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City of Rockingham  
Corporate and Engineering Services Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday 16 October 2012 - Council Boardroom

1. Declaration of Opening

The Chairperson declared the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting open at 4.00pm and welcomed all present.

2. Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cr Barry Sammels    | Chairperson  
| Cr Lorraine Dunkling|  
| Cr Allan Hill       |  
| Cr Ron Pease        |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2 Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mr Andrew Hammond  | Chief Executive Officer  
| Mr Chris Thompson  | Director Engineering and Parks Services  
| Mr Nick Brown      | A/ Director Corporate Services  
| Mr John Woodhouse  | Director Legal Services and General Counsel  
| Mr Scott Lambie    | A/ Manager Engineering Services  
| Mr Gary Rogers     | Manager Procurement and Projects  
| Mr Debbie Dune     | A/ Manager Asset Services  
| Mr James Henson    | Manager Parks Development  
| Mr Cadell Buss     | Manager Economic Development  
| Mr Ben Searcy      | Manager Human Resource Development  
| Ms Vanisha Govender| A/ Manager Financial Services  
| Mr Peter Varris    | Manager Governance and Councillor Support  
| Mrs Jelette Edwards| Governance Coordinator  

| Members of the Public: | Nil  
| Press:                | 1  

| 2.3 Apologies:        | Nil  

| 2.4 Approved Leave of Absence: | Nil  

3. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice

Nil
4. **Public Question Time**

4:01pm  The Chairperson invited members of the Public Gallery to ask questions. There were none.

5. **Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting**

Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Hill:

That Council **CONFIRM** the Minutes of the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting held on 18 September 2012, as a true and accurate record.

Committee Voting – 4/0

6. **Matters Arising from the Previous Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting Minutes**

Nil

7. **Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion**

4:02pm  The Chairperson announced to all present that decisions made at Committees of Council are recommendations only and may be adopted in full, amended or deferred when presented for consideration at the next Council meeting.

8. **Declarations of Members and Officers Interests**

4:02pm  The Chairperson asked if there were any interests to declare. There were none.

9. **Petitions/Deputations/Presentations/Submissions**

Nil

10. **Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed**

Nil

11. **Bulletin Items**

**Corporate and General Management Services Information Bulletin – October 2012**

**Corporate Services**

1. Corporate Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Mobile Computing (AIM) Licensing Fees
   3.2 Minutes and Agenda Software
   3.3 Online Records Management Training
   3.4 Retention and Disposal Project
   3.5 Document Migration
   3.6 Disaster Recovery Solution
   3.7 Telephone System Replacement
   3.8 GIS Developments – SLIP & Custodial Module
   3.9 Building Licence Software
   3.10 Civil Drainage Software
3.11 Authority 4J’s Licence  
3.12 VM Licencing  
4. Information Items  
4.1 List of Payments  

**Governance and Councillor Support**  
1. Governance and Councillor Support Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3. Project Status Reports  
3.1 Electronic Meeting Papers and Decision Making Process  
4. Information Items  
4.1 Regional Subsidiaries – Local Government Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012  
4.2 National Sea Change Taskforce Newsletter  

**Human Resources**  
1. Human Resources Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3. Project Status Reports  
3.1 Employee Wellness Programme  
3.2 Corporate Training Programme  
3.4 Leadership & Management Programme  
3.5 Values Programme  
3.6 Safety Achievement Program  
4. Information Items – Enterprise Agreement  

**Economic Development**  
1. Economic Development Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3.1 Leadership Forum  
3.2 City Chronicle  
3.3 Social Media  
3.4 Global Friendship  
4. Information Items  
4.1 Media Tracking  

**Strategy Coordination**  
1. Strategy Coordination Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3. Project Status Reports  
4. Information Items  
4.1 Establishing Linkages Between the Community Plan, the Specific Purpose Plans and the Team Plans  
4.2 2012 Customer Satisfaction Survey  
4.3 Coordinating the Development of a 10 Year Infrastructure Plan  
4.4 Coordinating the Development and Implementation of a Development Contribution Scheme  
4.5 Operational Team Plans  
4.6 New Ideas Incentive Scheme  
4.7 City Scoreboard  
4.8 Climate Change Response Strategy  
4.10 Integrated Risk Management Framework for the City of Rockingham  
4.11 LGMA Challenge
Committee Recommendation

That Councillors acknowledge having read the Corporate and General Management Services Information Bulletin – October 2012 and the contents be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0

---

**Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – October 2012**

**Engineering Services**
1. Engineering Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Delegated Authority for approval of Directional Signage
   - 4.2 Delegated Authority for Thoroughfare Closures
   - 4.3 Local Area Traffic Management and Road Safety Design Projects 2012/13
   - 4.4 Delegated Authority for Approval of Engineering Drawings - Subdivisions
   - 4.5 Delegated Authority for Acceptance of As-Constructed Engineering Drawings Subdivisions
   - 4.6 Delegated Authority to approve the Release of Bonds for Private Subdivisional Works
   - 4.7 Handover of Subdivisional Roads
   - 4.8 Delegated Authority for the Payment of Crossover Subsidies

**Engineering Operations**
1. Engineering Operations Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Road Construction Program Roads to Recovery 2012/13
   - 4.2 Road Construction Program Main Roads Direct Grant 2012/13
   - 4.3 Road Construction Program Main Roads Grant 2012/13
   - 4.4 Road Construction Program State Black Spot 2012/13
   - 4.5 Footpath Construction Program Municipal Works 2012/13
   - 4.6 Road Maintenance Program 2012/13
   - 4.7 Passenger Vehicle Fleet Program 2012/13
   - 4.8 Light Commercial Vehicles Program 2012/13
   - 4.9 Heavy Plant Program 2012/13

**Parks Development**
1. Parks Development Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Greening Plan Review
   - 3.2 Tamworth Swamp Management Plan Review
   - 3.3 Feral Cat /Fish Control Implementation Strategy
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Groundwater Monitoring
   - 4.2 Mundijong Road Environmental Offsets
   - 4.3 Lake Richmond Heritage Listing
   - 4.4 Bight Reefs Reserve Public Toilet Consultation
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**Asset Management**
1. Asset Management Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3. Project Status Reports  
   3.1 Levels of Service Customer Survey  
   3.2 Access Audit  
   3.3 Audit Public Scheme Water Facilities  
4. Information Items  
   4.1 Asset Management Improvement Strategy  
   4.2 Asset Systems Management  
   4.3 Lease Management  
   4.4 Engineering & Parks Financial Control

**Building Maintenance**
1. Building Maintenance Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3. Project Status Reports  
   3.1 Singleton Street Lighting Replacement  
4. Information Items  
   4.1 Building Maintenance  
   4.2 Graffiti Removal  
   4.3 Street Lighting Maintenance

**Procurement and Capital Projects**
1. Procurement and Capital Projects Team Overview  
2. Human Resource Update  
3. Project Status Reports  
   3.1 Coastal Management Consultants (Sand Drift/Erosion Problems)  
   3.2 Coastal Infrastructure Facilities Consultant (Jetties/Boat Ramp Planning)  
   3.3 Lighting Consultants (Technical Planning/Design, Underground Power Program)  
   3.4 Major Project Property Development Planning (Design Modifications/Tender Planning/Structural Testing)  
4. Information Items  
   4.1 Delegated Written Notification of Successful Tenders  
   4.2 Delegated Release of Retention/Bank Guarantee’s  
   4.3 Proposed Shoalwater North Underground Power Project  
   4.4 2012 Public Area Lighting and Arterial Lighting  
   4.5 Lark Hill Wind Turbine  
   4.6 Bent Street Boat Launching Facility – Proposed Navigation Channel  
   4.7 Point Peron Boat Launching Facility – Design, Demolition and Replacement  
   4.8 Aqua Jetty – Replace/Upgrade HVAC Services  
   4.9 Bell Park Toilet – Replacement including Curfew Lockout System  
   4.10 Baldivis Library and Community Centre – Design  
   4.11 Baldivis Old School – Redevelopment  
   4.12 Challenger Court Electrical System Upgrade  
   4.13 Aqua Jetty Swimming Club Office  
   4.14 Secret Harbour Surf Life Saving Club – Renovation  
   4.15 Baldivis Oval – Floodlighting
Waste and Landfill Services
1. Waste and Landfill Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Waste Kerbside Collection
   4.2 240 litre bin Recycling Service
   4.3 240 litre bin Recycling Participation Statistics
   4.4 Destroyed and Stolen Refuse Bins
   4.5 Landfill Statistics
   4.6 Education and Promotion
   4.7 T12/13-37 Supply and delivery of one new 20 tonne excavator fitted with a quick hitch with optional trade of the City’s existing Hitachi EX 200 excavator and / or outright purchase of the city’s existing Hitachi EX 200 excavator
   4.8 EO12/13-42 – Expression of Interest – Receipt and processing of Municipal Solid Waste using Waste to Energy technologies

Committee Recommendation

That Councillors acknowledge having read the Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – October 2012 and the contents be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0
12. Agenda Items

Corporate Services

Corporate and Engineering Services
Corporate Services

Reference No & Subject: CS-033/12
Quarterly Budget Review – September 2012

File No: FLM/17-04

Proponent/s:

Author: Ms Vanisha Govender, A/Manager Financial Services

Other Contributors:...

Date of Committee Meeting: 16 October 2012

Previously before Council:

Disclosure of Interest:

Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive Function

Site:

Lot Area:

Attachments: September 2012 Quarterly Budget Review

Maps/Diagrams:

Purpose of Report

To present the September 2012 Quarterly Budget Review for Council’s consideration and to seek Council’s authorisation of the budget amendments arising from the review.

Background

The City of Rockingham undertakes quarterly budget reviews to monitor its financial performance against the annual budget and to review projections to the end of the financial year. Any variations to the annual budget arising from the review process are presented for Council’s consideration and authorisation.

Details

The September 2012 Quarterly Budget Review includes details of transactions during the July 2012 – September 2012 period and adjustments required to the annual budget. The document includes the following information:

1. Summary of Budget Position
2. Detailed statement of Operating Revenue and Expenditure by Department
3. Detailed statement of Non-Operating Revenue and Expenditure

**Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   Not applicable

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   Not applicable

c. **Strategic**
   **Community Plan**
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 15:** Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. **Policy**
   Nil

e. **Financial**
   The overall effect of the various budget amendments is a small surplus of $66,473, however this is subject to any changes required to the opening position as a result of the audit process.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   Regulation 33A of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 requires local governments to undertake a budget review between 1 January and 31 March in each financial year. Within 30 days of the review being completed it is to be presented to Council. Council is to consider the review submitted and is to determine (by absolute majority) whether or not to adopt the review, any parts of the review or any recommendations made in the review. Within 30 days after Council has made a determination, a copy of the review and documentation is to be provided to the Department of Local Government.

**Comments**

The main amendments proposed in the Budget Review are summarised below.

Opening Position: The adopted budget was based on an opening surplus (including restricted funds) of $7.5 million however the unaudited position is $15.2 million. The main reasons for the larger than expected surplus is $0.6 million additional income, more carried forward funds for incomplete capital works of $4.7 million, savings on operating expenditure of $1.7 million and $0.6 million in non-cash and accrual adjustments.

Operating Revenue: Operating revenue has been increased by $1.5 million with the major change being the introduction of internal charges of $1.86 million to account for tip pass usage. Other changes include $0.7 million reduction in rate revenue to reflect the rates paid in advance last year, $0.67 million in additional grants from Lotteries West and National Black Spot funding.

Operating Expenditure: Operating expenditure has increased by $2.7 million being for the tip pass internal charges and an adjustment to the overhead allocation resulting from the Mundijong Road project. Reallocations have also been made to reflect the new Legal Services & General Counsel directorate and the handover of the Meals on Wheels program.

Non-Operating Expenditure: Capital Expenditure has increased by $4.9 million with the major changes being the payout of balloon payments on loans of $2.6 million in accordance with the Business Plan, $0.47 million for the Mandurah Rd additional Black Spot works, various adjustments
to carry over funds from last year and an additional $0.71 million for the cell construction at Millar Road Landfill.

**Cell 14 Liner**

The Adopted Budget included a provision of $1.45 million for the construction of Cell 14 with a clay liner at Millar Road Landfill Facility with the clay being sourced from the clay mud pits in East Baldivis. However, over the last three to five years a significant amount of research has been undertaken into the construction of landfill cells with synthetic, rather than clay liners.

Synthetic liners have been used in the Eastern States for a longer period of time, and more recently have been introduced into Western Australia. Prior to the construction of a new cell the City is required to seek a works approval through the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC). The City engaged Ian Watkins of IW Projects to prepare the design of the proposed Cell 14 and to submit a works approval to DEC. For improved protection and reduced environmental risks, he has recommended that Cell 14 be constructed using a synthetic liner, which complies with the DEC’s policy and is now recognised as “Best Practice” for cell construction.

Clay lining is a metre in thickness, compared to a synthetic liner being approximately 12 centimetres. Utilising this new methodology of construction will require an additional $0.71 million with a synthetic lined Cell costing $2.16 million; the additional costs are for a sloped base rather than flat base and using blue metal rather than sand to improve the leachate drainage system. However, with the reduction in the thickness of the liner (from clay to synthetic) an additional amount of almost 90 centimetres in air space is derived across the whole area of the cell. This extra space will derive additional income of approximately $1.4 million over the life of Cell. This method of construction is recommended as it is best practice and reduces risk considerably for the City, complies with DEC guidelines and provides the highest whole of life financial return for the City.

The $710,000 required for the cell construction is proposed to be funded by $460,000 from the opening surplus which can be attributed to additional income from landfill operations in 2011/12 and a reduction of $250,000 in the budgeted transfer to the Waste Reserve in 2012/13. The transfer to reserve will be monitored during future budget review processes and will be reinstated should funds become available in landfill operations.

Non-Operating Revenue: Non-operating revenue has decreased by $1.4 million which is mainly due to adjustments to transfers from reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council:
1. **ADOPT** the September 2012 Quarterly Budget Review; and
2. **AMEND** the budget accordingly.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council:
1. **ADOPT** the September 2012 Quarterly Budget Review; and
2. **AMEND** the budget accordingly.

Committee Voting – 4/0

**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable

**Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable
## Corporate and Engineering Services

### Corporate Services

**Reference No & Subject:** CS-034/12  
**Tender:** T12/13-44 – Period Debt Collection Services  
**File No:** T12/13-44  
**Proponent/s:** Ms Vanisha Govender, A/Manager Financial Service  
**Author:** Ms Toni Gumina, Senior Rates Officer  
**Other Contributors:** Mr John Pearson, Director Corporate Services  
**Date of Committee Meeting:** 23 October 2012  
**Previously before Council:**  
**Disclosure of Interest:**  
**Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:** Executive Function  
**Site:**  
**Lot Area:**  
**Attachments:**  
**Maps/Diagrams:**

### Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tender/s received for Tender T12/13-44 – Period Debt Collection Services, the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

### Background

Tender T12/13-44 – Period Debt Collection Services was advertised in The West Australian on Saturday, 8 September 2012. The tender closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 26 September 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

### Details

**Tender Summary:**

The type of works to be undertaken under the contract shall include:

- Debt collection for rate debtors
- Debt collection for sundry debtors.

The period of the contract shall be for 24 calendar months calculated from the date of award.

---

1 Title Engineering and Parks Services was incorrect in the Agenda, now correctly amended to Corporate Services
Tender submissions were received from:

- AMPAC Debt Recovery (WA) Pty Ltd
- Austral Mercantile Collections Pty Ltd
- The Arms Global Group Pty Ltd
- CS Legal
- Dun & Bradstreet (Australia) Pty Ltd

A panel comprising Director Corporate Services, A/Manager Financial Services and Senior Rates Officer undertook tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tender, in accordance with the advertised tender assessment criteria, produced the following weighted scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Austral Mercantile Collections Pty Ltd</th>
<th>AMPAC Debt Recovery</th>
<th>CS Legal</th>
<th>Dun &amp; Bradstreet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject to the mutual agreement of both the Principal and the Contractor, and with the absolute discretion of either party not to extend, the Contract may be extended for maximum of up to 24 additional calendar months, in periods not greater than 12 calendar months.

**Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   
   Not Applicable

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   
   Not Applicable

c. **Strategic**
   
   **Community Plan**

   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 15:** Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. **Policy**
   
   Purchasing Policy and Procurement Standard applies. To provide compliance with the Local Government Act 1995; Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, Regulation 11A(1).

e. **Financial**
   
   Expenditure of $360,000 has been allocated in the 2012/2013 budget account 210228.1539 for rates debtors and sundry debtors has an allocation of $5000 against GL 210042.1434.
f. **Legal and Statutory**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms Global Group Pty Ltd was not assessed as its tender was non-conforming. Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender criteria, all other companies demonstrated a capacity to complete the works, however, the submissions received from Pier Group Pty Ltd trading as CS Legal is considered the best value to the City and is therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Council <strong>ACCEPT</strong> the tender submitted from Pier Group Pty Ltd trading as CS Legal – Unit 11/56 Creaney Drive, Kingsley WA 6026 for Tender T12/13-44 – Period Debt Collection Services in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being for 24 calendar months calculated from the date of award.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Council <strong>ACCEPT</strong> the tender submitted from Pier Group Pty Ltd trading as CS Legal – Unit 11/56 Creaney Drive, Kingsley WA 6026 for Tender T12/13-44 – Period Debt Collection Services in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being for 24 calendar months calculated from the date of award.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Voting – 4/0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-035/12 Request for Rubbish Charges to be Waived – Lot 1786 Hymus Street, Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>RTV/1-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Crippled Children’s Home Society (Inc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms A Gumina, Senior Rates Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 1786 Hymus Street, Rockingham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Report**

To advise Council that a request has been received from the Alfred Hines Seaside Camp for Children seeking the donation of the annual cost of the rubbish/recycling charges.

**Background**

The Alfred Hines Seaside Camp for Children is administered by the Crippled Children’s Home Society (Inc), a non-profit, charitable organisation. The camp is situated at Lot 1786 Hymus Street, Rockingham. It is used primarily by children with a disability and their families, but is also used by sporting and hobby groups and educational institutions.

Council has previously approved the donation of the cost of rubbish charges for this organisation. At the April 2005 meeting it was resolved:

“That Council donates the sum of $864 from the Sundry Donations Account No 200592.1805 to the Alfred Hines Seaside Camp for Children, representing an amount equivalent to the cost of the Camp’s annual rubbish charges for the years 2004/05.”

At the December 2005 meeting of Council it was resolved to donate the rubbish charges on an annual basis thereafter.
Details

A letter dated 13 September 2012 has been received from Alfred Hines Seaside Camp for Children requesting the cost of the rubbish charges be donated once again as per Council’s December 2005 resolution.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not applicable

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   No applicable

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:

   **Aspiration 15:** Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. Policy
   Nil

e. Financial
   The total rubbish/recycling charges for the 2012/13 financial year are $2,712.00 and will need to be written off.

f. Legal and Statutory
   Section 6.12 of the Local Government Act 1995 underpins the power for a local government to defer, grant discounts, waive or write off debts.

Comments

The City now has the Community Grants Program (CGP) in place for organisations such as Alfred Hines Seaside Camp to access funding. The CGP replaces all previous grant types, donations and sponsorship requests.

The Community Grants Program has four key areas comprising travel donations, sundry donations, minor projects/events grants, and infrastructure planning and development grants. Applications for travel and sundry donations (amounts less than $500) can be applied for at any time. Minor project/event grants for amounts between $501 and $20,000 are advertised four times a year. Infrastructure Planning and Development grants are held over three rounds per financial year for funding requests up to $30,000. All application forms are available on the City’s website.

As the Crippled Children’s Seaside Homes has already paid its rubbish charges for 2012/13 and the current round for minor projects/events grants has closed, it is recommended that Council approve the donation of the rubbish/recycling charges for 2012/13, as it has done for the past seven years, but inform the Crippled Children’s Seaside Homes that in future it will need to make application through the Community Grants Program for such funding. The closing dates for the next minor project/events funding rounds are 14 December 2012 and 15 March 2013.

Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority
### Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the donation of the rubbish/recycling charges to Crippled Children’s Seaside Homes for 2012/13 for $2,712.00 for its property at Lot 1786 Hymus Street, Rockingham.

2. **WRITE OFF** rubbish/recycling charges totalling $2,712.00 for Lot 1786 Hymus Street, Rockingham (assessment number 248000) for the 2012/13 year.

3. **ADVISE** Crippled Children’s Seaside Homes that in future it will need to make application through the Community Grants Program for such funding.

### Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **APPROVE** the donation of the rubbish/recycling charges to Crippled Children’s Seaside Homes for 2012/13 for $2,712.00 for its property at Lot 1786 Hymus Street, Rockingham.

2. **WRITE OFF** rubbish/recycling charges totalling $2,712.00 for Lot 1786 Hymus Street, Rockingham (assessment number 248000) for the 2012/13 year.

3. **ADVISE** Crippled Children’s Seaside Homes that in future it will need to make application through the Community Grants Program for such funding.

Committee Voting – 4/0

### The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

### Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
Purpose of Report

To receive the monthly Financial Management Report for August 2012.

Background

Nil

Details

The monthly Financial Management Report includes the following:

1. Statement of Financial Activity by Program
2. Statement of Net Current Assets
3. Other schedules and charts for management information purposes.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not Applicable
b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Not Applicable
c. **Strategic**  
**Community Plan**  
This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

*Aspiration 15:* Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.

d. **Policy**  
Nil

e. **Financial**  
Major variances (above $250,000) between budget estimates and actual results for the month to which the statement relates are shown in the supporting documentation.

f. **Legal and Statutory**  

**Comments**

The numerous variances identified have been reviewed within the current budget review.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**


**Committee Recommendation**


Committee Voting – 4/0

**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable

**Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable
**Corporate and Engineering Services Governance and Councillor Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>GCS-015/12 Ordinary Local Government Elections 2013 and Extraordinary Elections and Polls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>GOV/10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Western Australian Electoral Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Peter Varris, Manager Governance and Councillor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>23 October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>19 October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Report**

Council consideration of appointing the Western Australian Electoral Commissioner to:

1. Conduct the ordinary local government election for the City of Rockingham in October 2013 together with any other elections or polls that may also be required; and
2. Conduct the ordinary local government election, other elections or polls by the postal ballot method.

**Background**

The Western Australian Electoral Commission (WAEC) has conducted the City’s elections by the postal ballot method since May 1999. Prior to that the elections were by the ‘in person’ method and the last election of that type was held in 1997 and attracted voter participation of 13.7%.

Since using postal elections the voter participation rate has averaged at 34.2% with the 2011 election participation rate at 30.9%.
The next ordinary local government election is scheduled for October 2013 and in order for the WAEC to commence planning it has requested that Council consider whether they wish to appoint the Electoral Commissioner to conduct the election by postal ballot.

If Council wish to pursue the option it needs to resolve to appoint the Electoral Commissioner to conduct the election, together with any other elections or polls required, and that the elections or polls be conducted as a postal election or poll.

The other elections required are any extraordinary elections created by the resignation of Councillors mid-term that can be held in conjunction with the ordinary election or polls that Council may decide to hold at the same time as the ordinary election.

A decision to appoint the Electoral Commissioner for the 2013 elections would not be affected by the current review of ward boundaries and Councillor representation with the exception of the number of elections required.

**Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Year</th>
<th>% Voter Participation</th>
<th>Election Year</th>
<th>% Voter Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implications to Consider**

a. Consultation with the Community
   Nil

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Liaison with WAEC will be ongoing leading up to the election in October 2013.

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-
   
   **Aspiration 15:** Governance systems that ensure decision making and resource allocation is accountable, participative and legally and ethically compliant.
   **Aspiration 16:** A Council which engages with all elements of the community in order to make decisions that respect Rockingham’s unique sense of place whilst positively contributing to its future prosperity.

d. Policy
   Nil

e. Financial
   The Electoral Commissioner has advised that the cost of conducting the 2013 ordinary local government elections for the City of Rockingham is $158,000 including GST. The appropriate allocation will be made in the 2013/14 budget.

f. Legal and Statutory
   In accordance with section 4.20(4) and section 4.61(1) and (2) of the Local Government Act 1995 – Appointment of Returning Officer and Choice of Method of Conducting Election. (Absolute Majority)
### Comments

The WAEC has conducted the City of Rockingham elections since 1999 with an increase in voter turnout, averaging at 34.2% voter participation rate.

### Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority

### Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **DECLARE**, in accordance with section 4.20(4) of the Local Government Act 1995, the Electoral Commissioner to be responsible for the conduct of the 2013 ordinary elections together with any other elections or polls which may be required; and

2. **APPROVE**, in accordance with section 4.61(2) of the Local Government Act 1995 that the method of conducting the election will be as a postal election.

### Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **DECLARE**, in accordance with section 4.20(4) of the Local Government Act 1995, the Electoral Commissioner to be responsible for the conduct of the 2013 ordinary elections together with any other elections or polls which may be required; and

2. **APPROVE**, in accordance with section 4.61(2) of the Local Government Act 1995 that the method of conducting the election will be as a postal election.

Committee Voting – 4/0

### The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

### Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
### Purpose of Report

To establish a clear Council position on funding priorities for both major political parties to consider in the lead up to the 2013 WA State Government Elections.

### Background

The State and Federal Parliaments are both heading into pre-election mode.

#### The Federal Parliament

The House of Representatives lasts for no more than three years after it first meets and after the House is dissolved it must reconvene within 140 days. The maximum period therefore between elections is three years and 140 days.

Given that the most recent Federal election was conducted on Saturday 21 August 2010, the last possible date for an election for the House of Representatives is Saturday 30 November 2013. The first possible date for a House of Representatives and half Senate election is Saturday 13 August, so one could assume that in normal circumstances we could anticipate an election around about September or October of 2013.

#### The State Parliament

Elections are required for both Houses at least once every four years. Legislation was enacted in November 2011 fixing the date of the State election on the second Saturday of March every four years. The date of the next election for both Houses of the State Parliament will therefore be Saturday 9 March 2013.
Historically, local candidates seek the views of Local Governments as to their priority projects and also matters of community concern.

In July 2012 a request was received from the Liberal Party of Australia candidate for the Federal Electorate of Brand Ms Donna Gordin as to major City projects or programs that require funding. A document containing details of four major proposals was produced and delivered to both Ms Gordin and the incumbent member for Brand, Hon Gary Gray AO, representing the Australian Labor Party.

The projects/programs advocated are as follows:

- Rockingham Youth Venue  
  $4 million requested  
  $6 million total cost

- Laurie Stanford Reserve Master Plan  
  $4 million requested  
  $6 million total cost

- Val Street Jetty Redevelopment  
  $3.5 million requested  
  $5.5 million total cost

- Safer Rockingham Project  
  $1 million requested  
  $1.4 million total cost

The document distributed to Messrs Gordin and Gray is attached.

---

**Details**

It is highly likely that the major political parties will commence high profile election promotional activity commencing early in 2013, probably after the Christmas festive season celebrations and holidays have concluded.

It is therefore important that the City is in a position to give very clear direction to the respective parties on priority projects and important community issues.

It is typically uncommon for State Governments to apply large scale funding for capital works that will accommodate Local Government activities such as buildings that will deliver library, recreation, youth services, etc.

The opportunity exists however to seek support for what are services traditionally delivered by the State, particularly in the areas of health, law and order, transport and education. The election lead up also provides a good opportunity to seek funds to provide supporting infrastructure, omitted when major projects have been undertaken by the State in the past.

---

**Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   Nil

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   Nil

c. **Strategic**
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 14:** Economic Development opportunities that make living, working and investing in the City of Rockingham an attractive proposition.

d. **Policy**
   Nil
e. **Financial**
   Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**
   Nil
**Comments**

The outcomes of this process will be used to underpin a lobbying campaign leading up to the next election.

The campaign will target both major parties principally with dialogue via Hon Mark McGowan, MLA, Leader of the Opposition and member for Rockingham, Paul Papalia, MLA, Member for Warnbro, Roger Cook, MLA, Member for Kwinana and the Hon Phil Edman, MLC, Rockingham based Southern Metropolitan Region, Member of the Legislative Council.

**Infrastructure required to support State Projects**

**Woodbridge Second Access**

To provide a second access into the Woodbridge estate, which since the construction of the Perth-Mandurah Railway, is only accessible via Elanora Drive. The proposed route was adopted by Council in September 2008 with support from relevant agencies, and is referred to as “Northern Route Option B”, and is described as starting at Dixon/Day Road, then running parallel to Darile Street through predominantly degraded open grassland, with a bridge over the rail line, then running parallel to Timberlane Loop and continuing around the back of the St John Ambulance Depot and Rockingham District Hospital to join up with Elanora Drive.

**Need:**

Justification for the second Woodbridge Access would set to benefit the Rockingham District Hospital and Woodbridge Estate and will:

- Minimise risk to hospital and residents being isolated during an emergency such as a bush fire
- Guarantee access to hospital at all times
- Reduce emergency response time, particularly from Kwinana
- Decrease traffic volumes on Elanora Drive minimising congestion and social impact
- Travel distance and time saved
- Preferred route minimises environmental issues

**Function:**

This two-way road would provide the estate with an alternate means of access/egress. There has been significant heightened public concern since the railway was constructed and the feeling by residents of being trapped in an emergency - be it fire in the Regional Park or a significant traffic accident that blocks Elanora Drive and Ennis Avenue. This concern has been exacerbated with the reliance following a significant upgrade on the Rockingham General Hospital.

**Dual Use Path – Safety Bay Road, Baldivis, Nairn Drive to Warnbro Train Station**

To provide a safe protected dual use path connecting the Warnbro Train Station and the fast growing suburb of Baldivis, and to provide residents with greater accessibility. The bus connections to/from the station are limited. The link is 4.6km in length with 2.3km of this running adjacent to a regional park. The traffic speed along Safety Bay Road is 80km/per hour with an average daily traffic volume of over 30,000 vehicles. The path will be built at a width of 2.5m to enable a mix of commuting cyclists and pedestrians. Currently cyclists need to use the road and there are no facilities at all for pedestrians. This link has been identified in the WA Bike Network Plan as a missing strategic link, the East-West link would be built on the southern side of Safety Bay Road and will be challenging to build due to the adjacent terrain and wetlands.

**Need:**

Justification for the Safety Bay Road Dual Use Path:

- Cyclist and Pedestrian Safety
- Improve access to Warnbro Station
- Improve health and lifestyle
- Numerous written complaints received
- Reduce the number of cars parking at the overflowing Warnbro Station Car Park
- Will also provide a link to the Baldivis District Centre which has community facilities and a shopping precinct
- Missing strategic link
- Public transport services to Baldivis are limited

Function:
To provide a safe alternate to travelling by car and provide a connection from Baldivis to the Railway network and improve the integration of the limited public transport services.

Education Issues
Golden Bay Primary School
The Golden Bay Primary School was initially identified within the initial Golden Bay Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) in 1994 to accommodate projected population growth within the area. In early 2010 the City approved a change to this CDP to allow subdivision of the ‘Stage One Primary School Precinct’. This change, and the related subdivision application, was lodged following a request by the Department of Education to create the primary school site to alleviate pressure on the Comet Bay and Singleton Primary Schools. The change was supported in good faith given the City’s awareness that the Department of Housing had commenced a full review and update of the CDP. The Stage One subdivision approval was granted by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) in April 2010.

Despite a large number of the 151 residential lots within this Precinct having now been developed there is still no timeframe for construction of the Golden Bay Primary School. Continued growth in the suburbs of Secret Harbour, Golden Bay and Singleton has seen the local population expand to nearly 18,000 placing even greater pressure on existing primary schools. Comet Bay Primary School currently has 1028 students\(^2\), Secret Harbour PS currently has 707 students and Singleton PS currently has 766 students, and the creation of a further 2,200 lots within the Department of Housing’s updated CDP will significantly worsen the current situation.

This population growth has also placed further demands on community infrastructure, and in particular, the provision of public open space with capacity to accommodate structured sport and recreation activities. The Golden Bay Primary School is identified as a shared-use reserve and the City has allocated funds within its Business Plan to contribute towards construction of a playing field. Given the shared nature of this facility its delivery is impacted by delays to the primary school. The primary school site forms part of the updated CDP approved by the WAPC in April 2012, and the Department of Education has completed its due diligence and acquired the site, so there are no impediments to the construction of Golden Bay Primary School.

Law and Order Issues
Safer Rockingham Community Safety Project
The City is aiming to achieve a safer community where residents feel secure, relaxed and comfortable in their homes, work and social environments. Through consultation the community has identified community safety to be a priority aspiration for Council to focus on.

The City’s Community Safety Team comprises four teams who work closely together in:
- Crime Prevention and Community Safety
- Emergency Services
- Ranger Services
- Security Support Services

The City acknowledges the important role in complementing the work of Police and partner agencies to reduce and prevent criminal offences and meet community safety objectives. This collaborative approach also helps to foster an informed perception of local crime. Empowering

\(^2\) Report has been amended by adding further information about the number of students at Comet Bay Primary School.
people to feel safe assists in building and strengthening the community to prevent community harm and enhance quality of life.

Priorities of the City include promoting community ownership of crime issues, prevention and reduction strategies, keeping people safe, tackling anti-social behaviour and building harmonious communities.

Residents have rated feeling safe in their environment to be of high level of importance to them in community places and in their homes. There is a link between feelings of community safety, community pride and physical and mental health and wellbeing.

Project Justification:

The City is working towards an enhanced perception of safety in the community and enhanced levels of community and stakeholder engagement. Ultimately we would like to see an effective reduction in levels of anti-social behaviour through the delivery of focussed initiatives on knowledge sharing and the strengthening of relationships.

Expanding on technologies and resources to increase efficiency and effectiveness in daily duties will be an increasingly important priority in delivering community safety initiatives.

We see the value in providing additional support for local action groups and the like who are resilient and remain committed to continual development of new and old relationships within the community and provide targeted responses in their neighbourhood.

The City is focussed on criminal offence reduction through surveillance and monitoring, design and education, we are focusing on reducing anti-social behaviour, graffiti vandalism, assaults and violence, residential burglaries and vehicle related crime.

**Mangles Bay Marina**

Council endorsed the project based upon the following objectives and outcomes:

**Social Objectives:**
- Creation of a world class regional asset that is responsive to community values.
- Development of a shared vision that reflects local heritage, culture and visual amenity of the area.
- Improved marine, tourist and public recreational facilities.
- Create an active and vibrant community with a mix of commercial, tourist and residential product.
- Provision of a high quality public open space and pedestrian friendly access to the beachfront and Cape area.

**Environmental Objectives:**
- Create a development that respects the area’s marine and land environment.
- Provide a net increase in the area of seagrass in Cockburn Sound.
- Improve management of the surrounding land and marine environments.
- Provide passive recreation facilities to enhance visitor experience and protect the natural values of Cape Peron.
- Include a financial commitment to more than offset any environmental impact to the land, primarily through the rehabilitation of degraded areas in the surrounding Cape Peron bushland.

**Economic Objectives:**
- Creation of a vibrant tourist district that will increase activity in the area and attract visitors to the region.
- Creation of sustainable employment opportunities for Rockingham and the surrounding area.
- Commercial/recreational opportunities.
- Provision of facilities for an already thriving marine eco-tourism industry.
- Development of a financially viable project.
Project Commitments:
- A tourism hub including restaurants, cafes and short term accommodation.
- Opening up the beach along Mangles Bay to public access.
- Construction of a dual use path along the length of the beachfront to the causeway.
- Affordable family holiday accommodation with beachfront access.
- A site for boating clubs, on a non-commercial leasehold basis, with marina frontage and beach access.
- A seabed lease in the marina and adjoining the boating clubs in which they can build pens and lease them to members.
- Room for 500 pens.
- Commercial pens to be provided in the public tourist area for commercial charter operators.
- Remediation and enhancement of the balance of Cape Peron.
- A site for a Marine Science Centre.
- Realignment of the Water Corporation’s service corridor.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ENDORSE** the following projects as key priorities for consideration by both major political parties leading up to the 2013 State Election.
- Mangles Bay Marina – to be delivered as per the pre-defined original social, environmental and economic objectives and commitments.
- Woodbridge Second Access.
- Dual use pedestrian access between Baldivis Town Centre and Warnbro Station.
- Funding contribution to the Safer Rockingham Community Safety Project.
- Construction of the Golden Bay Primary School.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ENDORSE** the following projects as key priorities for consideration by both major political parties leading up to the 2013 State Election.
- Mangles Bay Marina – to be delivered as per the pre-defined original social, environmental and economic objectives and commitments.
- Woodbridge Second Access.
- Dual use pedestrian access between Baldivis Town Centre and Warnbro Station.
- Funding contribution to the Safer Rockingham Community Safety Project.
- Construction of the Golden Bay Primary School.

Committee Voting – 4/0

**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable

**Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not applicable
Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-36 – Rae Road, Rockingham – Landscaping and Irrigation Works, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

Background

Tender T12/13-36 – Rae Road, Rockingham – Landscaping and Irrigation Works was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 1 September 2012. The tender closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 19 September 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

Details

Tender submissions were received from:
CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 2012

PRESIDING MEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Lump Sum Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frogmat Environmental (Australasia) Pty Ltd (Alternate Tender)</td>
<td>$122,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frogmat Environmental (Australasia) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$151,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthcare Landscapes</td>
<td>$156,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Industries Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$158,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Systems Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$195,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Horticultural Technical Officer - Design, Irrigation Assets Officer and Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

An alternative tender was received from Frogmat Environmental (Australasia) Pty Ltd to supply 45 litre trees instead of 75 litre trees, as specified in the tender document. The assessment panel considered the alternate submission and concluded that 75 litre trees would provide a better landscaping impact than the 45 litre trees and therefore the alternate submission was not considered, as it did not meet the tender requirements.

Evaluation of the tender, in accordance with the advertised tender assessment criteria, produced the following weighted scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Frogmat Environmental</th>
<th>Environmental Industries</th>
<th>Earthcare Landscapes Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Landscape Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderers Resources &amp; Delivery/Availability</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implications to Consider**

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not Applicable

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Not Applicable

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 6:** Civic buildings, public places and transport infrastructure of contemporary design, constructed and maintained using best practice principles.
d. **Policy**

Purchasing policy and Procurement Standard applies. To provide compliance with the Local Government Act 1995; Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, Regulation 11A(1).

e. **Financial**

An amount of $200,000 has been allocated for the landscaping of Rae Road in the 2012/2013 Budget – W21434.3103.

f. **Legal and Statutory**


### Comments

Frogmat Environmental have successfully delivered projects for the City such as T09/10-103 Relining of Lake and Landscaping at Amadeus Crescent Reserve, Port Kennedy and T10/11-24 - Waikiki Foreshore Development - Landscape Works. The company demonstrated their capability to deliver each project within the set timeframe and within the respective budget.

Following consideration of the conforming tender submissions in accordance with the tender criteria all companies demonstrated a capacity to complete the works, however, the submission received from Frogmat Environmental is considered to represent best value to the City and are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer.

### Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

#### Officer Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Frogmat Environmental, 2/15 Blackly Row, Cockburn Central, WA 6164, for Tender T12/13-36 – Rae Road, Rockingham – Landscaping and Irrigation Works in accordance with the tender documentation for the lump sum value of $151,616 excluding GST.

#### Committee Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Frogmat Environmental, 2/15 Blackly Row, Cockburn Central, WA 6164, for Tender T12/13-36 – Rae Road, Rockingham – Landscaping and Irrigation Works in accordance with the tender documentation for the lump sum value of $151,616 excluding GST.

Committee Voting – 4/0

#### The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

#### Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
Corporate and Engineering Services
Engineering and Parks Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-078/12 Tender T12/13-33 – Supply, delivery and licensing of two tandem axle side loading refuse trucks with optional trade of the City’s existing side loading refuse truck RO 65 and / or outright purchase of City’s existing side loading refuse truck RO 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>T12/13-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Paul Molony, Waste Services Coordinator Mr Graham Rose, Manager Waste and Landfill Services Mr Glen Zilko, Coordinator Fleet Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-33 – Supply, delivery and licensing of two tandem axle side loading refuse trucks with optional trade of the City’s existing side loading refuse truck RO 65 and / or outright purchase of City’s existing side loading refuse truck RO 65 and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

Background

Tender T12/13-33 - Supply, delivery and licensing of two tandem axle side loading refuse trucks with optional trade of the City’s existing side loading refuse truck RO 65 and / or outright purchase of City’s existing side loading refuse truck RO 65 was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 04 August 2012. The tender closed at 2.00pm Wednesday, 22 August 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after closing time.
## Details

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Price for Supply, Delivery and Licencing of Two Tandem Axle Side Loading Refuse Trucks Excluding GST</th>
<th>Trade In Value for the City’s existing Side Loading Refuse Truck RO65 Excluding GST</th>
<th>Total Cost Change-Over Excluding GST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA Iveco (Iveco Acco – Superior Pac)</td>
<td>$657,940</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$607,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Truck Services Pty Ltd (Dennis Eagle – Superior Pack)</td>
<td>$683,158</td>
<td>$72,727</td>
<td>$610,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Truck Services Pty Ltd (Dennis Eagle - MacDonald Johnston)</td>
<td>$733,970</td>
<td>$72,727</td>
<td>$661,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Motors Pty Ltd (Isuzu - Superior Pak)</td>
<td>$741,680</td>
<td>$63,636</td>
<td>$678,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald Johnston (Body Only) NON CONFORMING</td>
<td>$171,800</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$171,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising of the City’s Manager Waste Services, Waste Services Coordinator and Coordinator Fleet Services undertook tender evaluations.

Evaluation of the tender, in accordance with the advertised tender assessment criteria, produced the following weighted scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>WA Iveco Acco Superior Pak</th>
<th>AV Truck Service Superior Pak</th>
<th>AV Truck Service MacDonald Johnston</th>
<th>Major Motors Superior Pac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implications to Consider

a. **Consultation with the Community**
   - Not Applicable

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**
   - Not Applicable
c. **Strategic**  
**Community Plan**  
This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:—  

**Aspiration 12:** Carbon footprint reduction and waste minimisation programs centred upon public awareness and the use of new technologies.

d. **Policy**  
Purchasing policy and Procurement Standard applies. To provide compliance with the Local Government Act 1995; Section 3.57 and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, Regulation 11A(1).

e. **Financial**  
Expenditure of $795,000 ($380,000 and $415,000) has been allocated for the purchase of two new side loading refuse trucks in the 2012/2013 budget account (GL 413356.1 and GL 413358.1) – Plant and Equipment Purchases with an estimate trade in value for the City’s existing refuse truck RO65 of $40,000.

f. **Legal and Statutory**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No tender submissions for the outright purchase of the City’s existing side loading refuse compactor unit RO65 were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald Johnston’s tender submission was for supply of compactor body only and was therefore not evaluated, as it was non-conforming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Officers undertook test drives and mechanical assessments of available truck cab chassis and side loading compactor units in accordance with the advertised tender selection criteria, performance and experience of tenderer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following assessment of the submissions received including the above mechanical and operating assessments being undertaken, the assessment panel considered that the tender submission received from WA Iveco for the supply delivery and licencing with the optional trade of the City’s existing side loading refuse truck represents best value for money to the City. Therefore WA Iveco is recommended as the preferred tenderer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing refuse truck RO65 will not be released until delivery of the new side loading refuse trucks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That Council <strong>ACCEPT</strong> the tender submitted from WA Iveco 268 Great Eastern Highway, Belmont, for Tender T12/13-33 for the supply, delivery and licensing of two side loading refuse trucks fitted with the 24 cubic metre Superior Pak side loading compactor for a total cost of $657,940 excluding GST, with the optional trade-in of the City’s existing side loading refuse truck RO65 for $50,000 excluding GST resulting in a net change over of ($657,940 - $50,000) $607,940 in accordance with the tender documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Committee Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from WA Iveco 268 Great Eastern Highway, Belmont, for Tender T12/13-33 for the supply, delivery and licensing of two side loading refuse trucks fitted with the 24 cubic metre Superior Pak side loading compactor for a total cost of $657,940 excluding GST, with the optional trade-in of the City’s existing side loading refuse truck RO65 for $50,000 excluding GST resulting in a net change over of ($657,940 - $50,000) $607,940 in accordance with the tender documentation.

Committee Voting – 4/0

## The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

## Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
13. **Reports of Councillors**

   Nil

14. **Addendum Agenda**

   Nil

15. **Motions of which Previous Notice has been given**

### Engineering and Parks Services

#### Corporate and Engineering Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-075/12 Notice of Motion from Cr Hill – Consideration on the use of contemporary synthetic turf products in public places such as road verges, recreation reserves and areas in the general public domain.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>RDS/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Cr Allan Hill, OAM JP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr James Henson, Manager Parks Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Scott Lambie, A/Manager Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>Image of a Synthetic Turf Sports Field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of Report

To provide Officer comment and advice on Cr Hill’s Notice of Motion.

Background

Cr Hill submitted the following motion for consideration at the Ordinary Council Meeting in August 2012:

“That Council DIRECT the Chief Executive Officer to submit a report for Council consideration on the use of contemporary synthetic turf products in public places such as road verges, recreation reserves and areas in the general public domain.”

Due to Cr Hill being unable to attend the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee meeting held on 18 September 2012, the Committee moved:

“That consideration of item EP-075/12 – Notice of Motion from Cr Hill – Consideration on the use of contemporary synthetic turf products in public places such as road verges, recreation reserves and areas in the general public domain be deferred until the October meeting of the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee.”

Details

Synthetic turf was first invented in the mid 1960’s in the United States of America; it originally came into existence in the market place to replace natural grass that had difficulty growing in indoor stadiums.

Natural Grass – natural grass refers to any natural turf species used for sports ground construction i.e. Kikuyu, Couch and Rye grass.

Synthetic Turf – refers to any artificial turf surface used in sports ground construction including unfilled, sand or rubber filled and water-based surfaces.

The popularity of synthetic turf grew steadily during the 1970’s and 1980’s, with most of its use in professional sports arenas, however, complaints about the surfacing began to unfold suggesting the harder surface increased the chance of injury.

The movement against synthetic turf gained momentum, and many of the artificial surfaces were returned to natural grass.

In the mid 1990 improvements in the design and application of the synthetic turf has seen the introduction of a blended polyethylene–polypropylene material woven to simulate blades of grass. The “grass” is held upright and given some cushioning by adding a layer of infill made of recycled tyres, (rubber particles 3 mm in diameter or smaller). This crumb rubber infill is sometimes mixed with coarse siliceous sand.

Despite the relatively recent development of the new-generation synthetic turf, unanswered questions regarding its potential effects on health and the environment have been raised by a number of worldwide public health organisations.
There is a school of thought that suggests the crumbs become airborne which may be inhaled and tracked into homes on sports gear. There are also questions about the allergic and ingestion affects; notwithstanding the unknown ecological impacts.

Natural grass will potentially last forever providing it is maintained properly. It does require a lot more maintenance than its synthetic alternative, with regular mowing, fertilising, watering and weed control needed.

A quality synthetic turf has a life of around 15 years in a landscape setting before requiring replacement. Synthetic turf can be extremely hardwearing under normal use, with many brands carrying a 7-10 year guarantee. Synthetic turf isn’t completely maintenance free though - it requires washing, brushing, grooming and refilling of sand fines regularly to keep the grass blades standing upright.

Natural grass is up to 15°C cooler on a hot day in comparison to hard surfaces and can help ameliorate the surrounding environment. Research has shown that a front natural lawn cools the environment equivalent to 4 evaporative air conditioners.

While Synthetic turf in a residential environment does not require as much water as a well maintained natural lawn, it does not provide natural filtration of rain into the soil, instead requiring the need for additional drainage to be installed within the verge to capture the run off. Synthetic turf does not have any post installation benefits such as helping reduce greenhouse gases such as Co2, Co and So2 plus many other pollutants. 100 square metres of natural lawn emits enough oxygen throughout the day for a family of four.

Synthetic grass will cost between $80 - $110 per square metre to supply and install including base preparation but not including drainage costs. Natural lawn will cost around $25 per square metre to supply and install depending on base preparation.

Once installed, synthetic turf potentially costs very little to maintain after it has been installed, whereas natural grass will have higher ongoing costs. It is generally accepted that the initial investment of synthetic grass can become cost neutral after 10 years when compared to natural lawn. The use of synthetic turf treatments within the public domain (reserves, verges etc) however, are more likely to be exposed to heavy usage, vandalism and accidental damage, reducing the serviceable life of the product. This therefore increases the likelihood of some synthetic turf treatment being less economic to natural lawn.

### Implications to Consider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Consultation with the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.</th>
<th>Consultation with Government Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c.</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 2:** A safe community where residents feel secure, relaxed and comfortable within their home, work and social environments.

**Aspiration 6:** Civic buildings, public places and transport infrastructure of contemporary design, constructed and maintained using best practice principles

**Aspiration 13:** A community that is welcoming and desirable in the eyes of residents and non-residents alike.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d.</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Engineering Policy No PE1 Street Verge Development
e. Financial

The potential financial implications are difficult to quantify due to the number of variables to consider. However, it should be noted that with a typical synthetic turf verge treatment likely to cost upwards of $6000, significant extra costs to road / footpath projects could be experienced if the City was required to replace the product when “making good”.

Advice from service authorities also suggests they will not replace synthetic turf on verges which may also have a cost implication for the City if restoration is required.

f. Legal and Statutory

Legal requirements for verge treatments are covered within “Activities in Thoroughfares and Public Places and Trading Local Law 2001, Subdivision 2 – Permissible verge treatments”.

Comments

Public utilities such as Telstra and Western Power need to have unrestricted access to verge areas, and they have indicated that they will not replace artificial turf as part of their reinstatement process. They would simply cut it and work through the channel they require, and unlike lawn which will regrow over time, loose flaps of synthetic turf could pose a potential trip hazard.

There are concerns with the long term effects of rubbish bins being put out on an artificial turf verge, and any damage that could be caused by the City’s trucks dropping bins back onto fitted turf. The use of heavy machinery by the City for pruning verge trees for maintenance and under power line maintenance could also easily cause damage to an artificial turf surface.

Similar issues could also be encountered with footpath installation or reinstatements where bus stop seats and bus shelters get placed on a verge with artificial turf. The replacement of the synthetic turf could add significant additional cost to these projects.

It has also been noted in some areas where anti-social driving activities, such as burnouts have occurred on synthetic turf, where the tyres have burnt the surface, leaving a long black mark which is non-removable. It is also likely that should the turf not be affixed properly, it may cause a roll up or ripple type effect due to being torn from its fixings, or stretched during the event.

In addition, the lack of comprehensive research on the human health effects of exposure to the constituents of synthetic turf restricts the ability to make that choice with any degree of confidence. On the basis of the limited toxicity data, some reports have concluded the health risks are minimal. Most agree, however, that far more research is needed before the question can be definitively answered. Synthetic turf located within a verge environment is more likely to be exposed to animal faeces and vehicle emitted pollutants. There have also been concerns raised relating to carcinogenic material used in the manufacture of the product, and resulting possibilities of cancer through exposure.

It is therefore recommended that until sufficient supporting information becomes available which confirms the safety of the product any proposal to substitute natural grass with a synthetic replacement should be deferred.

It has also been noted that the “West Australian” reported on 18 September 2012 that the Towns of Claremont and Victoria Park had both recently considered the use of artificial turf and both Council’s supported the ban of the product due to environmental reasons.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council **NOT SUPPORT** the use of contemporary synthetic turf products in public places such as road verges, recreation reserves and areas in the general public domain until such time that the safety and validity of synthetic turf products can be assured.
## Motion from Cr Hill

That Council **DIRECT** the Chief Executive Officer to submit a report for Council consideration on the use of contemporary synthetic turf products in public places such as road verges, recreation reserves and areas in the general public domain.

## Committee Recommendation

That Council **NOT SUPPORT** the use of contemporary synthetic turf products in public places such as road verges, recreation reserves and areas in the general public domain until such time that the safety and validity of synthetic turf products can be assured.

Committee Voting – 4/0

## The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

## Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
16. **Notices of motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting**
   Nil

17. **Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee**
   Nil

18. **Matters Behind Closed Doors**
   Nil

19. **Date and Time of Next Meeting**
   The next Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting will be held on **Tuesday 20 November 2012** in the Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The meeting will commence at 4:00pm.

20. **Closure**
   There being no further business, the Chairperson thanked those persons present for attending the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee meeting, and declared the meeting closed at **4:20pm**.