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## Declaration of Opening

The Chairperson declared the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting open at **4:04pm** and welcomed all present.

## Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Councillors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cr Barry Sammels</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Lorraine Dunkling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Deb Hamblin</td>
<td>Deputising for Cr Allan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Chris Elliott</td>
<td>Deputising for Cr Ron Pease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2 Executive</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Pearson</td>
<td>A/Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson</td>
<td>Director Engineering and Parks Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Woodhouse</td>
<td>Director Legal Services and General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Scott Lambie</td>
<td>A/Manager Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kelton Hincks</td>
<td>Manager Asset Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr James Henson</td>
<td>Manager Parks Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Cadell Buss</td>
<td>Manager Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Ben Searcy</td>
<td>Manager Human Resource Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Karin Strachan</td>
<td>Manager Strategy Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Vanisha Govender</td>
<td>A/Manager Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Peter Varris</td>
<td>Manager Governance and Councillor Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members of the Public:** Nil

**Press:** 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3 Apologies:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cr Allan Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr Ron Pease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.4 Approved Leave of Absence: | Nil |

## Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice

Nil
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Public Question Time</strong></td>
<td><strong>5. Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05pm The Chairperson invited members of the Public Gallery to ask questions. There were none.</td>
<td>Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Elliott: That Council <strong>CONFIRM</strong> the Minutes of the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting held on 21 August 2012, as a true and accurate record. Committee Voting – 4/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6. Matters Arising from the Previous Corporate and Engineering Services Committee Meeting Minutes</strong></th>
<th><strong>7. Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4:06pm 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>8. Declarations of Members and Officers Interests</strong></th>
<th><strong>9. Petitions/Deputations/Presentations/Submissions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:06pm The Chairperson asked if there were any interests to declare. There were none.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>10. Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:06pm The Chairperson advised in accordance with section 5.23(2)(a)(b) and (c) of the Local Government Act 1995 – if there were any questions or debate on Confidential Item GCS-011/12 – Nomination for Honorary Freeman of the City of Rockingham, then the Committee will need to go behind closed doors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFIDENTIAL ITEM
NOT FOR PUBLIC ACCESS
Section 5.95(3) Local Government Act 1995 (the Act)
This item may be discussed behind closed doors as per Section 5.23(2)(b) of the Act

### Corporate and Engineering Services Governance and Councillor Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>GCS-011/12 Nomination for Honorary Freeman of the City of Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>COM/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Cr Allan Hill, OAM JP</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>18 September 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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority – In accordance with the intent of the Council Policy.

### Cr Hill’s Nomination

That Council:

1. ACCEPT the submitted nominee for the title of ‘Honorary Freeman of the City of Rockingham’; and
2. WITHHOLD the release of the successful nominee’s name until the nominee is formally advised by the Mayor.
## Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. **ACCEPT** the submitted nominee for the title of ‘Honorary Freeman of the City of Rockingham’; and
2. **WITHHOLD** the release of the successful nominee’s name until the nominee is formally advised by the Mayor.

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
11. **Bulletin Items**

**Corporate and General Management Services Information Bulletin – September 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 SAN/NAS Disk for Data Growth
   - 3.10 Building Licence Software
   - 3.11 Civil Drainage Software
   - 3.12 Authority 4J’s Licence
   - 3.13 VM Licencing
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Change of Basis of Rates
   - 4.2 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 National Sea Change Taskforce Newsletter
   - 4.2 Regional Susidiaries – Local Government Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012

**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
   - 4.1 Enterprise Agreement

**Economic Development**
1. Economic Development Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Leadership Forum
   - 3.2 Collateral Print and Distribution Audit
   - 3.3 Social Media
3.4 Tourism Strategy
3.5 Global Friendship

4. Information Items
4.1 Film Applications
4.2 City of Rockingham Website
4.3 City of Rockingham – Economy ID
4.4 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
   4.12 Other initiatives that the Strategy Coordination team is involved with

**Committee Recommendation**

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

Committee Voting – 4/0

**Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – September 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
   4.9 Mundijong Road Extension (Auslink Funded)
**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 Federal Black Spot 2012/13
   4.5 Road Construction Program State Black Spot 2012/13
   4.6 Road Construction Program Municipal Works 2012/13
   4.7 Road Renewal Program Municipal Works 2012/13
   4.8 Road Resurfacing Program Municipal Works 2012/13
   4.9 Footpath Construction Program Municipal Works 2012/13
   4.10 Road Maintenance Program 2012/13
   4.11 Passenger Vehicle Fleet Program 2012/13
   4.12 Light Commercial Vehicles Program 2012/13
   4.13 Heavy Plant Program 2012/13

**Parks Development**
1. Parks Services 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 Kent Street Community Arts Centre Landscape Project
   4.3 Lake Richmond Heritage Listing
   4.4 Rockingham Foreshore Strategy
   4.5 Delegated Subdivision Public Open Space Handovers
   4.6 Delegated Public Open Space Approvals
   4.7 Memorial Seat Approvals

**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

**Capital Projects**
1. 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 Aquatic Centre – Renewal of Toilets/Unisex/Change Rooms
   4.11 Baldivis Library - Design
   4.12 Aqua jetty – Solar Heating
   4.13 Baldivis Old School - Redevelopment
   4.14 Hymus Street Coastal Protection
   4.15 Repair Rock Armour at Various Boat Launching Facilities
   4.16 Challenger Court Electrical System Upgrade
   4.17 Aqua Jetty Swimming Club Office
   4.18 Secret Harbour Surf Life Saving Club – Renovation
   4.19 Baldivis Oval - Floodlighting

**Waste & Landfill Services**
1. Waste & 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
### Committee Recommendation

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

Committee Voting – 4/0
12. Agenda Items

Corporate Services

Corporate and Engineering Services

Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>CS-031/12 Application for Rating Exemption – 21 Beale Way, Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>RTV/1-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>South Metropolitan Youth Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms A Gumina, Senior Rates Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>18 September 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>21 Beale Way, Rockingham</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

To seek Council’s approval to grant a rating exemption to South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc.

Background

Correspondence has been received from South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc. seeking a rating exemption on a property it owns that is being used to run a number of early intervention programs for young people who have offended or are at risk of offending.

Details

The following documents have been received from South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc.:

1. Constitution of South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc.
2. Certificate of Incorporation
3. Endorsement as a deductible gift recipient.
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 total rates levied for the 2012/13 financial year are $4,442.01 and will need to be written off if Council approves the rating exemption.

f. Legal and Statutory
   Under Section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995, land used exclusively for charitable services is not rateable land.

Comments

A legal opinion has previously been obtained as to whether the South Metropolitan Youth Link (SMYL) Inc. is entitled to a rate exemption on a property at 32 Telsa Road, Rockingham. Pursuant to Section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act, a rate exemption was granted to SMYL on 23 November 2010 for that property. It has now purchased a further property at 21 Beale Way, Rockingham which is being used to undertake the same programs as the Tesla Road property.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. APPROVE the rating exemption on 21 Beale Way, Rockingham (assessment number 349184) owned by the South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc. effective from 1 July 2012 as it is non rateable pursuant to section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995.

2. WRITE OFF rates totalling $4,442.01 on 21 Beale Way, Rockingham (assessment number 349184) for the 2012/13 financial year.

Committee Recommendation

That Council:

1. APPROVE the rating exemption on 21 Beale Way, Rockingham (assessment number 349184) owned by the South Metropolitan Youth Link Inc. effective from 1 July 2012 as it is non rateable pursuant to section 6.26(2)(g) of the Local Government Act 1995.

2. WRITE OFF rates totalling $4,442.01 on 21 Beale Way, Rockingham (assessment number 349184) for the 2012/13 financial year.

Committee Voting – 4/0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of Report

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
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PRESIDING MEMBER

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
General Management Services

Reference No & Subject: GCS-012/12 Advisory Committee Community Review and Appointments

File No: GOV/39

Proponent/s: Mr Peter Varris, Manager Governance and Councillor Support

Author: Ms Jelette Edwards, Governance Coordinator

Other Contributors: Mr Philip Yap, Engineering Technical Officer
Mr Cadell Buss, Manager Economic Development
Mr Gary Rogers, Manager Projects and Procurement
Mr Scott Lambie, Acting Manager Engineering Services

Date of Committee Meeting: 18 September 2012

Previously before Council:

Disclosure of Interest: Executive Function

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

Site:  
Lot Area:  
Attachments:  
Maps/Diagrams:  

Purpose of Report

To consider nominations from community members / representatives for appointment on various Advisory Committees reporting through the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee.

Background

Advisory Committees comprise of Councillors, community members and representatives of organisations. They provide recommendations to Council in accordance with their respective terms of reference. Councillor membership of Advisory Committees is determined after each Council ordinary election with the last appointments made in at the Special Council meeting of 17 October 2011. In accordance with Council’s ‘Governance and Meeting Framework’ policy the City is to review the community membership of all Advisory Committees between 1 July and 30 September in the year falling between Council ordinary elections with all new membership proposals being considered by Council no later than the October ordinary Council meeting of that year, in this case 2012.
The policy requires that the Advisory Committee community member positions to be advertised in the local media and that existing members be written to and invited to reapply.

**Details**

To facilitate the process to review and appoint Advisory Committee community members, advertisements seeking nominations were published in the Weekend Courier on 6 July 2012 and the Sound Telegraph on 11 July 2012. The City also called for nominations on the City’s website and through various social media platforms. The Executive Support Officers for each Advisory Committee also wrote to the existing membership inviting them to renominate and the Mayor took the opportunity to remind those in attendance of the nomination process at the Civic Reception for Advisory Committee community members held on the 18 July 2012.

Nominations closed at 4pm Friday 27 July 2012 and late nominations have been accepted where insufficient nominations have been received to fill the specified number of positions.

The review process has also identified a number of issues relating to Advisory Committees. These include the need to review terms of reference and / or the relevance of the Advisory Committee, the number of community members and whether the community member represents a community or special interest group.

**Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   Nominations for community membership of Advisory Committees were invited through advertisements in the local newspapers, the City’s website and social media platforms. Letters were also sent to existing community members.

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 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**

   Council Policy ‘Governance and Meeting Framework’ underpins the review and appointment of community membership of Advisory Committees.

e. **Financial**

   The financial implications of the review and appointment of community members to Advisory Committees is limited to the cost of advertising and officer time in undertaking the review. Costs will be accommodated within existing budget allocations.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

   Sections 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10 of the Local Government Act 1995 specifies legislative matters in respect to committees and the appointment of committee members.

**Comments**

The following information provides the background on each Advisory Committee, the nominations for community membership received and any other matters arising in respect function of the respective Advisory Committee:
Australia Day Awards Selection Panel

Terms of Reference
To select persons for Australia Day Awards from nominations received.

Current Membership
2 Councillors (1 Deputy)
3 Community Representatives
- Mary Davies
- Eileen Frith
Executive Support – Manager Governance and Councillor Support

Number of Vacancies
Nil

Community Membership Nominations Received
Nil

Recommendation
That Council
1. APPOINT the following community representatives to the Australia Day Awards Selection Panel for a two-year term of office commencing 25 September 2012:
   - Mary Davies
   - Eileen Frith
2. AMEND the Australia Day Awards Selection Panel composition from 3 community representatives to the 2 Freeman of the City of Rockingham.

Comments
The composition of the Australia Day Awards Selection Panel will be amended to reflect its current composition.

Disability Access Advisory Committee

Terms of Reference
To collate Council’s Disability Services Plan for the improvement of accessibility to Council facilities and services for people with disabilities of all kinds.

Current Membership
2 Councillors (1 Deputy)
8 Community Members
- Ms Joanne Bamford
- Ms Helen Makeham
- Mr Craig Johnston
- Mr Bryan Pickering
- Ms Hayley Briene
- Ms Suzanne Marshall
- Ms Sheila Morris
- Mrs Valerie Gillian

Number of Vacancies
13 Community Representatives

Community Membership Nominations Received
- Natalie Hatton
- Marija Nelson
Recommendation

That Council

1. **APPOINT** the following community representatives to the Disability Access Advisory Committee for a two-year term of office commencing 25 September 2012:
   - Ms Natalie Hatton
   - Ms Marija Nelson
   - Ms Shielia Morris
   - Ms Helen Makeham
   - Ms Suzanne Marshall
   - Ms Joanne Bamford
   - Ms Valerie Gillian

2. **AMEND** the Disability Access Advisory Committee terms of reference and composition of the Disability Access Advisory Committee as follows:
   “To discuss and provide strategic advice to Council for the improvement of accessibility to Council’s facilities and services for people with a disability”
   Composition of Disability Access Advisory Committee
   Reduce number of community representatives from 13 to 7

Comments

The committee has been established with members having direct experience or responsibility the provision of disability services sector. The application received from Mr Dennis Cumming did not indicate any particular or specialised interest or experience in this disability services sector, which is considered essential given the matters to be considered and level of discussion that takes place at the Committee meetings. As a result the application received from Mr Cumming for membership to the Disability Access Advisory Committee membership is not supported.

The role of the group has changed significantly over the previous two years with a reduction of time spent in considering matters pertaining to the Disability Services Plan resulting in focus on the provision of universal access to facilities and a focus services provision outside the purview of the plan. The change in focus has resulted in a change in the terms of reference to reflect the role of the group in providing strategic advice to the Council on matters pertaining to universal access and service provision to persons with a disability in the Council’s services.

Global Friendship Committee

Terms of Reference

The role of the Committee is to make recommendations to Council on:

- Promoting awareness of the social and economic importance of the Global Friendships program to the community;
- Planning and arranging visits to and from global affiliates;
- Measuring the performance and effectiveness of individual Global Friendships in terms of community and economic development benefit;
- New Global Friendship proposals; and
- Reviewing the performance and effectiveness of each Global Friendship every four years to assess the degree of activity, value to Council and associated benefits for the City of Rockingham.
Current Membership
3 Councillors
4 Community Members

- Mrs Marion Paterson
- Ms Made Delaveris
- Ms Deb Wall
- Mr Noburo Hagiwara

Executive Support – Manager Economic Development

Number of Vacancies
1 Community member

Community Membership Nominations Received
Ms Rosalie Cameron

Recommendation
That Council APPOINT the following community representatives to the Global Friendship Committee for a two-year term of office commencing 25 September 2012:

- Mrs Marion Paterson
- Ms Made Delaveris
- Ms Deb Wall
- Mr Noburo Hagiwara

Comments
At the August 2012 Global Friendship Committee Meeting, the committee requested that Executive Support seek a nomination from the Rockingham Youth Advisory Council as the Committee would like a youth representative on the Global Friendship Committee. As the committee is requiring a youth representative, Rosalie Cameron will not be appointed as a community representative.

Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee

Terms of Reference
The Committee was formed to discuss and advise on various coastal facilities, amenities and infrastructure within the City of Rockingham Municipality.

Current Membership
2 Councillors
7 Representatives from Local Marine Groups and State Agencies

- Darren Schofield representing Department of Fisheries
- Mr Sean Emmett representing Department of Environment and Conservation
- Mr Chris Mather representing Department of Transport – Marine Safety
- Mr Tony Manolias representing Mangles Bay Fishing Club
- Mr David Slowly representing The Cruising Yacht Club
- Mr Chris Aleman representing Rockingham Volunteer Sea Rescue Group
- Mr David Haggar representing Safety Bay Windsurfing Club

Nil Community Members

Executive Support Officer – Manager Procurement and Projects

Number of Vacancies
2 Community Members

Community Membership Nominations Received
- Mr Leslie Dodd
- Ms Rosalie Cameron
Recommendation: Appointment of Community Member

That Council

1. **APPOINT** Mr Leslie Dodd as a community representative to the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee for a two-year term of office commencing 25 September 2012.

2. **APPOINT** the following representatives to the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee for a two-year term of office commencing 25 September 2012:
   - Darren Schofield representing Department of Fisheries
   - Mr Sean Emmett representing Department of Environment and Conservation
   - Mr Chris Mather representing Department of Transport – Marine Safety
   - Mr Tony Manolas representing Mangles Bay Fishing Club
   - Mr David Slowly representing The Cruising Yacht Club
   - Mr Chris Aleman representing Rockingham Volunteer Sea Rescue Group
   - Mr David Haggar representing Safety Bay Windsurfing Club

3. **AMEND** the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee composition by reducing the number of community representatives on the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee from 2 to 1.

**Comments**

The committee has been established with members having direct experience or responsibility in marine related activities. It is necessary for community representatives on the committee to discuss and consider such matters based on their own marine related expertise.

Following consideration of the Community representative nominations received it was determined that the nomination from Mr Leslie Dodd demonstrated a high level of relevant experience and knowledge with respect to local coastal infrastructure, recreational boating and diving.

The application received from Ms Cameron did not indicate any particular or specialised interest or experience in marine related matters, which is considered essential given the matters to be considered and level of discussion that takes place at the Committee meetings. As a result the application received from Ms Cameron for membership to the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee membership is recommended to not be accepted.

---

**Pioneers Luncheon Working Party**

**Terms of Reference**

To coordinate events for the Annual Pioneers Luncheon.

**Current Membership**

2 Councillors (1 Deputy)

1 Community Member

Ms Mary Davies

Executive Support – Manager Governance and Councillor Support

**Number of Vacancies**

1 Community Member

**Community Membership Nominations Received**

Ms Mary Davies

**Recommendation:**

That Council **APPOINT** Ms Mary Davies as a community representative to the Pioneers Luncheon Working Party for a two-year term of office commencing 25 September 2012.

**Comments**

Nil
Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee

Terms of Reference
To advise Council on the content and review of the Economic Development Implementation Plan.

Current Membership
1 Councillor
Chief Executive Officer of the City of Rockingham
4 Community Representatives
- Nigel Satterly
- John Yovich
- Brett Wolski
- Terry Howlson
Executive Support Officer – Manager Economic Development

Number of Vacancies
Nil

Community Membership Nominations Received
Nil

Recommendation
That Council
1. **APPOINT** the following community representatives to the Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee (REDAK) for a two-year term of office commencing 25 September 2012:
   - Nigel Satterly
   - John Yovich
   - Brett Wolski
   - Terry Howlson
2. **AMEND** the REDAK composition of community representatives on REDAK from 6 to a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 6.

Comments
Currently there are 4 community members on Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee. Amending the composition of Community representatives to allow a minimum of 4 and maximum of 6 gives the committee flexibility.

Rockingham Tourism Festival Committee

Terms of Reference
To oversee preparation of a business case to establish feasibility or otherwise for Council to conduct an annual major tourism event.

Current Membership
2 Councillors
- Cathy Terry representing Tourism Rockingham
- Stacey Graham representing Tourism Rockingham
- Steve Crotty representing Rockingham Kwinana Chamber of Commerce
- Angela Ryan representing Rockingham Kwinana Chamber of Commerce
- Executive Support – Manager Economic Development

Number of Vacancies
Nil
CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING
SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 16
OCTOBER 2012
PRESIDING MEMBER

Community Membership Nominations Received
Nil

Recommendation
That Council HOLD OVER the Rockingham Tourism Festival Committee pending the submission of a report to Council on the completion of Terms of Reference.

Comments
The preparation of the business case is now completed therefore the Committee has now fulfilled its terms of reference. The business case will presented to Council at a later date for Council decision at which time the future of the Committee will be determined.

Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee
Terms of Reference
This committee is established with the guiding principles to:
• Improve road safety within the City of Rockingham.
• Raise community awareness of road safety issues and initiatives in local communities
• Facilitate community planning, development and implementation of road safety programs and promotions.
• Develop programs and initiatives which target specific groups and road safety issue in the community
• Identify road safety problems, and to pursue and review road safety strategies which can be adopted by the City of Rockingham, Main Roads WA and the Western Australian Police Service.
• Identify crash problems, community concerns, black spot projects, and poor road user behaviour and to develop initiatives to address these.

All members of the RRWAC are to promote and adhere to the Vision and Guiding Principles.

Current Membership
2 Councillors (1 Deputy)
5 Community Representatives
• Mr George Montgomery
• Mr Dennis Cumming
• Ms Celine Low
• Mrs Arlene Yates
• Mr Kenneth Sankey

1 RoadWise Officer (WALGA) shall be a standing ex-officio member of the Committee.

One (1) Police representative, appointed by the Senior District Police officer in a non-voting capacity.

Executive Support – Coordinator Traffic Services

Number of Vacancies
5 Community Representatives.

Community Membership Nominations Received
• Mr George Montgomery
• Mr Dennis Cumming
• Ms Celine Low
• Mrs Arlene Yates
• Mr Kenneth Sankey
• Dr Ken Hay
• Ms Rosalie Cameron
• Mr Edward Burrows
Recommendation:
That Council:
1. **APPOINT** the following community representatives to the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee for a two-year term of office commencing 25 September 2012:
   - Mr George Montgomery
   - Mr Dennis Cumming
   - Ms Celine Low
   - Mrs Arlene Yates
   - Mr Kenneth Sankey
   - Dr Ken Hay
2. **AMEND** the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee composition by increasing the number of community representatives on the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee from 5 to 6.

Comments
The performance and attendance of the existing community representatives has consistently been at a high standard with few instances of unannounced non-attendance at the monthly meetings. This has also been displayed by the re-nomination of all existing community representatives to continue their association with the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee.

The number of community representatives had been previously reduced from six (6) to five (5) with Cr Ron Pease successful in his bid to become a Councillor. However, it is proposed to re-establish the number of community representatives to six (6) after a nomination was received from Dr Ken Hay. Dr Hay has experience working in emergency departments dealing with the results of road trauma and holds a special interest in the psychology of accident prevention. It is anticipated that Dr Hay’s experience and interests would be of particular value to the committee and its aims.

Voting Requirements
Absolute Majority

Officer Recommendation
That Council:
1. **DECLARE** vacant all non-Councillor positions on the following Advisory Committees:
   - Australia Day Awards Selection Panel
   - Disability Access Advisory Committee
   - Global Friendship Committee
   - Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee
   - Pioneers Luncheon Working Party
   - Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee
2. **HOLD OVER** the Rockingham Tourism Festival Committee pending the submission of a report to Council on the completion of the Committee’s Terms of Reference.
3. **APPOINT** the following members to the respective Advisory Committees listed as follows:
   **Australia Day Awards Selection Panel**
   - Mary Davies
   - Eileen Frith
   **Disability Access Advisory Committee**
   - Ms Natalie Hatton
   - Ms Marija Nelson
   - Ms Shiela Morris
   - Ms Helen Makeham
   - Ms Suzanne Marshall
   - Ms Joanne Bamford
   - Ms Valerie Gillian
Global Friendship Committee
• Mrs Marion Paterson
• Ms Made Delaveris
• Ms Deb Wall
• Mr Noburo Hagiwara

Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee
• Mr Les Dodd
• Darren Schofield representing Department of Fisheries
• Mr Sean Emmett representing Department of Environment and Conservation
• Mr Chris Mather representing Department of Transport – Marine Safety
• Mr Tony Manolas representing Mangles Bay Fishing Club
• Mr David Slowly representing The Cruising Yacht Club
• Mr Chris Aleman representing Rockingham Volunteer Sea Rescue Group
• Mr David Haggar representing Safety Bay Windsurfing Club

Pioneers Luncheon Working Party
• Ms Mary Davies

Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee
• Nigel Satterly
• John Yovich
• Brett Wolski
• Terry Howlson

Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee
• Mr George Montgomery
• Mr Dennis Cumming
• Ms Celine Low
• Mrs Arlene Yates
• Mr Kenneth Sankey
• Dr Ken Hay

4. **AMEND** the Australia Day Awards Selection Panel composition from 3 community representatives to the 2 Freeman of the City of Rockingham.

5. **AMEND** the Disability Access Advisory Committee terms of reference and composition of the Disability Access Advisory Committee as follows:

   “To discuss and provide strategic advice to Council for the improvement of accessibility to Council’s facilities and services for people with a disability”

Composition of Disability Access Advisory Committee

Reduce number of community representatives from 13 to 7

6. **AMEND** the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee composition by reducing the number of community representatives on the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee from 2 to 1.

7. **AMEND** the Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee composition of community representatives on REDAC from 6 to a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 6.

8. **AMEND** the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee composition by increasing the number of community representatives on the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee from 5 to 6.

9. **AMEND** the Governance and Meeting Framework Policy to reflect changes.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **DECLARE** vacant all non-Councillor positions on the following Advisory Committees:
   • Australia Day Awards Selection Panel
   • Disability Access Advisory Committee
   • Global Friendship Committee
2. **HOLD OVER** the Rockingham Tourism Festival Committee pending the submission of a report to Council on the completion of the Committee’s Terms of Reference.

3. **APPOINT** the following members to the respective Advisory Committees listed as follows:

   **Australia Day Awards Selection Panel**
   - Mary Davies
   - Eileen Frith

   **Disability Access Advisory Committee**
   - Ms Natalie Hatton
   - Ms Marija Nelson
   - Ms Sheila Morris
   - Ms Helen Makeham
   - Ms Suzane Marshall
   - Ms Joanne Bamford
   - Ms Valerie Gillian

   **Global Friendship Committee**
   - Mrs Marion Paterson
   - Ms Made Delaveris
   - Ms Deb Wall
   - Mr Noburo Hagiwara

   **Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee**
   - Mr Les Dodd
   - Darren Schofield representing Department of Fisheries
   - Mr Sean Emmett representing Department of Environment and Conservation
   - Mr Chris Mather representing Department of Transport – Marine Safety
   - Mr Tony Manolas representing Mangles Bay Fishing Club
   - Mr David Slowly representing The Cruising Yacht Club
   - Mr Chris Aleman representing Rockingham Volunteer Sea Rescue Group
   - Mr David Haggar representing Safety Bay Windsurfing Club

   **Pioneers Luncheon Working Party**
   - Ms Mary Davies

   **Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee**
   - Nigel Satterly
   - John Yovich
   - Brett Wolski
   - Terry Howson

   **Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee**
   - Mr George Montgomery
   - Mr Dennis Cumming
   - Ms Celine Low
   - Mrs Arlene Yates
   - Mr Kenneth Sankey
   - Dr Ken Hay

4. **AMEND** the Australia Day Awards Selection Panel composition from 3 community representatives to the 2 Freeman of the City of Rockingham.

5. **AMEND** the Disability Access Advisory Committee terms of reference and composition of the Disability Access Advisory Committee as follows:

   “To discuss and provide strategic advice to Council for the improvement of accessibility to Council’s facilities and services for people with a disability”

   Composition of Disability Access Advisory Committee
   Reduce number of community representatives from 13 to 7
6. **AMEND** the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee composition by reducing the number of community representatives on the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee from 2 to 1.

7. **AMEND** the Rockingham Economic Development Advisory Committee composition of community representatives on REDAC from 6 to a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 6.

8. **AMEND** the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee composition by increasing the number of community representatives on the Rockingham RoadWise Advisory Committee from 5 to 6.

9. **AMEND** the Governance and Meeting Framework Policy to reflect changes.

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>
Strategy Coordination
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Reference No & Subject: SC-003/12 Draft Climate Change Response Strategy
File No: CPM/80
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Purpose of Report

Council to endorse the Draft Climate Change Response Strategy for the purpose of public consultation. The Strategy identifies the Climate Change Risks for the City over the next 60 years, including mitigation and adaptation actions to address these Risks.

Background

Climate Change can be defined as a significant and lasting change in the statistical distribution of weather patterns over periods ranging from decades to millions of years. It may be a change in average weather conditions or the distribution of events around that average (e.g. more or fewer extreme weather events). Climate Change may be limited to a specific region or may occur across the whole Earth. Historic trends and modelling into the future indicate that the Coast of Western Australia (and the City of Rockingham) is susceptible to various risks as a result of anticipated changes in our climate.

Geographically, the City of Rockingham is contained within a complex geophysical system with a large variety of coastal and wetland habitats. Potential Climate Changes, such as sea-level rise, decline in rainfall, increased annual temperatures and changes in the frequency and intensity of extreme events will have broad ranging impacts on the natural systems that contribute to the economic, social and environmental prosperity of the region. Some elements such as sea level rise will occur gradually over many years, and so integration into a Disaster Management Plan is not appropriate. Local Government plans will need to accommodate this gradual, incremental long term
change. Other Climate Change elements such as storms, cyclones and heat waves are highly visible, sudden, and extreme events that require disaster planning. Understanding how this variation applies to the particular Local Government area for the City of Rockingham may be useful for planning effective adaptation measures.

**Details**

The purpose of the Climate Change Response Strategy is to:

- Provide an overview of what Climate Change is and how it could potentially impact the organisation and its activities
- Address those Strategic Community Plan Aspirations that would be affected by the variables associated with Climate Change and to link this to the City’s Operations
- Provide a “vehicle” through which the identified community and organisational Strategic objectives can be driven through targeted mitigation and adaptation actions that have been developed through a Risk analysis process

The desired outcome of the Climate Change Response Strategy is to:

- Provide a comprehensive link between the Strategic Community Plan and Operational Team Plans with regards to planning for and acting upon the possible threat and associated implications of Climate Change
- Prompt staff within the organisation that Climate Change requires pro-active planning
- Provide a source of information which identifies the following elements with regards to Climate Change:
  - Climate Change variables that could impact on the City
  - Risks associated with these variables
  - Actions to address these risks
  - Team plans and Responsible people that would be required to plan and budget for these actions and implement them
- Provide a framework within which identified actions can be tracked for implementation and updated on an ongoing basis in order to ensure that the City remains pro-active with regards to Climate Change mitigation and adaptation

The Strategy supports at least five of the aspirations that have been specified in the City’s Strategic Community Plan.

**Key Aspirations covered by this Climate Change Response Strategy:**

- Infrastructure Construction & Planning
- Facilities & Services
- Climate Change
- Coastal and Bushland Reserves
- Carbon footprint & Waste reduction

**Purpose of this Climate Change Response Strategy:**

To Identify the Climate Change Risks for CoR and to develop Adaptation and Mitigation actions to address these Risks

**Key variables:**

1. Sea level rise
2. Reduced rainfall
3. Increased temperature
4. Increased intensity of storm events
5. Ocean acidification / Sea temp rise
The strategy covers the next 60 years, and will be reviewed annually in order to update the assumptions and identified actions as and when new knowledge becomes available.

The key strategic objectives from the Climate Change Response Strategy are focussed on two entities, namely the community and the organisation:

**Community objectives**
- Educate the community on what Climate Change is and how it would affect them
- Address all potential Health and Safety issues with regards to the community
- Ensure continuity of services and facilities to the community as far as is possible, especially with extreme events

**Organisational objectives**
- Ensure knowledge and awareness amongst staff about what Climate Change is and what potential threats it could hold for the organisation and its operations
- Develop business continuity plan through the City's risk management framework
- Minimise costs associated with planning for and reacting to Climate Change events, without compromising the sustainability of the organisation and the safety of its people

Key next steps that would ensure a common level of understanding and ongoing implementation of the identified actions presented from the Risk analysis include:
- A vigorous approach towards knowledge transfer across the organisation and within the community
  - The Climate Change focus group will address this through appropriate briefing documents and information sessions
- Active tracking of the implementation of identified mitigation and adaptation actions that have been developed from the Risk Analysis and are in support of the Key Strategic objectives
  - The Climate Change focus group meet on a monthly basis to discuss progress with the implementation of the actions and to develop further actions as and when required
- Ongoing update and incorporation of the mitigation actions identified in the Corporate Local Action plan (CLAP) which sets targets for corporate greenhouse gas emissions reduction. The CLAP was first developed and endorsed in 2000 to help the City achieve its 20% emissions reduction target, as set by the Cities for Climate Protection Programme (CCP). The Plan is regularly reviewed to ensure that it is current and to enable actions to be modified and priorities to be re-set.

**Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   Once endorsed by Council, the draft Climate Change Response Strategy will be presented to the community for consultation during October and November. Following an update based on community inputs, it is anticipated that the Final Climate Change Response Strategy will be brought to Council for approval at the December Council meeting.

   Information sessions will also be held to inform the community of Climate Change impacts as and when required.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

   Ongoing interaction with Government Departments as and when new knowledge becomes available with regards to Climate Change.
The Climate Change Authority was established on 1 July 2012, and provides independent advice on the operation of Australia’s carbon price, emissions reduction targets, caps and trajectories, and other Australian Government climate change initiatives. The Authority is established under the Climate Change Authority Act 2011.

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:-

Aspirations 4 and 5: A healthy community engaging in positive and rewarding lifestyles with access to a range of passive and active recreational and personal development opportunities” and “Community facilities and services delivered in a timely manner, able to meet expectations and serve new and growing neighbourhoods.

Aspiration 9: Planning systems, infrastructure standards and community awareness programs that serve to acknowledge and mitigate the impacts of Climate Change.

Aspiration 10: Coastal and bushland reserves that are well utilised and managed in a way that will preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

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

d. Policy

Nil

e. Financial

Financial implications include the implementation of a number of actions identified from the Strategy.

Costs:

- Operating costs:
  - An amount of $50,000 has been budgeted for Climate Change as an operating project in the 2012/2013 Financial year within the Strategic Planning and Environment Team Plan
  - Actions identified from the Climate Change Response Strategy will be brought to Council for approval through the Team Plan budgeting process as Operating projects on an annual basis
  - Day-to-day operating expenses associated with actions identified in the Climate Change Response Strategy have been included in current team plans and will be updated accordingly on an annual basis

- Capital costs: Varies, depending on the scope of the work required. These costs will be incorporated in the total costs of the infrastructure projects and will be brought to Council through the major and minor infrastructure planning process

- Asset management costs: To be incorporated into the Asset Management Plan on an ongoing basis

- Consultant costs: Minimal, since most work will be done in-house as far as possible

f. Legal and Statutory

The Clean Energy Legislation Amendment Act 2012 (CELA Act) and related Acts were passed in June 2012. The CELA Act makes amendments to the Clean Energy Act 2011 and related legislation establishing the Government’s carbon pricing mechanism. It contains provisions concerning the coverage of gaseous fuels by the mechanism and minor technical and consequential amendments to ensure the legislation is clear and consistent.
Although not directly addressing Climate Change, the above legislation needs to be considered in parallel with the City’s Climate Change Response Strategy.

**Comments**

The City’s Climate Change Response Strategy forms an integral part of various Community Plan Aspirations. The implementation of the identified actions from the Risk analysis proceeds through the various team Plans, the Asset Management Plan and the Infrastructure Plan.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ENDORSE** the Draft City of Rockingham Climate Change Response Strategy for the purpose of community consultation as per the attachment to Item SC-003/12.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ENDORSE** the Draft City of Rockingham Climate Change Response Strategy for the purpose of community consultation as per the attachment to Item SC-003/12.

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 T12/13-31 - Supply, installation and maintenance of reticulation system pump cubicle control switchboards, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

Background

The tender was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 7 July 2012 for Tender T12/13-31 - Supply, installation and maintenance of reticulation system pump cubicle control switchboards. The tender closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 25 July 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

Details

The works associated with this specification shall include the supply and installation of reticulation system pump cubicle control switchboards as detailed in the tender document.
Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northlake Electrical Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D U Electrical Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlite Electrical Contractors Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising Manager Parks Operations, Reticulation Coordinator and Irrigation Assets Officer undertook tender evaluations.

D U Electrical did not provide pricing for supply and delivery of cubicles and/or switchboards greater than 7.5Kw. D U Electrical were contacted to clarify why they couldn’t provide the units and they replied by confirming that the pricing for the larger units was incorrectly left out of the tender submission and they could provide units. As the additional pricing for the units was not received until after the closing date the additional pricing was not considered. D U Electrical was still considered for the smaller switchboard units and electrical maintenance.

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>Northlake Electrical</th>
<th>D U Electrical</th>
<th>Greenlite Electrical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 4:** A healthy community engaging in positive and rewarding lifestyles with access to a range of passive and active recreational and personal development opportunities

   **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**

Capital works expenditure will be in accordance with the City’s Business Plan and operational expenditure will be in accordance with the Engineering and Parks operations maintenance budgets as allocated in the 2012/13 budget.

Annual expenditure for this operational service has historically been in the region of $220,000.

f. **Legal and Statutory**


**Comments**

Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender criteria all companies demonstrated an ability to deliver the required services, however, there was an acknowledgement that it had been difficult to rely on one contractor to deliver all required electrical installation and maintenance tasks for irrigation cubicles across the City. As a result, the assessment panel considered there was an operational benefit to award the contract to more than one nominated contractor.

North Lake Electrical and Greenlite Electrical were identified through the assessment process as best meeting the requirements of the tender and are therefore both recommended as preferred tenderers.

Works are to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Northlake Electrical Pty Ltd, U1 / 33 Cutler Road, Jandakot and Greenlite Electrical Contractors Pty Ltd, Unit 7 / 133 Winton Road, Joondalup for Tender T12/13-31 - Supply, installation and maintenance of reticulation system pump cubicle control switchboards in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award for a period of 24 months.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Northlake Electrical Pty Ltd, U1 / 33 Cutler Road, Jandakot and Greenlite Electrical Contractors Pty Ltd, Unit 7 / 133 Winton Road, Joondalup for Tender T12/13-31 - Supply, installation and maintenance of reticulation system pump cubicle control switchboards in accordance with the tender documentation for the contract period being from the date of award for a period of 24 months.

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 T12/13-28 – Period Supply, Fit and Repair Tyres and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

Background

The tender was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 7 July 2012 for T12/13-28 – Period Supply, Fit and Repair Tyres. The tender closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 25 July 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

Details

The work includes the supply, fitting and repair of tyres at the contactors workshop and/or on-site at various locations within the City of Rockingham, for vehicles, trucks and various items of plant, including.

The Contract period shall be from the date of award until 31 August 2014.

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyres 4 U Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Rockingham Medina Tyre Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jane Corporation Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Beaurepaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising Manager Engineering Operations, Coordinator Fleet Services and Procurement Coordinator 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>Tyres 4 U Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Bob Jane Corporation Pty Ltd</th>
<th>Rockingham Medina Tyre Service</th>
<th>Beaurepaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>93%</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 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
   Operational expenditure will be in accordance with the Engineering and Parks operations maintenance budgets as allocated in the 2012/13 operational plant budget.
   Tyre expenditure for the 2011/12 financial year was $312,686

f. Legal and Statutory

**Comments**

The tender submission from Tyres 4 U Pty Ltd advised that they would use Rockingham Medina Tyre Service as a subcontractor, the tender assessment panel considered this request as acceptable.
Due to the diverse nature of the tyres required, together with the understanding that at times no one contractor would be available to carry out the required tasks on demand, the assessment panel considered it to be operationally suitable to recommend multiple tenderers. The works are to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender criteria all companies demonstrated a capacity to complete the works, however, the submissions received from Rockingham Medina Tyre Service, Tyres 4 U Pty Ltd and Beaurepaires are considered to represent best value to the City and are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers.

### Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

### Officer Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted from Rockingham Medina Tyre Service, 53 Dixon Road, Rockingham; Tyres 4 U Pty Ltd, 102 Welshpool Road, Welshpool; and Beaurepaires, Level 1, 116 Kewdale Road, Kewdale for Tender T12/13-28 – Period Supply, Fit and Repair Tyres for the contract period being from date of award until 31 August 2014 in accordance with the tender documentation.

### Committee Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted from Rockingham Medina Tyre Service, 53 Dixon Road, Rockingham; Tyres 4 U Pty Ltd, 102 Welshpool Road, Welshpool; and Beaurepaires, Level 1, 116 Kewdale Road, Kewdale for Tender T12/13-28 – Period Supply, Fit and Repair Tyres for the contract period being from date of award until 31 August 2014 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
### Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-26 – Supply and delivery of various items of safety equipment, clothing and footwear, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

### Background

The tender was advertised in the West Australian Newspaper on Saturday, 7 July 2012. The tender closed at 2:00pm Wednesday, 25 July 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

### Details

The scope of the contract is for the Supply and Delivery of Various Items of Safety Equipment, Clothing and Footwear.

The period of the contract shall be from the date of award until the 30th August 2014.
Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worksense Workwear and Safety Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Safeman WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protector Alsafe Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Heatley Sales Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Blackwood &amp; Son (Blackwoods)</td>
<td>Regalia Craft Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers World Pty Ltd</td>
<td>L&amp;H Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Brands Workwear Group Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Deltalex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEA Pty Ltd</td>
<td>BOC Ltd -- Non Conforming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising of the Technical Support Officer, Storeperson and the Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

BOC Ltd submitted an alternate tender which the assessment panel deemed non-conforming as prices were fixed for a six month period, therefore not compliant with the General Conditions of Contract.

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>L&amp;H Rockingham</th>
<th>Safeman WA</th>
<th>Worksense Workwear</th>
<th>Delta Flex</th>
<th>RSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Blackwoods</th>
<th>Protector Alsafe</th>
<th>Heatley Sales</th>
<th>Regalia Craft</th>
<th>Workers World</th>
<th>Pacific Brands Workwear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</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 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
   Operational purchases will be in accordance with the Engineering and Parks operations maintenance budgets as allocated in the 2012/13 operational budget.
   Total 2011/12 expenditure on safety equipment, clothing and footwear was $102,303.

f. Legal and Statutory

Comments

Safeman WA is the City’s current supplier and has provided good levels of service.

Due to the diverse nature of the goods to be supplied, the assessment panel considered it to be operationally suitable to recommend multiple tenderers. The works are to be allocated based on availability, price, level of service and proven performance along with suitability in relation to specific job requirements.

Following consideration of the submissions in accordance with the tender criteria all companies demonstrated a capacity to complete the works, however, the submissions received from Safeman WA and L&H (Lawrence & Hansen) Rockingham are considered to represent best value to the City and are therefore recommended as the preferred tenderers.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted from Safeman WA, 23 Colin Jamieson Drive, Welshpool and L&H Rockingham, Unit 2, 2 Pickard Avenue, Rockingham; for Tender T12/13-26 – Supply and delivery of various items of safety equipment, clothing and footwear for the contract period being from date of award until 30 August 2014 in accordance with the tender documentation.
**Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tenders submitted from Safeman WA, 23 Colin Jamieson Drive, Welshpool and L&H Rockingham, Unit 2, 2 Pickard Avenue, Rockingham; for Tender T12/13-26 – Supply and delivery of various items of safety equipment, clothing and footwear for the contract period being from date of award until 30 August 2014 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
Purpose of Report

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-27 – Supply and delivery of one drainage jetting and vacuum unit including cab chassis, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

Background

The tender was advertised in the West Australian Newspaper on Saturday, 7 July 2012 and the Sound Telegraph on Wednesday, 11 July 2012. The tender closed at 2:00pm Wednesday, 1 August 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

Details

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Equipment Company (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Centre (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising of the Manager Engineering Operations, Fleet Coordinator and the Procurement Coordinator 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>Sewer Equipment Company (Australia)</th>
<th>Truck Centre (WA) Pty Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68.4%</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 building, 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**  
   Expenditure of $360,000 has been allocated for the purchase of one drainage jetting and vacuum unit including cab chassis in the 2012/2013 budget account W22230.3217.086 – Plant and Equipment Purchases. As the cost of the new plant is $367,029 and therefore, $7,029 more than the budget, excess funds from W21598.3217.086, purchase of new 6 Wheel Side Loader Rubbish Truck - GL 410117.0001.086 will be identified in the September 2012 Budget Review to cover the additional cost of $7029 for the Jetting Machine.

f. **Legal and Statutory**  

**Comments**

Following consideration of the tender submissions and in accordance with the tender assessment criteria both companies demonstrated a capacity to supply and deliver the drainage jetting and vacuum unit including cab chassis, however, the submissions received from Sewer Equipment
Company (Australia) 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 Sewer Equipment Company (Australia), Unit 5, 85-115 Alfred Road, Chipping Norton, NSW, 2170 for Tender T12/13-27 – Supply and delivery of one drainage jetting and vacuum unit including cab chassis for the cost of $367,029 in accordance with the tender documentation.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Sewer Equipment Company (Australia), Unit 5, 85-115 Alfred Road, Chipping Norton, NSW, 2170 for Tender T12/13-27 – Supply and delivery of one drainage jetting and vacuum unit including cab chassis for the cost of $367,029 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
Corporate and Engineering Services
Engineering and Parks Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-072/12</th>
<th>Tender T12/13-30 – Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring and Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>T12/13-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr James Henson, Manager Parks Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Ken Sullivan, Irrigation Assets Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>18 September 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site:**

**Lot Area:**

**Attachments:**

**Maps/Diagrams:**

---

**Purpose of Report**

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T12/13-30 – Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring and Reporting and document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

**Background**

The tender was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 7 July 2012 for Tender T12/13-30 – Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring and Reporting. The tender closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 1 August 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.

**Details**

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WSP Environment &amp; Energy</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Hydro Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS Environment and Planning</td>
<td>ENV Australia</td>
<td>Worley Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Environmental</td>
<td>Sidecrest</td>
<td>Cardno (WA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERS</td>
<td>GHD</td>
<td>Endemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDC Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A panel comprising of the Manager Parks Development, Irrigation Assets Officer and Procurement Coordinator undertook tender evaluations.

### 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 9:** Planning systems, infrastructure standards and community awareness programs that serve to acknowledge and mitigate the impacts of climate change |
|   | **Aspiration 10:** Coastal and bushland reserves that are well utilised and managed in a way that will preserve them for future generations to enjoy |
| e. | Financial | Readvertising costs will be met from operational expenditure for Procurement Services. |

### Comments

During the tender assessment it became apparent that the majority of tenderers interpreted the tender specification differently and it was considered that the price schedule could not be fairly assessed or compared.

Tender requests for groundwater and surface water monitoring and reporting services have not been requested before and the specification required for the works was very complex and had not been tested in the commercial market place.

To ensure fairness and in order to satisfy the veracity of the City’s tender process it is recommended that all tenders be rejected.

It is recommended that the tender for the groundwater and surface water monitoring and reporting services be re-advertised with revised documentation which acknowledges internal and external feedback acquired as a result of the previous tender process.

### Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

### Officer Recommendation

That Council:

1. **REJECT** all the tenders for T12/13-30 – Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring and Reporting, as they cannot be fairly assessed.

2. **RE-ADVERTISEMENT** the tender for the statutory period.
Committee Recommendation

That Council:
1. **REJECT** all the tenders for T12/13-30 – Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring and Reporting, as they cannot be fairly assessed.
2. **RE-ADVERTISE** the tender for the statutory period.

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 Committee Minutes
Tuesday 18 September 2012

CONFIRMED AT A CORPORATE & ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 16 OCTOBER 2012

PAGE 51

Purpose of Report

That Council consider the recommendation arising from the RoadWise Advisory Committee meeting held on 6 August 2012.

Recommendations to the Corporate and Engineering Services Committee

Advisory Committee Recommendation 1:
Main Roads Investigation of Ennis Avenue and Willmott Drive Intersection

That Council DIRECT the Chief Executive Officer to request that Main Roads Western Australia investigate counter measures that may be put in place to address the number of serious casualty crashes that are taking place at the intersection of Willmott Drive and Ennis Avenue, Waikiki.

Background

Willmott Drive is a local distributor Road under the care and control of the City of Rockingham. Speed zoned at 50km/h, it meanders through Cooloongup and Waikiki, providing a link between Read Street and Ennis Avenue.

Ennis Avenue (Melville to Mandurah Highway) is a controlled access Highway under the care and control of Main Roads WA. The road section that incorporates the intersection of Willmott Drive, Ennis Avenue is speed zoned at 100km/h.

Over that last few months, a number of serious crashes have occurred at the intersection of Ennis Avenue and Willmott Drive, Waikiki. This has prompted a number of letters to both the City and local newspapers requesting that the safety of the intersection be addressed.

A review of the intersection’s crash history reveals that in the last 5 years (ending December 2011), a total of 64 reported crashes have occurred. This represents an average crash rate of 12.8 crashes a year with a high of 16 in 2007 and a low of 9 in 2011. When considering the number of vehicle movements within the intersection, this shows a rate of 1 crash for every 891,000 vehicles moving...
through the intersection. While no fatal crashes were reported within the above 5 year period, 26.5% of the reported crashes were considered serious enough to require medical attention. The predominate crash type within this intersection is the rear end crash type with 35 being recorded in the 5 years. Of greater concern however is the high number of right angle and right turn through crashes (2 vehicles colliding with one vehicle being hit side on) where 21 were recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications to Consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration/s contained in the Community Plan 2011:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration 2: A safe community where residents feel secure, relaxed and comfortable within their home, work and social environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Legal and Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Voting Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer Recommendation if Different to Advisory Committee Recommendation**

That Council SUPPORT the continued liaison between City officers and Main Roads WA into the investigation of road safety improvements at the intersection of Ennis Avenue and Willmott Drive, Waikiki.

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

Although raised at the August RoadWise Committee meeting, the City’s Engineering Services have been liaising with Main Roads officers over safety improvements within Ennis Avenue near Willmott Drive locality for a number of years, with more detailed discussions beginning in late 2011.

The most recent correspondence received from Main Roads (6th August 2012) indicated that the intersection has been identified for possible improvement works and that Main Roads would continue to work with the City to investigate and analyse the location and to consider appropriate treatment strategies.

**Committee Recommendation**

That Council SUPPORT the continued liaison between City officers and Main Roads WA into the investigation of road safety improvements at the intersection of Ennis Avenue and Willmott Drive, Waikiki.

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 T12/13-37 – 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 document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

Background

The tender was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 4 August 2012 for Tender 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. The tender closed at 2.00pm, Wednesday, 22 August 2012 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
**Details**

Tender submissions were received from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Excavator Type</th>
<th>Supply, delivery and licensing of one excavator</th>
<th>Optional Trade in of the City's existing excavator</th>
<th>Nett Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hitachi Construction Machinery</td>
<td>Hitachi ZX200LC-3</td>
<td>$219,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$199,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liebherr Australia Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Liebherr R906 C</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthwest</td>
<td>Hyundai R210LC-9</td>
<td>$206,300</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$186,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Equipment Sales Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Doosan - DX225LC</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td>$25,454</td>
<td>$155,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WesTrac Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Caterpillar 320DL</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McIntosh &amp; Son</td>
<td>CASE CX210B</td>
<td>$203,284</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$173,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutt Bryant Equip</td>
<td>Sumitomo SH210LC-5</td>
<td>$198,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komatsu Australia Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Komatsu HB205-1</td>
<td>$259,300</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$239,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJD Equipment Pty Ltd</td>
<td>Volvo EC210C</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising of the Manager Waste and Landfill Services, Landfill Services Coordinator and the Procurement Coordinator 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>Tutt Bryant Equip</th>
<th>Clark Equip Sales</th>
<th>CJD Equip</th>
<th>Earthwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>McIntosh &amp; Son</th>
<th>Hitachi</th>
<th>WesTrac</th>
<th>Komatsu</th>
<th>Liebherr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and experience of Tenderer</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendered Price/s</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Weighted Scores</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</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 building, 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
   Expenditure of $270,000 has been allocated for the purchase of one new excavator in the 2012/2013 budget account GL410122 (W22162) – Plant and Equipment Purchases with an estimate trade in value of $10,000 for the City’s existing Hitachi Excavator (Plant No. 60446).

f. Legal and Statutory

Comments

Due to the number of submissions received the assessment panel following assessment, shortlisted Clark Equipment Sales, CJD Equipment and Tutt Bryant Equipment for operator and mechanical assessments and following assessments incorporated these scores within the assessment matrix, therefore, the other companies were not scored on operator and mechanical assessment.

Following consideration of the submission and their assessment in accordance with the tender criteria by the assessment panel, the submission received from Tutt Bryant Equipment was deemed to represent best value to the City.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Tutt Bryant Equipment, 50 Great Eastern Highway, South Guildford for Tender 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 in accordance with the tender documentation for the supply of one Sumitomo SH210LC-5 excavator for the lump sum value of $198,000 (GST Excl) less trade in of the City’s existing excavator for $20,000 (GST Excl) resulting in a net change over of price of $178,000 ($198,000 - $20,000) in accordance with the tender documentation.
### Committee Recommendation

That Council **ACCEPT** the tender submitted from Tutt Bryant Equipment, 50 Great Eastern Highway, South Guildford for Tender 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 in accordance with the tender documentation for the supply of one Sumitomo SH210LC-5 excavator for the lump sum value of $198,000 (GST Excl) less trade in of the City’s existing excavator for $20,000 (GST Excl) resulting in a net change over of price of $178,000 ($198,000 - $20,000) 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**

**Engineering and Parks 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td></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></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></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>

Cr Allan Hill, OAM JP
Mr James Henson, Manager Parks Development
Mr Scott Lambie, A/Manager Engineering Services

18 September 2012

Executive Function
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.”

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**

- **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 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.
d. **Policy**  
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.

### 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.

**Moved Cr Dunkling, seconded Cr Elliott:**

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 Community and Engineering Services Committee.

Committee Voting – 4/0

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

To provide Cr Hill with an opportunity to speak to his Notice of Motion.

Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Nil
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-076/12 Notice of Motion from Cr Hamblin—Investigation into Mornington Reserve Development works being brought forward from 2014/15 to 2012/13 in the City’s Business Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Cr Deb Hamblin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr James Henson, Manager Parks Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>18 September 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>Lot 4368, corner Mornington Boulevard and Jersey Way Waikiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>Aerial view of Mornington Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of Report

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

Background

Cr Hamblin submitted the following motion for consideration at the Ordinary Council meeting in August 2012:

“That Council REQUESTS the November 2012 review of the City’s Business Plan 2012/13 to 2022/23 be prepared with the Mornington Reserve development works of $200,000 being bought forward from 2014/15 to 2012/13.”

At this meeting it was resolved:

“That Council DEFER the matter for consideration at a future meeting.”

The reason for the deferral was that the Notice of Motion stated “being bought forward from 2014/15 to 2012/13” when the intent was for it to be “bought forward from 2014/15 to 2013/14.”

Details

As part of the former Five Year Asset Creation Program for parks and reserves the development of Mornington Reserve, corner Mornington Boulevard and Jersey Way, Waikiki, was identified for delivery in 2011/12.

The intent of this program was to identify the levels of expenditure and the financial implications to Council, together with establishing a timeframe for programmed works in a recognised order of priority.

With the introduction of the City’s ten (10) year business planning process a revised assignment priority has deferred the timing for development of Mornington Reserve until 2014/15.

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 5: Community facilities and services delivered in a timely manner, able to meet expectations and serve new and growing neighbourhoods.
d. Policy
   Nil
e. Financial
   The development of Mornington Reserve, Waikiki is currently listed in the City Business Plan for delivery in 2014/15 at an estimated cost of $200,000.
f. Legal and Statutory
   Nil
Comments

While accepting the delay attributed to a revised priority with the introduction of the City Business Plan, together with acknowledging the local community support for the development of Mornington Reserve, any change in the order of priority requires reallocation of funds identified in the current adopted budget to deliver the project in the 2012/13 financial year.

The following is a list of Parks Operations, and Parks Development project funds currently allocated in the 2012/13 adopted budget.

1. Warnbro Recreation Reserve sports field irrigation upgrade $250,000
2. Parks Infrastructure Renewal - General $180,000

It is considered that the current irrigation system on Warnbro Recreation Reserve is in urgent need of replacement and any further delay in delivering these works would have far reaching consequences to both the standard of sports surface in relation to the Occupation Health and Safety (OHS) standards and the established reputation of the City to provide an adequate service level to the respective sports club using the reserve.

In relation to the account for the general provision of Parks Infrastructure renewal, the operating budget is allocated annually to cover the capital costs associated with the urgent and untimely replacement of parks infrastructure such as bore replacement, playground renewal or sports equipment repairs.

An opportunity exists however, to make an adjustment in the current program to interchange the timing of the ‘Ribbons of Green/Streetscape/Entry Statement Rae Road’ 2013/14 for the development of Mornington Reserve and thereby allow Council to support the revision in the City’s Business Plan.

The following is a list of Parks Operations, and Parks Development project funds currently allocated in the 2013/14 adopted budget.

1. Rae Road Ribbons of Green, Streetscape $250,000
2. Parks Infrastructure Renewal - General $180,000

The recent Department of Water restrictions applied to groundwater licencing would have naturally imposed a constraint to reduce the scope for Rae Road Streetscape and for that reason alone the timing of the Rae Road streetscape project attracts a lesser priority.

This adjustment would only delay the delivery of the project by an additional 5 to 6 months as it is unlikely the project would be initiated under the existing 2012/13 program until after the Christmas break.

It is therefore recommended that the Mornington Reserve assignment priority be amended in the City’s Business Plan 2012/13 to 2022/23 to reflect delivery in 2013/14 in exchange for a timing adjustment for the Rae Road Streetscape to 2014/15.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council SUPPORT amending the City Business Plan to have the Mornington Reserve development works of $200,000 bought forward from 2014/15 to 2013/14.

Motion from Cr Deb Hamblin

That Council REQUEST the November 2012 review of the City’s Business Plan 2012/13 to 2022/23 be prepared with the Mornington Reserve development works of $200,000 being bought forward from 2014/15 to 2012/13.
Committee Recommendation

That Council **SUPPORT** amending the City Business Plan to have the Mornington Reserve development works of $200,000 bought forward from 2014/15 to 2013/14.

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, 16 October 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 **4:29pm**.