & additional overtime components every year, yet uses the \$200,000 contracts/materials contingency as a balancing aid across the program. Therefore, it will be noted how this figure continues to fluctuate across the ten-year period.

- 9. The concept of placing funds into the Roadworks Reserve Fund to assist with funding the proposed program of works in years the later years of the Program has been retained.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The following Management Procedures are relevant to this item:

<i>MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE No.</i>	<i>IMP-020</i>
<i>MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE</i>	<i>MIDWEST REGIONAL ROAD GROUP (MWRRG) – SIGNIFICANT ROAD POLICY</i>
<i>RESPONSIBLE OFFICER</i>	<i>CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</i>
<i>PREVIOUS POLICY/PROCEDURE No.</i>	<i>15.40; IP-001</i>
<i>LEGISLATION</i>	<i>STATE ROAD COUNCIL / REGIONAL ROAD GROUPS</i>
<i>RELEVANT DELEGATIONS</i>	

**OBJECTIVES:**

To list roads under the control of the Shire of Chapman Valley as those recognised by the Mid-West Regional Road Group as Significant Roads.

**MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE STATEMENT:**

Roads under the control of the Shire of Chapman Valley recognised as being significant roads by the Mid-West Regional Road Group are: -

<b>Rd No.</b>	<b>Road Name</b>
19	Balla Whelarra
130	Chapman Valley
34	Coronation Beach
8	Dartmoor
21	Dartmoor Lake Nerramyne
12	East Bowes
1; 15 & 14	~ Durawah; ~ Station (between Durawah & Station Valentine Rd Junctions), ~ Station Valentine
150	East Chapman
16	East Nabawa
10	Nanson Howatharra
7	Narra Tarra
131	Northampton – Nabawa
132	Yuna – Tenindewa
13	Valentine

**ADDITIONAL EXPLANATORY NOTES:**

The above list of Significant Roads are the only roads eligible for funding through the Mid-West Regional Road Group Program.

In addition to the aforementioned Management Procedure Council has also adopted the following Management Procedure (IMP-017) in regard to the Road Funding Allocation Process:

MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE No.	IMP-017
MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE	ROAD WORK FUNDING ALLOCATION PROCESS
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
PREVIOUS POLICY/PROCEDURE No.	15.220
RELEVANT DELEGATIONS	

**OBJECTIVES:**

To set guidelines and procedures for categorising road hierarchy network and funding allocation priorities

**MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE STATEMENT/S:**

1. Council review existing Road Hierarchy List based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
2. Council review existing Regional Road Group priorities based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
3. Council reviews other grant programs (e.g. Black Spot, R2R) based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
4. Taking into account the delegations under Infrastructure Policy IMP-022, Council review existing Heavy Haulage Roads.
5. Council review existing Program of Road Works based Councillor(s) submissions and upon staff recommendation(s).
6. Councillors retain the right to present, and justify, changes to any of the above either via Chief Executive Officer’s report or directly to the meeting.
7. No changes to be made to any of the above unless fully endorsed by Council.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Road Works is the largest expenditure component of the Shires operations, which makes it important to ensure the limited resources made available by grants and those allocated by Council to this function are maximised.

**Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP):**

The Proposed Road Works Program has been structured in a way to maintain the Shire’s Own Resources contribution towards the overall program irrespective of the grants received. This will complement the estimated expenditure allocation in the current LTFP.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

It is imperative Council carefully considers where resources are allocated in future road works programs to ensure the higher priority roads are catered for. The Shires Road Hierarchy identifies the priority roads into the following categories:

- A. Main Arterial Roads (Significant Roads approved by the MWRRG only);
- B. Main Feeder Roads;
- C. Minor Feeder Roads;
- D. Major Access Roads; and
- E. Minor Access Roads

The Road Hierarchy list will be reviewed as part of the Road Infrastructure Committees purpose and is listed for discussion at Agenda Item 9.1.

**Strategic Community Plan/Corporate Business Plan:**

1.3	Maintain and enhance safety and security for the community	Review safe roads and infrastructure	Continue annual review of Road Hierarchy, Road Works Program, Plant Replacement Program
-----	--	--------------------------------------	---

## CONSULTATION

The Chief Executive Officer conferred with the Consultant Engineer, Manager Works & Services and Works Leading Hand when developing the *Proposed Ten-Year Road Works Programs* presented to Council.

## RISK ASSESSMENT

There is a risk Council may not be able to successfully allocate enough of its own resources to appease the requirements of the Roads to Recovery (R2R) legislation due to the high level of other grant funds obtained. This will be closely monitored over the life of the R2R program.

I consider the risk associated with the Road Works Program as being **Moderate**, bearing in mind the risk is project specific, not in total across all the Road Works Program i.e.

Measures of Consequence							
Rating (Level)	Health	Financial Impact	Service Interruption	Compliance	Reputational	Property	Environment
<b>Moderate (3)</b>	Medical type injuries	\$10,001 - \$50,000	Medium term temporary interruption – backlog cleared by additional resources < 1 week	Short term non-compliance but with significant regulatory requirements imposed	Substantiated, public embarrassment, moderate impact, moderate news profile	Localised damage requiring external resources to rectify	Contained, reversible impact managed by external agencies

## VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 1)

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorse the *10 Year Road Works Program 2021/22 to 2030/2031* as presented at **Attachment 9.2(a)** without change and this Program be used as a basis for resource allocation into the Draft 2021/2022 Budget.

- OR -

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 2)

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorse the *10 Year Road Works Program 2021/22 to 2030/2031* as presented at **Attachment 9.2(a)** with the following changes and this Program be used as a basis for resource allocation into the Draft 2021/2022 Budget:

1

2



<b>DISCUSSION ITEM:</b>	<b>9.3</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>REVIEW HEAVY HAULAGE VEHICLE PERMIT ROADS</b>
<b>PROPONENT:</b>	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER &amp; MANAGE WORKS &amp; SERVICES</b>
<b>SITE:</b>	<b>WHOLE SHIRE</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>1002</b>
<b>PREVIOUS REFERENCE:</b>	<b>MINUTE REFERENCE: 03/20-3</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2021</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>MAURICE BATTILANA, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</b>

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:**

Ref	Title	Attached to Report	Under Separate Cover
	NIL		

**BACKGROUND**

The purpose of this Item is to present the Committee the current endorsed *Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permit (Policy IP-003)* for discussion and review.

Council resolved the following at the March 2020 OCM:

*"Minute Reference RIC 02/20-6*

*The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the Management Procedure (IMP-025) – Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permits as presented without change."*

**COMMENT**

Below is a copy of the current HVS RAV configurations:

# Prime Mover, Trailer Combinations

2016

Heavy Vehicle Services

Category	VEHICLE DESCRIPTION AND CONFIGURATION CHART (RAV) – PRIME MOVER, TRAILER COMBINATIONS EXAMPLES	Axle Spacing Table	Length (m)	Mass (T) <small>multi-axle</small>	RAV Network
1	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A PIG TRAILER 	(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A	≤20	50 42.5 50 47.5	1
2	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING AN OVERHEIGHT SEMI TRAILER 	(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A	≤20	47.5 67.5 87.5 42.5	2
3	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER 	(A) A	≤27.5	84	3
4	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 4 AXLE DOG TRAILER 	(A) A	≤27.5	87.5	4
5	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER AND CONVERTER DOLLY 	(A) B (B) B (C) A (D) A	>27.5, ≤36.5	84 84+d 87.5+d 84	5
6	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 6 AXLE DOG TRAILER 	(A) A (B) A (C) A	>27.5, ≤36.5	87.5 87.5 87.5+d	6
7	(A) PRIME MOVER, TOWING SEMI TRAILER AND B DOUBLE 	(A) A (B) A	>27.5, ≤36.5	107.5 107.5	7
8	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 2 X DOG TRAILERS 	(A) B (B) B (C) A (D) A	>36.5, ≤53.5	120.5 84+d 107.5 107.5	8
9	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 2 X DOG TRAILERS 	(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A (E) A (F) A	>36.5, ≤53.5	127.5 127.5 127.5 147.5 147.5 87.5+d	9
10	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 2 X DOG TRAILERS 	(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A (E) A (F) A	>36.5, ≤53.5	127.5 127.5 127.5 147.5 147.5 87.5+d	10

1. Operators using a category of RAV outlined in this document must operate that RAV in accordance with the OPERATING CONDITIONS and only on the network specified.

2. These diagrams are a visual indication of the vehicle only.

3. Operators must refer to the OPERATING CONDITIONS for the full vehicle description.

4. The height of the vehicle can exceed 4.3 m but MUST NOT exceed 4.6 m when it is:  
(i) built to carry livestock or; (ii) carrying a crane to carry livestock or; (iii) carrying vehicles on more than one deck or;  
(iv) carrying a multi-modal container or; (v) carrying a large indivisible item or; (vi) when operating with an appropriately licensed over height surface sole or perforation trailer.

5. Maximum height of Pig Trailer must not exceed 3.5m.

**Heavy Vehicle Services**  
Tel: 139 HVO (486)  
Email: hvs@mainroads.wa.gov.au  
Website: www.mainroads.wa.gov.au

# Truck, Trailer Combinations

2016

## Heavy Vehicle Services

VEHICLE DESCRIPTION AND CONFIGURATION CHART (RAV) – TRUCK, TRAILER COMBINATIONS EXAMPLES				Axis Spacing Table	Length (m)	MSGS (1) Height (m)	RAV Network	
Category 1	(A) TRUCK LIVESTOCK OR VEHICLE CARRIER	(B) TRUCK TOWING A PIG TRAILER	(C) TRUCK TOWING A DOG TRAILER	(D) TRUCK TOWING A CAR CARRIER TRAILER	(A) A (B) B (C) B (D) A	<12.5 ≤20 ≤20 ≤20	27.5 45.5 50 42.5	Network 1
Category 2	(A) TRUCK TOWING A 6 AXLE DOG TRAILER	(B) TRUCK TOWING A CAR CARRIER TRAILER	(C) TRUCK TOWING A 2,3,4 OR 5 AXLE DOG TRAILER		(A) A (B) A (C) B	≤25 ≤25 ≤25	67.5 42.5 64.0	Network 2
Category 7	(A) TRUCK TOWING 2 X 5 OR 6 AXLE DOG TRAILERS				(A) A	>27.5, ≤36.5	107.5	Network 7
Category 8	(A) TRUCK TOWING 2 DOG TRAILERS				(A) A	>27.5, ≤36.5	107.5	Network 8

**NOTES**

- Operators using a category of RAV outlined in this document must operate that RAV in accordance with the OPERATING CONDITIONS and only on the network specified.
- These diagrams are a visual indicator of the vehicle only.
- Operators must refer to the OPERATING CONDITIONS for the full vehicle description.
- The height of the vehicle can exceed 4.3 m but MUST NOT exceed 4.6 m when it is: (i) built to carry livestock or (ii) carrying a crate to carry livestock or (iii) carrying vehicles on more than one deck or (iv) carrying a multi-modal container or (v) carrying a large indivisible item or (vi) when operating with an appropriately balanced over height curtain side or panel/trailer trailer.
- Maximum height of Pig Trailer must not exceed 3.5m.

Heavy Vehicle Services  
Tel: 138 HVO (466)  
Email: hvs@mainroads.wa.gov.au  
Website: www.mainroads.wa.gov.au



### POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Management Procedure IMP-022 being reviewed is shown below:

MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE No.	IMP-022
MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE	HEAVY HAULAGE VEHICLE PERMITS
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	MANAGER WORKS & SERVICES
PREVIOUS POLICY/PROCEDURE No.	15.110; IP-003
LEGISLATION	ROAD TRAFFIC ACT, 1974 – HEAVY VEHICLE OPERATIONS
RELEVANT DELEGATIONS	2012

### OBJECTIVES:

To identify a heavy haulage route for roads under the control of the Shire of Chapman Valley.

### POLICY STATEMENT/S:

The Shire adopt the current approved Main Roads WA's Restricted Access Vehicle (RAV) roads and conditions associated with approved roads within the Shire of Chapman Valley.

Procedures for the establishment of a new or amendment to an existing Heavy Haulage Route:

- Application to be sent to MRWA Heavy Vehicle Services (HVS) - Route Assessment Section.
- HVS to forward application to Shire of Chapman Valley for comments.
- Shire staff inspect route to determine suitability in accordance with basic MRWA criteria.
- Shire staff put recommendation to MRWA to reject or progress the application.
- MRWA HVS will send the application to MRWA regional office to inspect route and make appropriate recommendation back to MRWA HVS

- f) MRWA HVS reviews the route assessment then approves or rejects route and advised Shire of Chapman Valley accordingly.

Once a route has been approved it remains relevant to all operators who then make direct application to MRWA for a permit (not to the Shire).

Refer to the current Main Roads WA's Restricted Access Vehicle (RAV), website (links below) for the approved list of roads within the Management Procedure;

<https://www.mainroads.wa.gov.au/UsingRoads/HeavyVehicles/notices/Pages/pmtc.aspx>

<https://mrapps.mainroads.wa.gov.au/RavNetworkMap>

Refer to relevant Policy/Procedure when exercising this delegation

This Management Procedure also refers to Delegation 2012 which states:

*"The Chief Executive Officer is delegated the authority to endorse the Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permits Applications in accordance with Management Procedure (IMP-022) for the determination of variations to the RAV Network within the Shire of Chapman Valley subject to this delegation being restricted to RAV7 level. Any applications beyond this RAV level are to be put to Council for consideration."*

In addition to the aforementioned Management Procedure Council has also adopted the following Management Procedure (IMP-017) regarding the Road Funding Allocation Process:

MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE No.	IMP-017
MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE	ROAD WORK FUNDING ALLOCATION PROCESS
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
PREVIOUS POLICY/PROCEDURE No.	15.220
RELEVANT DELEGATIONS	

#### **OBJECTIVES:**

To set guidelines and procedures for categorising road hierarchy network and funding allocation priorities

#### **MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE STATEMENT/S:**

1. Council review existing Road Hierarchy List based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
2. Council review existing Regional Road Group priorities based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
3. Council reviews other grant programs (e.g. Black Spot, R2R) based upon Councillor(s) submissions and staff recommendation(s).
4. Taking into account the delegations under Infrastructure Policy IMP-022, Council review existing Heavy Haulage Roads.
5. Council review existing Program of Road Works based Councillor(s) submissions and upon staff recommendation(s).
6. Councillors retain the right to present, and justify, changes to any of the above either via Chief Executive Officer's report or directly to the meeting.
7. No changes to be made to any of the above unless fully endorsed by Council.

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Road works is the largest income and expenditure component of the Shires operations, which makes it important to ensure the limited resources made available by grants and those allocated by Council to this function are maximized.

#### **Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP):**

The Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permit Management Procedure has been structured in a way to ensure each request for an upgrade the RAV rating to any particular road must go through a MRWA approved process.

There appears to be an increasing demand on the Shire road network by larger and heavier vehicles, which will no doubt have an adverse effect on the Shire roads and therefore the resources allocated by Council to roads.

It has also become obvious the Local Government Authority (LGA) is losing control of the level of heavy haulage vehicle using local roads under the control of the LGA. Though MRWA do consult with the LGA on every application made to introduce or upgrade the RAV rating on a local road the LGA cannot stop such applications if MRWA is comfortable the road meets their specification.

### STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

It is imperative Council carefully considers where resources are allocated in future road works programs to ensure the higher priority roads are catered for.

#### Strategic Community Plan/Corporate Business Plan:

1.3	Maintain and enhance safety and security for the community	Review safe roads and infrastructure	Continue annual review of Road Hierarchy, Road Works Program, Plant Replacement Program
-----	--	--------------------------------------	---

### CONSULTATION

The Chief Executive Officer conferred with the Manager Works & Services and Works Leading Hand when reviewing the *Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permit Roads Management Procedure* presented to the Committee.

### RISK ASSESSMENT

I believe there is a risk associated with the current approach being taken by MRWA Heavy Vehicle Services with RAV applications basically ignoring the wishes of the LGA. The issue of liability remain a vexed question. Is the permit issuer liable (i.e. MRWA) or the LGA who has management of the roads MRWA is permitting RAV vehicles to use LGA controlled road, even against the wishes of the LGA.

I have put this question to the Local Government Insurance Services (LGIS) with no firm response received as yet.

Therefore the Risk Assessment is basically unknown and could range from *Insignificant* to *Catastrophic*:

Measures of Consequence							
Rating (Level)	Health	Financial Impact	Service Interruption	Compliance	Reputational	Property	Environment
Insignificant (1)	Negligible injuries	Less than \$1,000	No material service interruption	No noticeable regulatory or statutory impact	Unsubstantiated, low impact, low profile or 'no news' item	Inconsequential or no damage.	Contained, reversible impact managed by on site response

### VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority – To amend Management Procedure

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 1)

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the *Management Procedure (IMP-025) – Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permits* as presented without change.

- OR -

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 2)

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the *Management Procedure (IMP-025) – Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permits* as presented with the following changes:

- 1.



<b>AGENDA ITEM:</b>	<b>9.4</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>REVIEW PLANT REPLACEMENT PROGRAM</b>
<b>PROPONENT:</b>	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER &amp; MANAGE WORKS &amp; SERVICES</b>
<b>SITE:</b>	<b>WHOLE SHIRE</b>
<b>FILE REFERENCE:</b>	<b>1018.00</b>
<b>PREVIOUS REFERENCE:</b>	<b>MINUTE REFERENCE: 03/20-3</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> FEBRUARY 2021</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>MAURICE BATTILANA, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</b>

#### SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:

Ref	Title	Attached to Report	Under Separate Cover
9.4(a)	Proposed Plant Replacement Program		✓

#### DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Nil

#### BACKGROUND

The Shire's *Plant Replacement Program* is reviewed annually to assist with the development of the Annual Budget for the forthcoming year. This review is also to consider the effect of the Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) which has plant replacement as an aspect to its overall costs estimates within the Plan.

Council resolved the following at the March 2020 OCM:

*"Minute Reference RIC 02/20-9*

*The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the Proposed Plant Replacement Program as presented with the following changes and request the Chief Executive Officer use this Program as a basis for resources to be allocated in the forthcoming budget*

1. *Amend Forklift to new 2½ tonne all terrain*
2. *Radar Speed Trailer – Minimum 50% Grant Reliant"*

The Plant Replacement Program was presented to the 20/21 Budget Workshops and again at the Special Meeting of Council where the 20/21 Budget was formally adopted. The Program was adjusted to reflect the decisions and determinations at these meetings.

#### COMMENT

As previously reported, the most recent fair value review of the Shire's Plant & Equipment indicated Council's standard of plant is high in comparison to similar type and sized local government authorities. Though such an outcome is welcomed it is important Council is mindful of not letting the life and standard of key items of plant and equipment to extend to the point this effects the organisations operational needs.

Staff have also approached the CEO enquiring into the following plant items being presented to Council for consideration with no changes being recommended.

The Manager Works & Services has again requested the inclusion of a ***Tiny Robot Surveyor*** to assist with the survey works required to mark out road surface prior to applying seal. This may also be used to line mark ovals. Estimated cost of \$20,000.

Below is an extract from the website of the organisation selling this item of equipment:

*Tiny Surveyor is a robotic pre-marker tool that will save you time, increase safety and enable you to mark out road lines automatically. With the ability to interface to any GNSS or total station for precise height measurements, the Tiny Surveyor is a versatile and reliable tool that works for eight hours on a single charge.*

Upload your design file via USB to the app and watch as the Tiny Surveyor completes the marking work for you. The Samsung tablet enables you to stay in control at all times and its high weatherproof rating ensures the Tiny Surveyor can work in even the toughest environments.

**Key Benefits:**

- Up to 10 times faster than marking out on foot
- Increase safety by following the robot from a car
- Reliable, repeatable 2-3cm accuracy
- Works as hard as you do with 8 hour battery
- Versatile to accommodate different spray can sizes
- Compact, portable design makes for easy transportation
- Use with your existing GNSS and optical survey equipment
- Works with a variety of standard file formats

The link below is to a YouTube of the device:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZeTJBxgSjEs>

This item has not been added to the Draft Plant Replacement Program as it was felt this needed to again be presented to Council by the Manager Works & Services to determine its value.

**STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT**

Not relevant

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

No Policy or Management Procedure affected.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

It is important Council annually review its *Plant Replacement Program* to ensure an informed decision-making process is evident when allocating resources update the Asset Management Plan, which is integrated with updates to the Long Term Financial Plan and the Annual Draft Budgets for the change-over/upgrading of Council’s plant & equipment.

**Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP):**

Any amendment to the Plant Replacement Program will affect the LTFP and any decision to do so will flow on as part of the review of the LTFP.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

It is strategically sound for Council to have a robust and realistic Plant Replacement Program.

**Strategic Community Plan/Corporate Business Plan:**

1.3	Maintain and enhance safety and security for the community	Review safe roads and infrastructure	Continue annual review of Road Hierarchy, Road Works Program, Plant Replacement Program
-----	--	--------------------------------------	---

**CONSULTATION**

The Chief Executive Officer consulted with the Manager Works & Services and Works Leading Hand when developing the Proposed Plant Replacement Program presented to Council.

Changes to the current Plant Replacement Program are indicated on the Proposed Plan provided at **Attachment 9.4(a)**.

**RISK ASSESSMENT**

There is a risk with the *Current & Proposed Plant Replacement Programs* extending the optimum life of plant before changeovers are scheduled resulting in the maintenance component of Council plant operating costs increasing.

However, I believe the current risk is *minor* at this stage, specifically now Council has employed a Plant Mechanic into the organisation i.e.

Measures of Consequence							
Rating (Level)	Health	Financial Impact	Service Interruption	Compliance	Reputational	Property	Environment
Minor (2)	First aid injuries	\$1,001 - \$10,000	Short term temporary interruption – backlog cleared < 1 day	Some temporary non compliances	Substantiated, low impact, low news item	Localised damage rectified by routine internal procedures	Contained, reversible impact managed by internal response

#### VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 1)

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the *Proposed Plant Replacement Program* as presented at **Attachment 9.4(a)** without change and request the Chief Executive Officer use this Program as a basis for resources to be allocated in the forthcoming budget.

- OR -

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 2)

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the *Proposed Plant Replacement Program* as presented at **Attachment 9.4(a)** with the following changes and request the Chief Executive Officer use this Program as a basis for resources to be allocated in the forthcoming budget

- 1.
- 2.



**9.0 Information Items**

Nil

**10.0 Urgent Business Approved by the Presiding Member or by a Decision of the Committee**

**11.0 Closure**