



SHIRE OF  
**Chapman Valley**  
*love the rural life!*

# MINUTES

## ROADS INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

**26<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2020**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**NABAWA**  
**9:00am**

### **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>

**ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**9.00AM - 26<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2020 COUNCIL CHAMBERS, NABAWA**

---

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

---

**Note: Road Inspections will be determined at the meeting on an as-needs basis only.**

---

**1.0 Election of Presiding Member (Unless President Exercises right to fill this Position)**

The Chief Executive Officer opened the meeting explaining the first item of business was to elect the Presiding Member for the Committee.

The Cr Farrell (President) advised he would like to nominate for the position, yet enquired if anyone else was interested he would be happy to go through the election process.

No further nominations were forthcoming so Cr Farrell was elected to the position of Presiding Member of the Shire of Chapman Valley Road Infrastructure Committee unopposed.

**2.0 Declaration of Opening / Announcements of Visitors**

The Presiding Member, Cr Farrell welcomed Elected Members and Staff to the meeting.

**3.0 Announcements from the Presiding Member (President)**

Nil

**4.0 Record of Attendance**

Present

Councillors

<b>Member</b>
Cr Anthony Farrell (President)
Cr Kirrilee Warr (Deputy President)
Cr Peter Humphrey
Cr Nicole Batten
Cr Darrell Forth
Cr Beverley Davidson
Cr Ian Maluish

Staff

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Position</b>
Mr Maurice Battilana	Chief Executive Officer
Mr Esky Kelly	Manager of Works & Services
Mr Marty Elks	Leading Hand Maintenance
Dianne Raymond	Manager of Finance & Corporate Services
Beau Raymond	Senior Finance (Commencement to 10:40am)

Visitors

<b>Name</b>
Nil

Apologies

<b>Name</b>
Cr Trevor Royce

## 5.0 Disclosure of Interest

Nil

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

Nil

## 7.0 Confirmation of Minutes from previous meetings

### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

**MOVED: Cr Batten**

**SECONDED: Cr Forth**

### Minutes Road Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2019

Recommend that the Minutes Road Infrastructure Committee Meeting held on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2019 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings. (**Supplied under separate cover**)

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-1**

## 8.0 Items to be dealt with En Bloc

Nil

## 9.0 Agenda Items

9.1 Review of Shire Road Hierarchy

9.2 Proposed 2020/2021 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; 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 03/19-11</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>26<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2020</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 2019 OCM:

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

*Minute Reference RIC 03/19-2*

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

- i) Add Beaufort Close as Category E – Minor Access Road;*
- ii) Add Bawden Street as Category E – Minor Access Road;*
- iii) Remove Wicka Road (closed road) from Category E – Minor Access Road;*
- iv) Apply to the Mid-West Regional Road Group to elevate both East Nabawa & Valentine Roads from Category 2 to Category 1 roads in the Mid-West Roads 2030 Regional Strategies for Significant Local Government Roads.”*

#### 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:

- 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

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

The application to the Mid West Regional Road Group to elevate both East Nabawa & Valentine Roads from Category 2 to Category 1 roads in the Mid-West Roads 2030 Regional Strategies for Significant Local Government Roads was successful, which has a positive effect on the Shire’s funding applications for these roads.

In addition to the aforementioned 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	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 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 LTFP. 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 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

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

**MOVED: Cr Batten**

**SECONDED: Cr Forth**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-2**

<b>DISCUSSION ITEM:</b>	<b>9.2</b>
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>PROPOSED 2020/2021 ROAD WORKS PROGRAM &amp; REVIEW OF TEN YEAR ROAD WORKS PROGRAM</b>
<b>PROPONENT:</b>	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER and 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 03/19-11 and 08/19-8</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>26<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2020</b>
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	<b>MAURICE BATTILANA, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</b>

#### 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 2020/2021 & 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 2019 OCM:

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

Minute Reference RIC 03/19-3

*The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorse the 10 Year Road Works Program – 2019/2020 to 2028/2029 as presented with the following amendment and this Program be used as a basis for resource allocation into the Draft 2019/2020 Budget:*

- *Eliza Shaw Road – Obtain engineering advice for a solution to drainage issues along Eliza Shaw Road (starting from Hester Road junction towards Redcliffe Concourse junctions and list in 2019/2020 draft roadworks program.*

*Voting 6/0  
CARRIED  
Minute Reference:03/18-7*

Council subsequently resolved the following at the August 2019 OCM:

*Council endorse the CEO's action to vary the Ten-Year Road Works Program by applying for 2020/2021 MWRRG grant projects as follows:*

<b>Road</b>	<b>Works Description</b>	<b>Total Project Cost Estimate</b>	<b>MWRRG Grant Request</b>	<b>Shire Contrib.</b>
Valentine	3.00km x 7.2m seal continuation	\$464,500	\$300,000	\$164,500
Dartmoor	3.40km x 7.2m seal continuation	\$454,000	\$300,000	\$154,000
Northampton Nabawa	2.00km Drainage, Shoulder Upgrades & reseal	\$453,500	\$300,000	\$153,500
East Nabawa (West)	2.75km x7.2m seal continuation	\$453,500	\$300,000	\$153,500

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

<b>Requested by</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
CV Agric Society	McCagh Rd – Extend seal 250m	The request from the CVAS is to extend the existing seal approx.. 250m to reduce dust over the Showgrounds.	<b>\$35,297 (To be confirmed)</b> Based on average Unit Rate per KM only.
Council	BHPCC – Overflow Carpark (gravel only)	The BHPCC Overflow Carpark is included in the BHPCC Masterplan. This item was listed for consideration in the 19/20 Budget process. However, was removed to balance the budget and requested to be brought back for further consideration in future budget(s).	\$30,000 (estimate only)
Council	Bawden Lane – Yuna & YMCC Carpark area sealing.	<p>This item was listed for consideration in the 19/20 Budget process. However, was removed to balance the budget and requested to be brought back for further consideration in future budget(s).</p> <p>The design has been revisited at Council's request and a revised cost established.</p> <p>At the Shire Tour (6/02/2020) it was requested an additional quote be obtained to asphalt to whole of Bawden Rd.</p>	<p>Estimate – Asphalt <u>Part</u> of Bawden Rd only:</p> <p><b>\$68,115 (To be confirmed)</b> Previous Year Estimate)</p> <p>Estimate – Asphalt <u>All</u> of Bawden Rd only:</p> <p><b>\$ (To be confirmed)</b></p>
Staff	Richards Rd – Complete seal.	<p>There has been requests from landowners adjacent to the unsealed section of Richards Rd to complete the seal along the southern end.</p> <p>At the time the northern end of the road was sealed it was felt the southern end could wait until further land development occurred.</p> <p>Staff have some concerns with the drainage in this area. However, the seal will not exacerbate this issue.</p>	<b>\$35,297 (To be confirmed)</b> Based on average Unit Rate per KM only)



		The drainage is a matter which could be dealt with if/when the land to the west is developed.	
Staff	Dartmoor Rd – Seal Extension	<p>It is expected at time the traffic volume will reduce to a point where the Dartmoor/Dartmoor Lake Nerramyne Rds will not score enough to receive MWRRG funds for seal extension.</p> <p>The Draft RW Program has listed as a Note indicating this route will be test scored annually to determine how it looks in regard to MWRRG submissions. This could be for both seal extensions and gravel sheeting.</p>	<p>\$450,000 per annum (approx.)</p> <p>Two thirds covered by MWRRG (if Grant applications are successful)</p>
Staff	Durawah – Station – Station Valentine Route – Seal Upgrade	<p>It will be noted this route has been included as part of the MWRRG projects from 2024/2025 onwards. This is obviously based upon the assumption this route will be endorsed by the MWRRG as a Significant Route in the MW Roads 2030 list of Significant Local Government Roads.</p> <p>If the route is not recognised funding will not be granted through the MWRRG and this assumption will need to be removed and the Shire's Ten Year RW Program reviewed.</p>	<p>\$450,000 per annum (approx.)</p> <p>Two thirds covered by MWRRG (only if route recognised as Significant).</p>

Proposed 2020/2021 Road Works Program

It is hoped all road projects scheduled for 2019/2020 should be completed; however, there is invariably slippages in the program of works estimated timeline, the recommended 2020/2021 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*

However, 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 2020/2021. Therefore, these particular projects cannot be adjusted.

Projects applied for and funding endorsed from the RRG for 2020/2021 are:

Project	Score	Estimated Total Costs	Projects Submitted	
			RRG Funds	Shire Matching & Other Contr.
Valentine Road	103.00	\$ 464,500	\$ 300,000	\$ 164,500

Upgrade from gravel to 7.2m wide seal. (SLKs - 15.38 to 18.38)				
<b>Dartmoor Road</b> Upgrade from gravel to 7.2m wide seal (SLKs 20.80 to 24.80)	99.59	\$ 454,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 154,000
<b>Northampton Nabawa Road</b> Remove/trim/clear vegetation where required repair failing pavement, reconstruct of unsealed shoulders, extension to existing culverts, install new culverts and reseal pavement. (SLKs 10.23 to 12.23)	96.00	\$ 453,500	\$ 300,000	\$ 153,500
<b>East Nabawa Road</b> Upgrade from gravel to 7.2m wide seal (SLKs 18.05 – 20.80)	95.80	\$ 453,500	\$ 300,000	\$ 153,500
		<b>\$ 1,825,500</b>	<b>\$ 1,200,000</b>	<b>\$ 625,500</b>

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

Roads to Recovery Grant (R2R) Funding over the past years was as follows:

15-16 (Actual)	16-17 (Actual)	17-18 (Actual)	18-19 (Actual)	19/20 (Actual)	Total Past Five Years	Average Past Five Years
\$697,621	\$734,746	\$240,000	\$235,444	\$328,620	<b>\$2,236,431</b>	<b>\$447,286</b>

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 current rate of \$328,620 per financial year.

The *Proposed 10 Year Road Works Program (2020/2021 to 2029/2030)* reflects the 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 (2019/2020 to 2028/2029)** (**Attachment 9.2(b)**) with the **Proposed 10 Year Road Works Program** adding the year 2028/2029 (**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 Sheetting on roads not recognised as MWRRG Significant Roads).
4. The previously endorsed list of gravel sheetting 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 not been altered in 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 road 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 details 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:

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

## 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: -

- Yuna Tenindewa
- East Chapman
- Balla Whelarra
- Dartmoor
- Dartmoor Lake Nerramyne
- Northampton/Nabawa
- Coronation Beach
- Nanson Howatharra
- East Nabawa
- Chapman Valley Road (Moonyoonooka/Yuna Rd junction to Shire southern boundary)
- East Bowes

**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 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

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

**MOVED: Cr Warr**

**SECONDED: Cr Humphrey**

Standing Orders 8:5; 8.7; 8.8 and 8:9 be suspended to allow open discussion on this item.

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-3**

**MOVED: Cr Warr**

**SECONDED: Cr Forth**

Standing Orders 8:5; 8.7; 8.8 and 8:9 be reinstated

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-4**

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (Option 1) - Lapsed

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorse the *10 Year Road Works Program 2020/21 to 2029/2030* as presented at *Attachment 9.2(a)* without change and this Program be used as a basis for resource allocation into the Draft 2020/2021 Budget.

**MOVED: Cr Davidson**

**SECONDED: Cr Forth**

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (Option 2)

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorse the *10 Year Road Works Program 2020/21 to 2029/2030* 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 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)

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-5**

*Meeting Adjourned for morning tea at 10:25am*

*Meeting reconvened at 10:54am*

<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: 03/19-11</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>26<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2020</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 2019 OCM:

Minute Reference RIC 03/19-4

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

*The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the following amended Heavy Haulage Vehicle Permits Management Procedure (IMP-022):*

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	

#### **OBJECTIVES:**

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

#### **POLICY STATEMENT/S:**

*Council 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:*

- a) *Application to be sent to MRWA Heavy Vehicle Services (HVS) - Route Assessment Section.*
- b) *HVS to forward application to Shire of Chapman Valley for comments.*
- c) *Shire staff inspect route to determine suitability in accordance with basic MRWA criteria.*
- d) *Shire staff put recommendation to MRWA to reject or progress the application.*
- e) *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 Council).

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>

Minute Reference RIC 03/19-5 – (Absolute Majority)

The Road Infrastructure Committee recommends Council endorses the following amended Delegation:

<b>DELEGATION NUMBER</b>	-	<b>2012</b>
LEGISLATIVE POWER	-	Local Government Act 1995 (Section 5.42)
DELEGATION SUBJECT	-	Heavy Haulage Routes
DELEGATE	-	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

*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.*

**COMMENT**

Below is a copy of the current HVS RAV configurations:



# Prime Mover, Trailer Combinations

VEHICLE DESCRIPTION AND CONFIGURATION CHART (RAV) – PRIME MOVER, TRAILER COMBINATIONS EXAMPLES				Axle Spacing (m)	Length (m)	Mass (T)	RAV Network			
Category 1	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A PIG TRAILER 	(B) PRIME MOVER TOWING AN OVERHEIGHT SEMI TRAILER 	(C) SHORT B-DOUBLE 	(D) TWINSTEER PRIME MOVER TOWING SEMI TRAILER 	(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A	≤20 42.5 50 47.5	50	Network 1		
Category 2	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A PIG TRAILER 	(B) PRIME MOVER TOWING SEMI TRAILER 	(C) B-DOUBLE 	(D) SHORT B TRIPLE 	(E) CAR CARRIER SEMI TRAILER 	(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A (E) A	≤20 527.5 527.5 527.5 225	47.5 87.5 87.5 42.5	Network 2	
Category 3	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER 	Example of Axle Groups 				(A) B	≤27.5	84	Network 3	
Category 4	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 4 AXLE DOG TRAILER 	Example of Axle Group with An Optional Axle 				(A) A	≤27.5	87.5	Network 4	
Category 5	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER 	(C) B-DOUBLE TOWING A CONVERTER DOLLY 	(D) B-TRIPLE 			(A) B (B) B (C) A (D) A	>27.5, ≤36.5 27.5, ≤36.5 27.5, ≤36.5 27.5, ≤36.5	84 84+d 87.5+d 84	Network 5	
Category 6	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 4 AXLE DOG TRAILER 	(B) B-TRIPLE 	(C) PRIME MOVER SEMI TRAILER TOWING A 4 AXLE TRAILER & CONVERTER DOLLY 			(A) A (B) A (C) A	>27.5, ≤36.5 27.5, ≤36.5 27.5, ≤36.5	87.5 87.5 87.5+d	Network 6	
Category 7	(A) PRIME MOVER, TOWING SEMI TRAILER AND B DOUBLE 	(B) B-DOUBLE TOWING A DOG TRAILER 				(A) A (B) A	>27.5, ≤36.5 27.5, ≤36.5	107.5 107.5	Network 7	
Category 8	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 2 X DOG TRAILERS 	(B) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER AND CONVERTER DOLLY 				(A) B (B) B (C) A (D) A	>36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤46 >36.5, ≤46 >36.5, ≤46	120.5 84+d 107.5 107.5	Network 8	
Category 9	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 2 X DOG TRAILERS 	(B) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER 	(C) B DOUBLE TOWING A DOG TRAILER 	(D) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A B-DOUBLE 			(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A	>36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤53.5	127.5 127.5 147.5 147.5	Network 9
Category 10	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 2 X DOG TRAILERS 	(B) B-DOUBLE TOWING A CONVERTER DOLLY CONNECTED TO 2 SEMI TRAILERS 	(C) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING B TRIPLE 	(D) B-DOUBLE TOWING 2 DOG TRAILERS 			(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A (E) A (F) A	>36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤53.5 36.5, ≤53.5	127.5 127.5 147.5 147.5 147.5 87.5+d	Network 10
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 indication 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 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 dual height curtain-aisle or perforated-trailer.
- Maximum height of Pig Trailer must not exceed 3.5m.

**Heavy Vehicle Services**  
 Tel: 138 HVO (486)  
 Email: [hvs@mainroads.wa.gov.au](mailto:hvs@mainroads.wa.gov.au)  
 Website: [www.mainroads.wa.gov.au](http://www.mainroads.wa.gov.au)



# Truck, Trailer Combinations

2016

## Heavy Vehicle Services

VEHICLE DESCRIPTION AND CONFIGURATION CHART (RAV) – TRUCK, TRAILER COMBINATIONS EXAMPLES				AXIS GROUPING labels	Length (m)	Mass (T) Max Permitted Mass	RAV Network	
Category 1	(A) TRUCK LIVINGSTOCK 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) C (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 indication 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 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 curtain side or partitioned trailer.
- Maximum height of Pig Trailer must not exceed 3.5m.

**Heavy Vehicle Services**  
Tel: 136 HVO (446)  
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:

Council 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.

- e) 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 Council).

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>

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
<b>Insignificant (1)</b>	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
<b>Minor (2)</b>	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
<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
<b>Major (4)</b>	Lost time injury	\$50,001 - \$150,000	Prolonged interruption of services – additional resources; performance affected < 1 month	Non-compliance results in termination of services or imposed penalties	Substantiated, public embarrassment, high impact, high news profile, third party actions	Significant damage requiring internal & external resources to rectify	Uncontained, reversible impact managed by a coordinated response from external agencies
<b>Catastrophic (5)</b>	Fatality, permanent disability	More than \$150,000	Indeterminate prolonged interruption of services – non-performance > 1 month	Non-compliance results in litigation, criminal charges or significant damages or penalties	Substantiated, public embarrassment, very high multiple impacts, high widespread multiple news profile, third party actions	Extensive damage requiring prolonged period of restitution Complete loss of plant, equipment & building	Uncontained, irreversible impact

## VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority – To amend Management Procedure

## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

**MOVED: Cr Batten**

**SECONDED: Cr Forth**

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (Option 1)

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

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-6**

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (Option 2) - Lapsed

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

<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: 03/19-11</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>26<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2020</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 2019 OCM:

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

*Minute Reference RIC 03/19-7*

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

- *Investigate transportable radar speed display trailer – acquisition is subject to grant funding and final endorsement by Council.*
- *Investigate costs for tow along broom sweeper"*

The Plant Replacement Program was presented to the 19/20 Budget Workshop (June 2019) and again at the Special Meeting of Council where the 19/20 Budget was formally adopted. The Program was adjusted to reflect the decisions and determinations at both 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.

During the 2019/2020 Budget deliberations a transportable Radar, Speed Trailer (subject to grants) was removed from the adopted budget. This has been placed back into the Draft Plant Replacement Program for further consideration.

Staff have also approached the CEO enquiring into the following plant items being presented to Council for consideration:

1. Forklift (Second-hand) – For use at the Nabawa Depot to assist in lifting operation. The current situation of the Backhoe or FEL not being available can result in the Skid Steer being used for tasks it is not suited for.

2. Six Wheel Truck – Changeover to a Prime Mover and acquire another side tipper, rather than staying with a six-wheel truck hauling the existing side tipper. This is a matter needs some serious debate as there is a train of thought this will diminish the fleet flexibility as the Shire will then be left with only one six-wheel truck.

The Manager Works & Services has also requested the inclusion of a **Tiny Robot Surveyor** to assist with the survey works required to mark out road surface prior to applying seal. 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 be presented to Council by the Manager Works & Services in the first instance.

## **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

**MOVED: Cr Maluish**

**SECONDED: Cr Humphrey**

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Standing Orders 8:5; 8.7; 8.8 and 8:9 be suspended to allow open discussion on this item.

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-7**

**MOVED: Cr Forth**

**SECONDED: Cr Batten**

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Standing Orders 8:5; 8.7; 8.8 and 8:9 be reinstated.

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-8**



## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

### COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (Option 1) - Lapsed

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.

**MOVED: Cr Batten**

**SECONDED: Cr Forth**

### COMMITTEE 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. Amend Forklift to new 2½ tonne all terrain
2. Radar Speed Trailer – Minimum 50% Grant Reliant

**CARRIED**  
**Voting 7/0**  
**Minute Reference RIC 02/20-9**

## 9.0 Information Items

Nil

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

Nil

## 10.0 Closure

The Chairman thanked the Committee members and staff for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 11:45am.