



MINUTES

ROADS INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

23rd FEBRUARY 2021

9:00am

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

Committee Members gathered at the Bill Hemsley Park Community Centre (Verandah Area) at 9:00am at which time some discussion and site inspections were undertaken. Members and Staff then travelled to the Council Chamber, Nabawa to formally convene the meeting.

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

Chief Executive Officer	(Observer)
Deputy CEO	(Observer)
Manager Works & Services	(Observer)
Works Leading Hand	(Observer)

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', is positioned above the name of the Chief Executive Officer.

Maurice Battilana
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEETING

10:52am – 23rd FEBRUARY 2021

COUNCIL CHAMBERS, NABAWA

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1.0 Presiding Member (President)

2.0 Declaration of Opening / Announcements of Visitors

The Presiding Member, Cr Farrell welcomed Elected Members and Staff and declared the meeting open at 10.52am at the Council Chambers, Nabawa.

3.0 Announcements from the Presiding Member (President)

Nil

4.0 Record of Attendance

4.1 Present

Committee Member
Cr Anthony Farrell (President)
Cr Kirrilee Warr (Deputy President)
Cr Peter Humphrey
Cr Nicole Batten
Cr Darrell Forth
Cr Beverley Davidson
Cr Trevor Royce

Officer	Position
Maurice Battilana	Chief Executive Officer
Esky Kelly	Manager of Works & Services
Marty Elks	Leading Hand Maintenance
Dianne Raymond	Manager of Finance & Corporate Services
Simon Lancaster	Deputy CEO

4.2 Apologies

Name
Nil

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

MOVED: Cr Forth SECONDED: Cr Batten

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

CARRIED
Voting F7/A0
Minute Reference RIC 03/21-1

8.0 Items to be dealt with En Bloc

Nil

9.0 Agenda Items

- 9.1** Review of Shire Road Hierarchy
- 9.2** Proposed 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

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

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*:

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 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

MOVED: Cr Forth SECONDED: Cr Batten

COMMITTEE 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.

CARRIED
Voting F7/A0
Minute Reference RIC 03/21-2

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 2) Lapsed

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

DISCUSSION ITEM:	9.2
SUBJECT:	PROPOSED 2021/2022 ROAD WORKS PROGRAM & REVIEW OF TEN YEAR ROAD WORKS PROGRAM
PROPONENT:	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER and MANAGER WORKS & SERVICES
SITE:	WHOLE SHIRE
FILE REFERENCE:	1002
PREVIOUS REFERENCE:	MINUTE REFERENCE 03/20-3
DATE:	23rd FEBRUARY 2021
AUTHOR:	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>	\$35,00 (To be confirmed) 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.	Quotes range from approx.. \$10,000 to \$30,000 for test works.

Cr Humphrey	Emails	<p>From: Maurice Battilana Sent: Friday, 22 January 2021 8:34 AM To: Cr Peter Humphrey crhumphrey@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au; Cr Anthony Farrell crfarrell@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au; Cr Beverley Davidson crdavidson@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au; Cr Darrell Forth crforth@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com; Cr Kirrilee Warr crwarr@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au; Cr Nicole Batten crbatten@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com; Cr Trevor Royce crroyce@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au; Darrell Forth (dforth61@gmail.com) dforth61@gmail.com; Trevor Royce (Private) tvroyce@bigpond.com Cc: Esky Kelly works@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au; Simon Lancaster dceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au; Anthony Abbott building@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au; Marty Elks lhworks@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au Subject: RE: Road Infrastructure & 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><u>Committee Meeting Venue</u> 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>Councillors – Can you please indicate (by a REPLY ALL email) if your preference to hold the meeting is Nabawa Offices or BHPCC.</p> <p><u>Roadworks Program</u></p> <p>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 & 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 | email
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

Sent: Thursday, 21 January 2021 2:37 PM

To: Maurice Battilana <ceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au>; Cr Anthony Farrell <crfarrell@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au>; Cr Beverley Davidson <crdavidson@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au>; Cr Darrell Forth <crforth@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com>; Cr Kirrilee Warr <crwarr@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au>; Cr Nicole Batten <crbatten@ShireofChapmanValley.onmicrosoft.com>; Cr Trevor Royce <crroyce@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au>; Darrell Forth (dforth61@gmail.com) <dforth61@gmail.com>; Trevor Royce (Private) <tvroyce@bigpond.com>

Cc: Esky Kelly <works@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au>; Simon Lancaster <dceo@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au>; Anthony Abbott <building@chapmanvalley.wa.gov.au>; Marty Elks <lhworks@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"> • Murphy Yetna • Nanson Howatharra • Nolba • Nolba Stock Route • Urch 	<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

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 31st 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
Estimated Totals			\$2,249,000	\$1,499,667	\$749,333

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 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 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:

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: -

Rd No.	Road Name
19	Balla Whelarra
130	Chapman Valley
34	Coronation Beach
8	Dartmoor
21	Dartmoor Lake Nerramyne
12	East Bowes
1; 15 & 14	<input type="checkbox"/> Durawah; <input type="checkbox"/> Station (between Durawah & Station Valentine Rd Junctions), <input type="checkbox"/> 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
Moderate (3)	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

Suspend Standing Orders 11.23am

MOVED: Cr Forth

SECONDED: Cr Warr

CARRIED
Voting F7/A0
Minute Reference RIC 03/21-3

Discussion was undertaken on the item

Reinstate Standing Orders 12.27pm

MOVED: Cr Warr

SECONDED: Cr Royce

CARRIED
Voting F7/A0
Minute Reference RIC 03/21-4

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Option 1) Lapsed

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.

MOVED: Cr Royce

SECONDED: Cr Davidson

COMMITTEE 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. Extend seal on McCagh Road to Golf Club entrance;
2. Remove Parkfalls Estate Shoulder works from future Program od works;

3. Ensure own resource projects from previous year not completed are prioritised in 2021/2022 budget;
4. Budget consideration for additional roadworks staff member
5. Concept Forum discussion on investigating improvement options Parkfalls Estate bridle paths; and
6. Traffic Counters to be placed on Nolba Road, Olsen Road, Nabawa Yetna Road; however grant project roads to take priority.

CARRIED

Voting F7/A0

Minute Reference RIC 03/21-5

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

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 (m)	Length (m)	Mass (T) (Maximum Permitted Mass)	RAV Network
1	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A PIG TRAILER (B) PRIME MOVER TOWING AN OVERHEIGHT SEMI TRAILER (C) SHORT B-DOUBLE (D) TWIN STEER PRIME MOVER TOWING SEMI TRAILER	(A) A (B) A (C) A (D) A	≤20 ≤19 ≤20 ≤19	50 42.5 50 47.5	1
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	≤27.5 ≤20 ≤27.5 ≤27.5 ≤25	65.5 47.5 67.5 87.5 42.5	2
3	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER	(A) B	≤27.5	84	3
4	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 6 AXLE DOG TRAILER	(A) A	≤27.5	87.5	4
5	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER (B) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER AND CONVERTER DOLLY (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+0 87.5+0 84	5
6	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 6 AXLE DOG TRAILER (B) B-TRIPLE (C) PRIME MOVER SEMI TRAILER TOWING A 6 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+0	6
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	7
9	(A) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING 2 X DOG TRAILERS (B) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A DOG TRAILER AND CONVERTER DOLLY (C) B-DOUBLE TOWING A DOG TRAILER (D) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A B-DOUBLE	(A) B (B) B (C) A (D) A	>36.5, ≤53.5 >36.5, ≤53.5 >36.5, ≤45 >36.5, ≤45	120.5 84+0 107.5 107.5	9
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 (E) DOUBLE ROAD TRAIN TOWING 2 B-DOUBLE TRAILERS (F) PRIME MOVER, SEMI TRAILER TOWING A 6 AXLE DOG TRAILER AND CONVERTER DOLLY	(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+4	10

NOTES

- Operators using a category of RAV outlined in this document must operate that RAV in accordance with the OPERATING CONDITIONS and any of 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 4.3m but MUST NOT exceed 4.6m when it is: (i) built to carry livestock or; (ii) carrying a cable 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 contain side or paratechtronic trailer.
- Maximum height of Pig Trailer must not exceed 3.5m.

Heavy Vehicle Services
Tel: 138 HVO (486)
Email: hvs@mainroads.wa.gov.au
Website: www.mainroads.wa.gov.au

Truck, Trailer Combinations

Heavy Vehicle Services

VEHICLE DESCRIPTION AND CONFIGURATION CHART (RAV) – TRUCK, TRAILER COMBINATIONS EXAMPLES				ADP Spacing Table	Length (m)	Mass (T) (Maximum Allowed Mass)	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 94.0	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 balanced over height curtain side or paneltrailer trailer.
- Maximum height of Pig Trailer must not exceed 3.5m.

Heavy Vehicle Services
Tel: 138 HVO (486)
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
- 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

MOVED: CR Farrell

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 F7/A0**

Minute Reference RIC 03/21-6

STAFF 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:

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

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) 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.

- OR -

MOVED: CR Batten

SECONDED: CR Warr

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. Add Tiny Surveyor Robot 2021/2022 budget consideration; and
2. Add Transportable Display Trailer 2021/2022 budget consideration.

CARRIED
Voting F7/A0
Minute Reference RIC 03/21-7

9.0 Information Items

Nil

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

Nil

11.0 Closure

The Chair thanked the Committee members and staff for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 1.02pm